The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tem (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.
Nation back on track with the America-generational investment and get our economy back to work.

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

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 300 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 in his role 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 from home 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 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 the 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 correcting drought conditions in California. I call upon the bipartisan leaders of the House and Senate to confront this crisis, including my bill, the RENEW WIIN Act.

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,

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.

Secretary of the House, pro tempore.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
House of Representatives,

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 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 such an 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(f);

(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;

(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, and 711 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–7 et seq.) to the Commission, the Attorney General, or any person alleging a violation of this Act against an employee described in section 5(3)(A) except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection.

(b) 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. 1980) shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Commission, the Attorney General, or any person alleging such practice.

(c) DAMAGES.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in section 1977A of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1981a) 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. 1980) 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) 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. 1311 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 the Attorney General, in 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.

(b) 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. 1980) 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...
SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

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

(2) the term “covered entity” means an employer, which means a person employing 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));

(3) the term “employee” means—

(A) an employee (including an applicant), as defined in section 717(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e); and

(B) includes—

(i) an employer, which means a person employing 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 employing agency, as defined in section 411(c) of title 3, United States Code;

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

(v) 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 entity (including an applicant), as defined in section 101 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301); and

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

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

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

(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 employer, the employment agency, or the employee’s designee, in the course of determining whether the employee or applicant has a medical condition, is likely to experience, or that the employer, the employment agency, or the employee’s designee reasonably believes is likely to experience, such a condition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1065, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

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.

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 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.

Chairperson, House Committee on the Judiciary,


Hon. Robert C. “Bobby” Scott,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor,

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 conferences 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.

Chairman, 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 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.
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 that were incorporated in the legislative text that are before us today.

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 or without 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 employers a unilateral veto over offered accommodations. However, the bill now clarifies that reasonable accommodations will 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, which is 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 this bill lacks from this last Congress. 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 when we worked 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 and safety and economic security of pregnant workers and their families. Unfortunately, under current Federal law, pregnant workers do not have access to reasonable workplace accommodations.

Some 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 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 to protect pregnant workers from suffering discrimination at an alarming rate.

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 years after the Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would outlaw discrimination on the basis of pregnancy, childbirth or related medical conditions, yet pregnancy discrimination is still widespread and disproportionately affecting women 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 support pregnant workers on the job, improving women’s and families’ economic security and promoting healthier pregnancies.

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

NATURAL PARTNERSHIP FOR WOMEN & FAMILIES


DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The National Partnership for Women & Families is a non-profit, non-partisan advocacy organization committed to improving the lives of women and families by achieving equity for all women. Since our creation as the Women’s Legal Defense Fund in 1971, we have fought for every significant legal and economic opportunity in the workplace, including the Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978 and the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (FMLA). We write in 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 disproportionately affecting women across industry, race, ethnicity and jurisdiction.

This bipartisan legislation will support pregnant workers on the job, improving women’s and families’ economic security and promoting healthier pregnancies.

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).

Women of color are much more likely than white women to file pregnancy discrimination charges, they are also at a higher risk for pregnancy-related complications like maternal labor, pre-eclampsia and hyper tension 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 depends 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. Pregnancy puts a higher risk of contracting 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. NISSER, 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. LEETLOW).

Ms. LEETLOW. 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 regulations that may further erode religious liberties. It leaves decisionmaking in the hands of unelected government bureaucrats.

Therefore, Congress must include a religious freedom exemption in the bill to safeguard our constitutional rights and ensure the benefits of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act are not compromised.

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. As members of the House of Representatives to vote in favor of this measure, bipartisan, and long overdue 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.

The ACLU is concerned that the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would combat an all-too-common form of pregnancy discrimination while also providing employers much-needed clarity on their obligations to accommodate pregnant workers. In 2006, the ACLU led a coalition of House Representatives to vote in favor of this measure, bipartisan, and long overdue 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.

The ACLU is concerned that the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would combat an all-too-common form of pregnancy discrimination while also providing employers much-needed clarity on their obligations to accommodate pregnant workers. In 2006, the ACLU led a coalition of House Representatives to vote in favor of this measure, bipartisan, and long overdue 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.

The ACLU is concerned that the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would combat an all-too-common form of pregnancy discrimination while also providing employers much-needed clarity on their obligations to accommodate pregnant workers. In 2006, the ACLU led a coalition of House Representatives to vote in favor of this measure, bipartisan, and long overdue legislation.
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 would have needed to work on restricted duties. 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. United States: Corrections Officer Ann Marie Legg was denied light duty during her pregnancy, even though Ulster County gave such accommodations to guards injured on the job. In her third trimester, Legg had to leave her job because she accumulated too many “points” under AT&T Mobility’s punitive attendance policy due to pregnancy-related symp- toms such as nausea. The policy makes her job “inherently dangerous” and imposes a severe penalty for every point that is accumulated.

Legg v. City of Tuscaloosa: 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, which mandates late arrivals, early departures, and absences due to fourteen enumerated reasons, some medical and some not, makes her job “inherently dangerous.”

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 guards injured on the job. In her third trimester, Legg had to leave 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 her job inherently dangerous and imposes a severe penalty for every point that is accumulated.

By not including this longstanding Civil Rights Act provision, H.R. 1065 is likely to create legal risk for religious organizations. Pregnancy-discrimina-
tion or pregnancy-accommodation laws are found in at least 16 States and the District of Columbia and the Civil Rights Act protects women from discrimination by religious organizations.

Conclusion:

It is time for Congress to act and pass the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. This legislation would add pregnant workers to the ADA’s list of protected classes, using a framework familiar to most employers, and prevent employers from forcing a pregnant employee to take a leave of absence if a reasonable accommodation can be provided; prevent employers from denying job opportunities to an applicant or employee because of the individual’s need for a reasonable accommodation; prevent an employer from forcing an applicant or employee to accept a specific accommodation; and prohibit retaliation against individuals who seek to use PWFA to protect their rights.

To learn more about this important legislation, visit www.pregnantworkersfairnessact.com.
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-SCTOR EMPLOYERS

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, 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 work, live and equally and safely 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. 2994, 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 women 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 explicitly state 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.

Sincerely,

[Company Names and Signatures]
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 for those individuals 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 by the employer as they view 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 NICHOI, Epilepsy Foundation.

KELLY BUCKLAND, National Council on Independent Living.

SAMANTHA CRANE, Autistic Self Advocacy Network.

MOLLY BURGOFF, The Arc of the United States.

Co-chairs, CCD Race 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, 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. 665). 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 preexisting pregnancy, 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 and work.

Three-quarters of women will be pregnant and employed at some point in their lives. (Most pregnant workers can expect a routine pregnancy, 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 consequences. Black pregnant women 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, non-cost or low-cost, temporary adjustments or modifications and instead risk being fired or forced to take unpaid leave to preserve the health of their pregnancy. This possible choice forces many pregnant workers to continue working without accommodations, putting women and their pregnancies at risk of long-lasting and severe consequences. Black 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 reasonable modifications in light lifting, or reasonable modifications such as temporary changes in work schedule 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 talking about how 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 also help prevent them to 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 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. 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; Black Women's Health Imperative; Breastfeeding in Combat Boots; California WIC Association; Centering Equity; Centering Equity & Cultural Diversity; Centering Equity and 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; National Black Women’s Birth Equity Collaborative; National Partnership for Women & Families; National Women’s Health Network; Nebraska WIC Association; Nonglory 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.

May 14, 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 right to the 19 pandemic disproportionately affecting women and marginalized communities, there is no better time to take action to improve the economic security of women 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 housing, shelter, and jobs to women entering the workforce in the 1850s, YWCA has been at the forefront of the most pressing social movements—from voting rights to affordable health care, 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 financial security 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. One in four women has become a single parent due to pregnancy, childbirth, and related medical conditions. A woman’s economic security is at risk when she faces the choice: to work and maintain a level of economic security for herself and her family, or to stay home with a newborn child. And many cannot afford either option. Employment and family life are entwined, and pregnant women and mothers—retail salesperson; waiter or waitress; most common occupations for pregnant workers—face challenges that can exacerbate these economic pressures.

The bipartisan Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 1065) takes critical steps to promote 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 couple 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 78.4% of Latina mothers are working mothers. As demographics shift 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 work—retail salesperson; waiter or waitress; school teachers, nurses, and home health aides. Women entering the workforce in the 1850s, YWCA has been at the forefront of the most pressing social movements—from voting rights to affordable health care, 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 financial security 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. One in four women has become a single parent due to pregnancy, childbirth, and related medical conditions. A woman’s economic security is at risk when she faces the choice: to work and maintain a level of economic security for herself and her family, or to stay home with a newborn child. And many cannot afford either option. Employment and family life are entwined, and pregnant women and mothers—retail salesperson; waiter or waitress; most common occupations for pregnant workers—face challenges that can exacerbate these economic pressures.

The bipartisan Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 1065) takes critical steps to promote 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 couple 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 78.4% of Latina mothers are working mothers. As demographics shift 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 work—retail salesperson; waiter or waitress; school teachers, nurses, and home health aides. Women entering the workforce in the 1850s, YWCA has been at the forefront of the most pressing social movements—from voting rights to affordable health care, 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 financial security 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. One in four women has become a single parent due to pregnancy, childbirth, and related medical conditions. A woman’s economic security is at risk when she faces the choice: to work and maintain a level of economic security for herself and her family, or to stay home with a newborn child. And many cannot afford either option. Employment and family life are entwined, and pregnant women and mothers—retail salesperson; waiter or waitress; most common occupations for pregnant workers—face challenges that can exacerbate these economic pressures.

The bipartisan Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 1065) takes critical steps to promote 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 couple 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 78.4% of Latina mothers are working mothers. As demographics shift 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 work—retail salesperson; waiter or waitress; school teachers, nurses, and home health aides. Women entering the workforce in the 1850s, YWCA has been at the forefront of the most pressing social movements—from voting rights to affordable health care, 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 financial security 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. One in four women has become a single parent due to pregnancy, childbirth, and related medical conditions. A woman’s economic security is at risk when she faces the choice: to work and maintain a level of economic security for herself and her family, or to stay home with a newborn child. And many cannot afford either option. Employment and family life are entwined, and pregnant women and mothers—retail salesperson; waiter or waitress; most common occupations for pregnant workers—face challenges that can exacerbate these economic pressures.

The bipartisan Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 1065) takes critical steps to promote 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 couple 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 78.4% of Latina mothers are working mothers. As demographics shift 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 work—retail salesperson; waiter or waitress; school teachers, nurses, and home health aides. Women entering the workforce in the 1850s, YWCA has been at the forefront of the most pressing social movements—from voting rights to affordable health care, 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 financial security 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. One in four women has become a single parent due to pregnancy, childbirth, and related medical conditions. A woman’s economic security is at risk when she faces the choice: to work and maintain a level of economic security for herself and her family, or to stay home with a newborn child. And many cannot afford either option. Employment and family life are entwined, and pregnant women and mothers—retail salesperson; waiter or waitress; most common occupations for pregnant workers—face challenges that can exacerbate these economic pressures.

The bipartisan Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 1065) takes critical steps to promote 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 couple 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 78.4% of Latina mothers are working mothers. As demographics shift 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 work—retail salesperson; waiter or waitress; school teachers, nurses, and home health aides. Women entering the workforce in the 1850s, YWCA has been at the forefront of the most pressing social movements—from voting rights to affordable health care, 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 financial security 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. One in four women has become a single parent due to pregnancy, childbirth, and related medical conditions. A woman’s economic security is at risk when she faces the choice: to work and maintain a level of economic security for herself and her family, or to stay home with a newborn child. And many cannot afford either option. Employment and family life are entwined, and pregnant women and mothers—retail salesperson; waiter or waitress; most common occupations for pregnant workers—face challenges that can exacerbate these economic pressures.
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-related complications.

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 movements 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 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 25 and 38 percent of unemployed workers, two-thirds of all 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 injury 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 having a healthy pregnancy and a paycheck.

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 refuse the reasonable accommodation that 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 propose these additional heavy-handed regulations. I trust America’s small business owners to treat their employees fairly. I honor the constitutional principles behind the bill, mandating that States should make their own health and safety regulations. I trust America’s small businesses to treat their employees fairly. I honor the constitutional principles behind the bill, mandating that States should make their own health and safety regulations. I trust America’s small businesses to treat their employees fairly. I honor the constitutional principles behind the bill, mandating that States should make their own health and safety regulations. I trust America’s small businesses to treat their employees fairly. I honor the constitutional principles behind the bill, mandating that States should make their own health and safety regulations. I trust America’s small businesses to treat their employees fairly. I honor the constitutional principles behind the bill, mandating that States should make their own health and safety regulations.

Mr. Scott of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ 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 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). Modelled 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 other workers of color, continue to face in the workplace. This includes making sure when pregnant workers voice a need for reasonable accommodations that their 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 do routine pregnancy and healthy birth. However, health care professionals have consistently recommended that some pregnant individuals adjust their daily 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 women of color, face barriers to these small changes to their workdays. For example, Black women experience maternal mortality rates three to four times higher than white women, with Black women disproportionately experiencing disproportionately high rates. The circumstances surrounding these alarming statistics can often be attributed to a lack of access to reasonable accommodations due to inflexible workplaces, and deep biases in racial understanding. Various social determinants such as health, education, and economic status drastically affect the outcomes of pregnancy for Black women leading to severe pregnancy-related complications. As the Black Mama’s 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 workers of color are disproportionately likely to work in physically demanding jobs that may lead to exacerbate pregnancy outcomes to produce 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 Black women and Black women of color too often face in the workplace. As scholar Nina Banks has noted, 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, this is because of the multiple forms of discrimination Black workers and other workers of color too often face in the workplace.

May 14, 2021.
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 low-cost, temporary adjustments in their work settings or activities and instead risk being fired or forced to take unpaid leave to preserve the health of their pregnancy.

This impossible choice forces many pregnant workers to continue working without accommodations, putting women and their pregnancies at risk for long-lasting and severe health consequences. When pregnant workers must continue working without accommodations, they risk miscarriage, excessive blood pressure 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 how to prevent this dangerous medical condition, yet we know that simply allowing pregnant 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 reasonable accommodation standard in place, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act has the potential to 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."

Mr. 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. My view is that 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, which incorporated 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, so benign, 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 longstanding Civil Rights Act religious organization protection should be added to H.R. 1065. At worst, it would do no harm. At best, it would 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, McEachin, McSally, and Scott in introducing this important bipartisan legislation.

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 workplace and having to choose between a healthy pregnancy and a paycheck.

Yvette was 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.

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 to 10 hours. 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 workplace 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. It creates 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 wrongly draw from the importance of this commonsense policy.

This bill is a product of extensive bipartisan negotiation and collaboration with advocates and the business community. Recognizing 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.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes 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 receive 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,

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: We 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 over 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 Pregnant Women’s Rights 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 women needing onsite accommodations for medical or safety reasons, countless workers confront difficult decisions 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 accommodations similar to those employers already must provide 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 affix 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 Committee 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 Districts 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, Idaho, Maine, New Hampshire, 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 Acts. 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 and employers is also needed to 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 gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), 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 the 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.


HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

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.

Moreover, after Congress passed the Pregnancy Discrimination Act (PDA) of 1978, women still face inequality in the workplace when they become pregnant. While this 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 established a very high standard for proving discrimination.

Research shows that 88 percent of first-time mothers worked during their last trimester, and 45 percent of pregnant women are pregnancy-related 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 changes 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 from the severe 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 discrimination without jeopardizing their employment. Pregnant women’s lives and livelihood are on the line when they cannot work safely. This bill is essential to protect gender equity, safety and health of 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.

Mr. 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 take a passive 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 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 the 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 pregnant workers if temporary 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 hamstring 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.

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. The American Medical Association has long warned that pregnancy-related complications often exacerbated by the pandemic and economic crisis. Pregnancy discrimination and economic crisis. Pregnancy discrimination is a form of sex and race discrimination that has been a challenge. I was forced to use water in her 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 and the Americans with Disabilities Act, mean many pregnant workers in need of accommodation are without legal protection in states that do not have state laws. As we explained in our report Long Overdue, "while the PDA bans pregnancy discrimination, it requires employers to make accommodations only if they accommodate other workers, or if an employee unearth 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 between pregnant workers and those with disabilities. We call this the "pregnancy penalty" and since day one, A Better Balance has recognized it as a key barrier to accommodations."

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 unpaid leave for needed 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 outcomes, 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-related accommodations. These situations are exacerbated by the pandemic and economic crisis. Tesla, a retail store employee from Missouri called us in 2020 after being forced out of work because her employer refused to let her carry a water bottle on the retail floor even though she was experiencing severe dehydration due to the 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 she 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 to accommodate her and cut off all communication with her after that.

The Americans with Disabilities Act and the Pregnancy Discrimination Act are not adequate for pregnant workers for two reasons. First, because pregnancy is not itself a disability under current disability law, a pregnant worker who has no complica-

The Americans with Disabilities Act in two-thirds of cases decided since Young, employers were permitted to deny pregnant workers accommodations under the Pregnancy Discrimination Act instead of the Americans with Disabilities Act. As I shared with the Subcommittee in a hearing on the Care Crisis, the Care Crisis Act adopted by 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 preg-
nant workers with serious health complica-
tions. As one court concluded in 2018, “Al-
though the 2008 amendments broadened the 
ADA’s definition of disability, these changes 
only have a modest impact when applied to 
pregnancy-related conditions.”

THE PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT IS A 
FAMILIAR FRAMEWORK THAT PROVIDES KEY 
SECURITY, SAFETY, MENTAL HEALTH, AND 
RACIAL JUSTICE MEASURES

Pregnant workers who are fired or forced 
on to unpaid leave for needing accommoda-
tions face significant economic hardship. In 
addition to losing their livelihood, many of 
these women lose their health benefits at a 
time when they need them most, forcing 
them to switch providers, delay medical 
care, and lose access to the health care asso-
ciated with pregnancy and childbirth. Many 
workers must use up saved paid or un-
paid leave they had hoped to reserve to 
return from childbirth, as 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 med-
ical bills, being denied coverage, and being 
forced to pay out of pocket. Many of those 
that need pregnancy accommodations also 
exacerbates the gender wage gap, as it means 
not only a loss of pay, but also losing out on 
many other benefits such as 401K retirement 
contributions, social security contribu-
tions, pensions, as well as opportunities for 
promotion and growth.

To clear misunderstandings, 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 legisla-
tion, 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 out-
comes makes a sustainable impact for a life-
time of better health.” The report noted that 
those poor health outcomes can include 
miscarriage, preterm birth, low birth weight, 
preclampsia (a serious condition and lead-
ing cause of maternal mortality), among 
other issues. According to the March of 
Dimes, in the U.S., nearly 1 in 10 babies are born 
preterm (before their due date). Among 
Black women are nearly fifty percent higher 
than it is for all other women. Preterm birth/low 
birthweight is a leading cause of disability 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 are more likely to die during 
their lifetimes than any other group. Even 
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 their first year of life. This is because 
Black women are less likely to receive 
appropriate care, to be seen by health care 
providers, to have access to prenatal care, 
and to be prescribed the appropriate medica-
tions. At the same time, we know Black women 
also face devastating health consequences 
when they are unable to obtain needed preg-
nancy care. Today, pregnancy complications 
are a leading cause of mortality among 
American women. The Pregnant Workers 
Fairness Act is a key measure to reduce poor 
maternal and infant health outcomes.

The new law addresses the two challenges 
with the ADA and the Americans with 
Disabilities Act. This ad-
justments to provide accommodations for 
limitations arising from pregnancy, childbirth, or related med-
ical conditions as outlined in the American with Disabilities Act. Similar to the Americans with Disabil-
ities Act, employers and employees will en-
gage in an interactive process in order to 
determine an appropriate accommodation. In 
order to prevent employers from pushing 
pregnant workers out of work when they 
need it, the law 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 accommo-
dation. While significant, employers who are 
not able to make a reasonable accommoda-
tion often do not ask for accommoda-
tions 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 
never has a disability as defined by the 
Americans with Disabilities Act in order to 
merit accommodations under the law. Rath-
her, the bill indicates that pregnant workers 
with known limitations related to preg-
nancy, childbirth, and related medical condi-
tions are entitled to reasonable accommoda-
tions. Known by definition 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 representa-
tive has communicated to the employer 
whether or not such condition meets the def-
inition of disability” as set forth in the 
Americans with Disabilities Act, the law 
addresses the two challenges with the ADA 
outlined above.

More than ever, the Pregnant Work-
ers Fairness Act is an urgent maternal 
health, racial justice, and economic security 
measure to keep pregnant workers healthy and 
productive, ensuring a paycheck and 
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.

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 (NWLC) 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 preg-
nant workers. In the last nine years, the Center has been a leader in 
avocating for the Pregnant Workers Fair-
ness Act, and for pregnancy accommodation protections in state law. We 
are eager to build on the momentum from 
September 2020, when the bill passed with 
overwhelming bipartisan support in the 
House, 259-73.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would 
clarify the law for employers and employees 
 alike, requiring employers to make reason-
able accommodations for limitations arising 
out of pregnancy, childbirth, and related 
medical conditions, just as they already do 
for disabilities. The bill ensures that women 
can work safely while pregnant and 
producers to fuel a labor force that couldn’t 
exist without them. Through the lens of 
women’s empowerment, we’re 

promoting women’s health, 

advocating for the 

Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, and for pregnancy accommodation protections in state law. We are eager to build on the momentum from September 2020, when the bill passed with overwhelming bipartisan support in the House, 259-73.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would clarify the law for employers and employees alike, requiring employers to make reason-
able accommodations for limitations arising out of pregnancy, childbirth, and related medical conditions, just as they already do for disabilities. The bill ensures that women can work safely while pregnant and not alone. Three more of her coworkers, also 
Black, miscarried after supervisors dis-
missed their requests for reprieve from 
heavy lifting. As Chorisse Scott, CEO of 
Babies First Through Pregnancy network 
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 
2019, we have been harassed as producers to fuel a labor force that couldn’t care less for us . . . " The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act will ensure pregnant workers who have told their employers that Black 
mothers, especially, are not treated as ex-
pendable on the job.

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 accommoda-
tions for pregnant employees. All of the laws 
passed in recent years are highly similar to 
the federal legislation, and all passed with 
bipartisan support, numerous. Many, including Tennessee’s and Kent-
ucky’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 work-
can remain healthy and attached to the 
workforce is an issue of critical importance, 
especially as this country faces a dev-
astating economic downturn. 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 includ-
ing Greater Cincinnati, Greater 
Kentucky’s leading chambers of commerce, 
support this measure. The PWFA will provide 
many needed clarity in the law which will 
lead to informal and upfront resolutions be-
tween employers and employees and help 
prevent problems before they start. Further-
more, accommodations are short term and 
low cost. The Pregnant Workers Fairness 
Act will help employers retain valuable em-
ployees and reduce high turnover and train-
ing costs. The cost of not providing 
accommodation is also borrowed from the 
American with Disabilities Act framework so em-
ployers are already familiar with the stand-
ards. Furthermore, pregnant workers 
employed save 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 
iequality pregnant workers continue to face 
at work. Employers, including private em-
ployers with fifteen or more employees, will 
be required to provide reasonable accom-
modations to qualified employees absent 
undue hardship on the employer. Both the 
term “reasonable accommodation” and 
“undue hardship” are defined in the same 
way as outlined in the American with Disabilities Act. Similar to the Americans with Disabil-
ities Act, employers and employees will en-
gage in an interactive process in order to 
determine an appropriate accommodation. In 
order to prevent employers from pushing 
pregnant workers out of work when they 
need it, the law specifies that an employer 
cannot require a pregnant employee to 
take leave if another reasonable
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 if 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 an accommodation because it “is more expensive or less convenient” to accommodate pregnant women too. The Young decision was an important victory for 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. However, courts have uniformly 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 requirement that requires employers to accommodate pregnant women when the accommodations they need are reasonable and do not pose an undue hardship to employers.

Accommodating pregnant workers is not only good for women and their 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 recruiting experienced workers on the job. And since pregnancy is temporary, pregnancy accommodations are, by definition, short-term; many of these accommodations are low and no cost.

The time is now to pass the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. Thirty states and the District of Columbia have enacted provisions explicitly granting pregnant employees the right to accommodations at work, from Massachusetts, New York, and California, to South Carolina, Utah, Nebraska, West Virginia, and Tennessee. Millions of pregnant workers have benefited from these protections, but many employers’ accommodations about 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 and the bottom line. Passing this bill is long overdue, and I urge a “yes” vote.

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

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 1⁄4 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, that is dear Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Justice National Women’s Law Center, 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 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 necessary medical 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. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is a great gift, and I am very pleased that God gave me that opportunity.
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 flexible work schedules that offer employees commute times which avoid crowded public transportation and increased exposure. Currently, pregnant women may continue to be hired because accommodations are not offered or Green’s pregnant workers are not recognized because they fear losing their jobs and need the income, thus endangering their health or the health of their pregnancy. Without accommodations, 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 86 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 six 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, 62 percent of children in families in 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. Migrant 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:


FATH 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 be able to protect their health in the workplace where they have "to starve or afflict themselves in order to feed their children" (Tosefta Bava Metzia 6:2). With reasonable workplace accommodations, essential workers can earn a living while protecting their health, so no worker faces the agonizing choice between a healthy pregnancy and their economic security. As the equitable 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 will disproportionately affect People of Color, contribute to the Black maternal health crisis and other forms of racial inequity. Congress must protect expectant parents and people with other reproductive health needs from such discrimination against them. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, which will help to mitigate the racial and economic injustices that pregnancy discrimination perpetuates."—Rabbi Jonah Pesner, Director, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism

NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice urges all 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. PWFA acknowledges that pregnant workers have the right to choose between a healthy pregnancy and a paycheck that 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 the sacredness of pregnancy. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would ensure that pregnant women who are accommodated"—Lawrence E. Couch, Director, CLN

"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 women have the right to choose between a healthy pregnancy and their economic security."—Judy 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 so that women 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, Latina immigrant women, and other Women of Color. Today, far too many of these essential workers are denied temporary job-related accommodations in order to make the heartbreaking choices between their family’s economic security and their health. No worker should ever be forced to make the heartbreaking choice between a healthy pregnancy and their economic security. As the equitable 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 will disproportionately affect People of Color, contribute to the Black maternal health crisis and other forms of racial inequity. Congress must protect expectant parents and people with other reproductive health needs from such discrimination against them. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, which will help to mitigate the racial and economic injustices that pregnancy discrimination perpetuates."—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. 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 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 AFL-CIO. 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 7 1⁄2 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 12 1⁄2 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 deterred from pursuing 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. FORTEMBERGER 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 workers 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. OKLAHOMA, 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 too 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 DE LAUER 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 health care 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 are still facing 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 in deference to 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, the workforce, and the family. The law often supports such stereotypes—as such, 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 surveyed pregnant women who work in physically demanding jobs found that 63 percent of women surveyed worried about facing negative comments directed to their pregnancy, and many avoided asking for accommodations, sensing instead that they needed to overexert themselves physically in order to do their work.

Another study’s authors recommended “creating[ing] better social support for utilizing pregnancy accommod-

ation.” 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 moment their needs are greatest, they must then fight to re-enter a job market that assumes new mothers are less competent and committed than fathers and other childless peers.

As the Supreme Court has repeatedly reaffirmed, such sex role stereotyping is a form of unconstitutional gender discrimination. Indeed, the constitutional right to be free of invidious sex stereotyping “at the faultline between work and family” is now well-established.

In Hibbs v.致信者, the Court rejected the “sex-role stereotype” that “women’s family duties trump those of the workplace.” 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 presupposes 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 and foster such discriminatory conduct, including gender-role stereotyping, by failing to provide reasonable accommodations to allow pregnant women to remain on the job and be mothers and workers. 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 accommodate Williams, including commissioning 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 sentence, Williams and her colleagues had the poor judgment to document their animus. Their emails made explicit the unconstitutional sex stereotyping behind their refusal to accommodate. Employers do not always put the animus underlying their refusal to accommodate in discoverable emails. The PDA has failed to root out such intentional yet “subtle forms of discrimi-

nation that are difficult to detect on a case-by-case basis,” thanks in part to a proof structure that demands onerous and lengthy litigation.

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 her boss and other employees about her pregnancy.

For instance, in response to Borchert’s “severe and ongoing nausea and vomiting coming after her pregnancy,” the state 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, Larkia 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 “she was merely words of her supervisors. The university “doctored” her as “unfit for accommodating 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” and refused the request to accommodate Jackson’s pregnancy, her state employer invoked a common sex stereotype about women and “implied that she was simply using her pregnancy as an excuse for not doing her work.” The state terminated her shortly thereafter.

In Tennessee, Kimberly Burnett, a veterinarian 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.” 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 state, in a different sex role stereotypes years ago is rooted in impermissible sex discrimination.

In North Carolina, Lauren Burch, a special agent, informed her employer, the state alco hol enforcement agency, that she was pregnant. On her doctor’s advice, Burch requested light duty status to avoid “situations that place her at risk for physical alterations.” Her state employer approved the request but assigned her to a worksite that “required a daily, six-hour round-trip commute,” which her doctor warned was “preventing her work credit for travel time” and was forced to use “her personal vehicle at her own expense.” The state refused to grant her an arrangement similar to her workplace—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. When the department “required her” to use her personal vehicle for on-duty work, she refused to do so. The state then terminated her. The state subsequently appealed Burch’s decision.

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, the Better Balance report, “Long Overdue,”—two-thirds of women lose their PDA pregnancy accommodation claims in court. A high percentage of these losses have come from 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 President Dina Bakti testified earlier this year:

[Recent decisions further illustrate how steep the bar that employers and the comparator by a 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, and the result would be unable to find the information needed to show they are entitled to an accommodation. Second, litigating accommodation cases under the PDA is often 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 necessary 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 “wrongful 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 the obvious, unconstitutional form of discrimination.

The PDA’s failure to combat states’ record of unconstitutional gender discrimination stems in part from the PDA’s weakness in Congress, where, as here, “Congress has already tried unsuccessfully” to remedy violations of equal protection and such “previous legislative attempts have[ve] failed.”

The PWFA is narrow, tailored, and targeted to combat gender discrimination, including invalid sex role stereotypes about the “childbearing role of women” in the workplace. 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-be mothers. Moreover reasonable accommodations for pregnant women are inherently time-limited, and the vast majority of accommodations pregnant women need, like the right to carry a water bottle or sit on a stoop at a retail counter, are low-cost or no-cost. The minimal (or non-existent) economic cost of a gender-neutral form of discrimination is why 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 1½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 12½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. 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.

But we have heard about the fact that it doesn’t include a religious exemption. Well, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act still applies. But there is no reason to give a wholesale exemption to religious organizations, because why are you exempting them from it?

Provision 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.

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.

In conclusion, I applaud 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.
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 shift in infant mortality. Not only do women now make up almost half of the workforce, but there are more pregnant workers than ever before and they increasingly go into higher-paying jobs. The simplicity is that some pregnant workers—especially those in physically demanding jobs—will have a medical need to maintain a healthy pregnancy, and employers will not accommodate them out of concern that their accommodations will put the pregnancy in danger or risk the health of a pregnancy. Yet, too often, instead of providing pregnant workers with an accommodation, employers will force them out of the workforce, 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 some women and immigrant workers are more likely to face inflexible and physically demanding jobs that can present specific challenges for pregnant workers, such as cashiers, home health aides, nurses, cleaners, and factory workers, making reasonable accommodations on the job even more important, and some lose 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 a reasonable accommodation 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 their pregnancy. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would ensure that all those working for covered employers would be protected.

Evidence from states and cities that 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 Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington.

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 challenging for those who are pregnant and unemployed.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is vital because it supports healthy pregnancies. Firing a pregnant worker and risking the health of a pregnancy is one no one should have to make. Pregnant workers cannot perform some aspects of their jobs. Pregnancy-related medical needs, including the stress of job loss, can exacerbate health conditions or push pregnant workers out of the workforce as well. Stress from job loss can increase the risk of having a baby with a birth defect. 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.

Council for Occupational Safety and Health (National COSH),
National Council of Jewish Women, National Council of Jewish Women Cleve-
land, National Council of Jewish Women (NCJW), Atlanta Section, National Domestic Workers
Alliance, National Education Association, National Environmental Law Project, National Employment Lawyers Association, National Health Law Program, National Hispanic
Justice, Northwest Breastfeeding Coalition, Nurse-Family Partnership,
Nurturing 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 Rights, Ohio Workers’ Union (UFCW), Ohio Women’s League,
Ohio Women’s Coalition, We All Rise, West Virginia Breastfeeding Alliance, Western Kan-
sas Birthkeeping, William E. Morris Institute for Justice (Arizona), Women’s
Foundation of Southwest Pennsylvania, Women’s Fund of Greater Chattanooga,
Women’s Law Center of Maryland, Wyatt, Brown & Jones, Wyoming Community
Coalition, 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.

And contrariwise, 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, work-
place protections for pregnant workers 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 pro-
tections 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 common-sense, current-law provision that
protects religious organizations from being forced to make employment de-
sions that conflict with their faith is shortsighted and disappointing. Con-
gress 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 impor-
tant 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 reli-
gious freedom by saying: “Congress shall make no law respecting an estab-
lishment of religion”—and this is very important, the next part—“or prohib-
iting the free exercise thereof.”

That is what we are talking about here today. We are talking about the
free exercise of religion; and 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, the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary; Mr. KATKO for his lead
cosponsorship; among other Republican members, to make this strongly biparti-

Mr. Speaker, I am excited about this legislation as a mother of five children—four daughters, one son—nine grandchildren. This recogni-
tion 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 faced with a choice 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
health of families, the economy, 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 oth-
ers 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, fathers, and women who have spoken out, often
risking professional retaliation, to end pregnancy discrimination in the work-
place.

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

This discrimination is out of place 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, expi-
cit, pregnancy accommodation framework—simply to the standard
that has been in place for decades for families, that is what this bill provides.

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

The Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. Speaker, that is why this legislation is important also from the standpoint ofhd Employment policy, building back better after this cri-{}sis, women of childbearing age succeed, one out of four women were pushed out of the labor force.

I think it is important to note that American women are part of the engine of America’s economy and the key to building back better after this crisis.

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.

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 the third time, and was read the third time.

The Speaker pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.
vote was a mistake. I support H.R. 1065, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

Stated against:
Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on rolloc 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. If I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rolloc 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 rolloc 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 rolloc No. 143.
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Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and some emotion that I rise to honor an outstanding and long-standing colleague 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.

But Michael brought, in his DNA, the spirit of his father, Isaac, who was watching down from Heaven and saw Michael the best in the next stages of his life. I thank Michael Long and wish him the best in the next stages of his journey.

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 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, 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 9 p.m.

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 API 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 combating hate, bigotry, and violence against the API community.

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 Appropositions 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, and 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, unfortunately, here in the 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. AGUILAR. 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 following up on the real-ly 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. AGUILAR. 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 vacci-nate. That is the strategy the 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 viola-tion 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 disease?

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 vaccina-tions. What the gentleman is asking is an important question. What the major-ity is saying is, let’s follow the guid-ance of the Office of the Attending Physician.

We have no interest in knowing indi-vidually what Members and what staff members are vaccinated. Our interest is in governing this House and the opera-tions of this body; and we trust that Dr. Monahan will work with both par-ties 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 in-consistency here. You will never, ever get to the point, Madam Speaker, that you will ever be able to get every Mem-ber to show some sort of vaccination card without violating the HIPAA pri-va protection.

Again, I am listening to the rhetoric. It is a simple question: How do you compel Members of this body to dis-close 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 vac-cinated?

I yield to my colleague from Cali-fornia.

Mr. AGUILAR. I appreciate the gentle-man from Georgia yielding once again. I will try to be as clear as I possi-bly can.

We will follow the guidance of the Of-fice of the Attending Physician, a deco-rated physican, who is hoping with the Sergeant at Arms, to govern the Cap-itol 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 cou-ple of observations.

Our colleagues across on the other side of the building are certainly fol-low 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 vaccina-tion 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 At-tending 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 gentle-man answer one question: Is Presi-dent Biden wrong? Or is Dr. Monahan wrong?

I yield to the gentleman from Cali-fornia.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I will say this be-fore we move on to the next topic. It does appear that many of us are gov-erned by different rules along the way.

As you know, this has been police re-form 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 Democratic leaders had its request to eliminate qualified immu-nity. 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—

Mr. AGUILAR. The gentleman knows there is 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 major-ity 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 this issue due 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 on 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, and again, both as mayors, had the honor of being involved in that, seeing the sacrifice that they make, whether it is local police officers, 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 county is 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 agree to meeting with Officer Fanone and 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.
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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 that 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 gentledwoman 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 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 nearly every community in 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 was 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 job 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 patients 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 goals. 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 share of亲身 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 overseas 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. 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 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 as I travel along,
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.
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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 shouting, “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.

HONORING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

(Ms. VAN DUYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute 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 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 Sloan, 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. His sacrifice is a daily reminder for police officers in decades; 264 law enforcement officers died in the line of duty.

HONORING LAW ENFORCEMENT 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 David Sohn 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. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

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

I was 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 to flourish. 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 us.

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

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.)

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 proud that through 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.
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. We honor the police officer who holds a child’s hand. We honor the police officer who comes to an emergency situation.
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and one for Republicans, or those who supported 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 directed the action 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 denounced 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—to find out the information about the Constitution did not permit it.

So they send a national security letter demanding that a bank accompany them to find out all the individual 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, sua sponte, was charged 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 one who 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 obstruction, 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—be it 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, 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 these 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 cartel’s 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.

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, 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 I 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. 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 Police Office Sullivan claims 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 at 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, misusing or present a risk. ‘’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 non-violent Capitol protestors, was supporting Donald Trump and daring to question the validity of the 2020 Presidential election as declared 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 convicted inight in January 2020, 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 bed 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. on January 6. 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 revealed 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.

“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 permit prosecutors a chance to object to releasing them 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 was ever opened 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.”
Nonetheless, agents threatened both Paul and Marilyn Huepers, 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 and wished 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 have not even been allowed to enter the building, a Federal Department with an agenda, and the Democratic Justice Department, also not as a judge but as an advocate because that is how that judge is acting. "I wanted to make sure there was a sense 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 was 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 by our 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 without 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. Prenon-trial 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 latest 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 set foot on the House floor itself. 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 and prevent 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 more rules 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. I don't like it. I think it should 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 Prevent 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 the case 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 non-violent—at least many of them. It is a misdemeanor, it should be, but they are acting to make rule violations a purpose to 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-Americans, 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. He is still 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 successful, 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.

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—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. They came home, front door, 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 was on here. Now, 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 purposes.

The overwhelming number of people caught up in this “unprecedented investigation,” as the Justice Department promises, they are actually non-violent, 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, describes 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,” shows 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 Democratic Members of Congress who kept us from voting on the impeachment. They are 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.

But, 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 sweatshirt or fixing 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 Floor of this House with 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, those 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 and 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 Opportunity 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 major 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 it 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 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 such 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 Arab leaders 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 angered by the trauma of Israelis seeking refuge in bomb shelters in the face of relentless rocket fire. And most Americans are angered 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 Hamas.

The false 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 106-136, 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 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–1112. 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–1137. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; (Dockets Nos. FAA–2020–0905; Project Identifier 2019–SW–102–AD; Amendment 20–23184; AD 2021–02–01) (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 7, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); Public Law 104–121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–1139. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; (Dockets Nos. FAA–2021–0136; Product Identifier AD–2021–09234–T; Amendment 20–21469; AD 2021–06–03) (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 7, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); 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; 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 clarify the 2021–00234–T; Amendment 39–21469; AD 2021–06–2020-0905; Project Identifier AD-03
tives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Dock-
ment’s final rule — Airworthiness Direc-
tives; (Dockets et No. FAA–2021–0136; Product Identifier AD–2021–09234–T; Amendment 20–21469; AD 2021–06–03] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 7, 2021, pur-
suant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); Public Law 104–121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally re-

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, 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.

Mr. DUNN: H.R. 3234. A bill to amend section 3013 of title 49, United States Code, to clarify the granting of an alternate vehicle endorsement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. BANKS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BARN, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mrs. ROBERTS, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BUCK, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. FALLON, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. GROVE, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KLEIN of New York, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. PERRY, Mr. RIESCH, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. ROY, Mr. AZBUTT of Georgia, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TIPPIT, and Mr. TUNIS): H.R. 3235. A bill to restrict executive agen-
cies from acting in contravention of Execu-
tive Order 13850; to the Committee on Over-
sight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. SMALWELL, Ms. TITUS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. TORRES of New York, and Mr. GIMENEZ): H.R. 3234. A bill to codify the Transporta-
tion Security Administration’s responsi-

Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. VAMSHAN, Mr. LAVAL, Mr. FALLON, and Mr. CLYDE):

Mr. CROW (for himself, Ms. HAYES, Mr. ROYDEN DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. MELDER): H.R. 3234. 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. 3236. 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. GARCIA of Illinois (for himself, Ms. KAPUT, Mr. LEE of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FOCAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. BUSH, Ms. TLAB, Mr. NORTON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. TRONK, Mr. KAHLE): H.R. 3236. 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. MAUNDER, Ms. ESPAILLAT, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CARSON, Mr. PRESSLEY, Mr. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KRANNA, Ms. OASIS-CORTES, Mr. GOVERN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BOW-
MAN, Ms. BASS, and Ms. JACKSON): H.R. 3237. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending September 30, 2021, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. 3237. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years 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 Mr. AMODEI (for himself, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. LAVALFA, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. RESCHENHAUSE, 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. BUSCH: 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 child tax credit and the earned income tax credit 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 Education and Labor, 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. 3242. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the American Opportunity Tax Credit, to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLEAVER (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. KATKO, Mrs. ROBERTS of New Mexico, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. ORR, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CLYDE): H.R. 3243. A bill to codify the Transportation Security Administration’s responsi-

By Mr. HICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. NORMAN, Ms. HERRMEL, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. VAMSHAN, Mr. LAVAL, 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 provide that uniformed law enforcement officers who 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. PINGER, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. GOLDEN): 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. RUTHFORD, Mr. PASCHELL, Mr. CREN- Shaw, Mr. KIND, Mr. STEUER, 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 firearms 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. MCKENNA): H.R. 3253. A bill to direct the Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to conduct a study on motorcycle safety and impaired driving, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LOUDENBOWLLIK (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LATTA, Mr. HICK of Georgia, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. STEFANIE, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. WENSTROOP, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CATHORN, 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. FOSEY, Mr. RISCHENTHALER, Mr. GODMETER, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. HARSHBAKER, Mr. AHERHOLT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. STEURITZ, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CATHORN, Mr. VAN DEW, 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. SCHRAEDER (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BENTZ, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. DEFazio): H.R. 3257. A resolution to rescind the 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. BULL (for herself and Mr. BILIRISKI): H.R. 3258. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to improve patient access to 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. MEJIA, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. MEERS, Mr. McCALL, Mr. LER of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. JACOB of California, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. LIER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. KUO of New Jersey, Mr. UPTON, Mr. COLE, Ms. KIM of California, and Mr. STEUER): H.R. 3261. A bill to authorize the 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 cyber-security risks to motor vehicle safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. BANSK, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BARN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BOSSERT, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BUCK, Mr. CATHORN, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. DONALDIS, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. FALLON, Mr. GROTHEMIN, Mrs. HARSHBAKER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ISA, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JACKSON of New York, Mr. Joyce of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MART of Mississippi, Mr. MOOLEMAAR, Mr. PERRY, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. ROY, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TIFFANY, and Mr. CALVEY): 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 judge individuals based on sex, race, ethnicity, and national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Ms. BRATZY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WOLLEMEN, Mr. LAWRENCE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. PINGRE, Ms. DEMINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. STRUCK-LAND, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. BASS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. ESSENDON, Mr. BATES, Ms. SCHLACER, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. PFUME, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DAVIS Scott of Georgia, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. PRESSLEY, Ms. DELONG of Florida, Mr. FALLON, Ms. LURIA, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. TRAHAN, Mr. BUTNING, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CRIST, Mr. SCHRAEDER, Mr. JONES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DELRHINE, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. HORSPORD, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RYAN, Ms. OMAHA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. BUSH, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WATERS, Mr. CROW, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. COREN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MEERS, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JACOB of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. KAP- TUR, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. 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. DA- VID of Kansas, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. TROWE, Mr. MURPHY of Missouri, Mr. ROY- 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 MALO- NEY of New York, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TORNES of New York, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. BASS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. EVANS, Ms. LOUIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIGGIN of New York, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. CAROLIN B. MALO- NEY of New York, Mr. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SOTO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CHIST, and Mrs. DEMINOS): 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, Mr. BASS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HIGGIN of New York, Mr. JACKSON of California, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. NORTON, Mr. ROY- ALLARD, Mr. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TORNES 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 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 Representa-
tives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitu-
tion 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 I, Section 8

By Mr. DUNN:
H.R. 3234.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8

By Mr. OWENS:
H.R. 3255.
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 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 I, 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 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CROW:
H.R. 3244.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant 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 I, Section 8

By Mr. GARCIA 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 . . ."

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 1, 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 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. 3252.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. KUSTER:
H.R. 3253.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. LEŠKO:
H.R. 3253.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LOUDERMILK:
H.R. 3254.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8

By Mr. NORCROSS:
H.R. 3255.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, 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, § 8, cl. 18.

By Ms. SEWELL:
H.R. 3258.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, 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 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: Ms. DESAULNIER, Ms. WILD, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. CASTEN, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 5: Mr. Bishop of North Carolina.

H.R. 8: Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 20: Mrs. AXN, Ms. ROSS, Mr. COMER, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLON, Mr. FEENSTRA, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 200: Mrs. AXN, Mrs. ROSS, Mr. COMER, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLON, Mr. FEENSTRA, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 210: Mrs. AXN, Mrs. ROSS, Mr. COMER, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLON, Mr. FEENSTRA, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 571: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 793: Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 378: Mr. BUCHSHON and Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 503: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 377: Mr. JACKSON and Mr. BUCHSHON.

H.R. 58: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.

H.R. 669: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H.R. 710: Mr. AHRON

H.R. 577: Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 378: Mr. BUCHSHON and Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 503: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 571: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 503: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 378: Mr. BUCHSHON and Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 571: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 503: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 378: Mr. BUCHSHON and Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 571: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 503: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 378: Mr. BUCHSHON and Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 571: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 503: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 378: Mr. BUCHSHON and Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 571: Mr. RUPPERSBERGE
H.R. 859: Mr. Good of Virginia and Mr. Davidson.

H.R. 921: Ms. Jacobs of California.

H.R. 959: Mrs. Kirkpatrick.

H.R. 1031: 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. Staurer.


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. 1265: Mrs. Kirk of California, Mr. Gonzalez of Ohio, Mr. Kaine of Virginia, Ms. DelBanco, Mr. Green of Texas, Ms. Delauro, Mr. Blumenauer, and Ms. Williams of Georgia.

H.R. 1247: Mr. Johnson of Texas, Mr. Palone, Mrs. Badewagen, Mr. Tonko, Ms. Newman, Mr. Kilmer, Mr. Sablan, Mr. Kildee, and Ms. Ross.

H.R. 1455: Mr. Titus, Mr. Cicilline, Mr. Green of Texas, Ms. DeLauro, Mr. Blumenauer, and Ms. Williams of Georgia.

H.R. 1488: Ms. Spanberger.

H.R. 1531: Ms. Norton and Mr. Throne.

H.R. 1614: Ms. Norton, Mrs. Watson, Mr. Cox, Mr. Kilmer, Mr. Sablan, Mr. Kildee, and Ms. Ross.

H.R. 1615: Mr. Meeks.

H.R. 1745: Mr. Meeks.

H.R. 1752: Mr. Meeks.

H.R. 1753: Ms. Lisciandrello, Mr. Soto, and Mr. Becerra.

H.R. 1821: Mr. Brown.

H.R. 1842: Ms. Williams of Virginia.

H.R. 1863: Mr. Sires.

H.R. 1884: Mr. Kafele.

H.R. 1916: Mr. Leeper, Mrs. Torres of California, Mr. Cartwright, Mr. Amodei, Mr. Correa, Mr. Himes, Mr. Steil, Ms. Kuster, Mr. Holingsworth, Mr. Quigley, Ms. DeLauro, Ms. Kaptur, and Mr. Casten.

H.R. 2131: Mr. Lautenberg and Mr. Kim of New Jersey.

H.R. 1960: Ms. Lohr, Mr. Franke of Florida, Mr. Meeks, Mr. Lautenberg and Mr. Kim of New Jersey.

H.R. 1866: Mr. Sablan.

H.R. 1868: Mr. Gallego.

H.R. 2077: Mr. Case, Ms. Ross, and Mr. Kildee.

H.R. 2028: Mr. Cardenas, Mr. Nadler, and Mr. Liu.

H.R. 2030: Mr. Trone, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Cullier, Mr. Cawthorn, Mr. Sablan, and Mr. LaHood.

H.R. 2033: Mr. Cicilline.

H.R. 2035: Mr. Papas.

H.R. 2096: Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Mr. Takano, and Mr. Lowenthal.

H.R. 2138: Mr. Fitzpatrick.

H.R. 2142: Mr. Kilmer, Ms. Kelly of Pennsylvania, Ms. Kaptur, Mr. Fitzpatrick, Mrs. Beatty, Mr. Kim of New Jersey, Ms. Sewell, Mr. Garcia of Illinois, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Fumio, Ms. Omar, Ms. Sewell, Mr. LaHood, Mrs. Walorski, Mr. Stivers, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, and Mr. Gonzalez of Ohio.

H.R. 2198: Ms. Clark of Massachusetts, Ms. Scalise, Ms. Jacobs of California, and Ms. Bonamici.

H.R. 2225: Mr. Case, Ms. Bonamici, Ms. Wild, Mr. Jackson Lee, and Mr. Perlmutter.

H.R. 2229: Mr. Johnson of Georgia.

H.R. 2298: Mr. Aderholt, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Carter of Georgia, Mr. Gaetz, Mr. Jones, Ms. Demings, Ms. Porter, Mr. Panetta, Mr. Costa, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. Soto, and Mr. Case.

H.R. 2385: Mr. Jacob of New York.

H.R. 329: Ms. Tenney, Mr. Fitzgerald, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Cline, Mr. Dunn, and Mr. Chabot.

H.R. 332: Mr. Emmer, Mrs. Miller of West Virginia, and Ms. Herrera Brutkewitz.

H.R. 368: Mr. Case, Ms. Napolitano, Mr. Bass, Mr. Sablan, and Ms. Pingree.

H.R. 386: Ms. Spartz.

H.R. 392: Mr. Cash.

H.R. 394: Mr. Duncan, Mr. Bentz, Mrs. Harsemberger, Ms. Salazar, Mr. Clyde, and Mr. Hudson.

H.R. 396: Mr. Good of Virginia, Mr. Westerman, Mr. Hrrn, 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. DE LAURO

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. Steube, Mr. Jackson, Mrs. Boebert, Mr. Budd, Ms. 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. McLaughlin, 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, Ms. Massie, Mr. Moore, Mr. Gohmert, Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Lamborn, Mr. Westerman, Mr. Cline, Mr. Gibbs, Mr. Carter of Georgia, Mr. Fallon, Mr. Hudson, and Mr. Allen.
EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

SPEECH OF
HON. NANCY PELOSI
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 2021

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, with great solemnity and prayerfulness, I rise to join my colleagues in recognition of National Police Week: observed by this Congress and Country for nearly sixty years.

Thank you, Mr. Val Demings, former Orlando Police Department Chief, a police officer for nearly 30 years, for providing us with this opportunity.

This week, we honor the thousands of heroes who don the uniform each day, as they honor their patriotic pledge to defend our Democracy.

They do so often in the face of grave danger—including the coronavirus pandemic, which has forced many to risk their lives as they work to save the lives of others.

We especially salute our U.S. Capitol Police heroes, including those who lost their lives in defense of the Capitol.

Following the January 6 assault, they have met horror with heroism; agony with action.

We are awed by their resilience and grateful for their courage.

As President Biden wrote in his Proclamation on Peace Officers Memorial Day and Police Week: “Every morning, our Nation’s law enforcement officers pin on a badge and go to work, not knowing what the day will bring, and hoping to come home safely.”

Solemnly, we honor the sacrifice of those who did not “come home safely.”

Today—and always—we pay tribute to our fallen officers, including the 394 officers added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial this past year. Fourteen Californians received this sad recognition.

The service of each of these heroes reminds us of our duty: to build a future worthy of their sacrifice.

May the memories of the fallen live always in our hearts, as a reminder of that responsibility. And may it be a comfort to the families of the fallen that so many mourn with and pray for them.

HON. KEVIN BRADY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 2021

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I am sorry I missed a vote, as I was unable to be present. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on Roll Call No. 139.

HON. JOHN JOYCE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 2021

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Wesley R. Fugate, Ph.D. for his service as the 20th President of Wilson College in Chambersburg, Pennsylvania.

Since commencing in this leadership role in January of 2020, Dr. Fugate has overcome challenges stemming from the pandemic. His strategic planning process has resulted in the implementation of six new undergraduate majors, along with a new degree completion program, a graduate program, and a new endorsement and certification program. These offerings have provided a strategic boost to the academic offerings at Wilson College, and his hard work is paving the way for continued advancement.

Prior to his work at Wilson College, Dr. Fugate served as the Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, Vice President and Chief of Staff, Secretary of the Board of Trustees, and Interim Vice President for Employment Management at Randolph College. He also served as the Deputy Chief of Staff for Planning and Education Policy to the Governor of Kentucky. As a community leader, Dr. Fugate has demonstrated great dedication and participation in local civic organizations. In our region, he has served on a number of leadership boards, including the Greater Chambersburg Chamber of Commerce.

Dr. Fugate earned his doctorate in higher education from the University of Georgia’s Institute of Higher Education. He received his master’s degree from Vanderbilt University and his bachelor’s degree from Centre College. In recognition of his outstanding achievements, Dr. Fugate has received many awards, including the Alice L. Beeman Research Award in Communications and Marketing for Educational Advancement for an Outstanding Doctoral Dissertation from the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education.

As a leader, Dr. Fugate is propelling a forward-looking vision for Wilson College. It is my privilege to serve the students and academic community of Franklin County alongside him. I thank Dr. Fugate for his work in our community, and I wish him every continued success.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF YONG AE YUE AND HONORING ELLIOTT AND ROBERT PETERSON

HON. JUDY CHU
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 2021

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Yong Ae Yue, and to honor her two sons, Elliott and Robert Peterson. Ms. Yue was one of eight people tragically killed in the March 16th shootings at three spas in the Atlanta metropolitan area.

Ms. Yue was raised an orphan in South Korea, where she met her former husband, Mac Peterson, who was in the U.S. Army. After having their first son, Elliott, in South Korea, the couple moved to the United States in the early 1980s and had their second son, Robert. Ms. Yue was determined to give her two children a promising and successful life in the United States, and she taught her sons the value and meaning of hard work. Given her sons’ multiracial background, she made sure they were proud of their Black and Asian identities, and helped them find strength in their heritage. According to her family, she was a selfless, compassionate, and generous woman who loved to sing karaoke and cook Korean food for her friends and family. She moved to the Atlanta area in 2001 to be closer to Robert and loved spending time with her children and grandchildren.

I also want to honor Ms. Yue’s sons, who have raised awareness of the impact that violence against Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders has on families and communities. Elliott bravely served our country in the U.S. Army for over 24 years. He recently retired in

HERB ATCHISON
HON. ED PERLMUTTER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 2021

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Herb Atchison, a former City Councilmember and Mayor of Westminster, Colorado and a great Coloradan.

Mayor Atchison has lived in Westminster for more than 40 years, during which time he has committed his time and energy into serving his community and local residents. Throughout his tenure serving the City of Westminster, Mayor Atchison held numerous positions on the City Council and on city government boards such as the Planning Commission and the City’s Special Permit and Licensing Board. Mayor Atchison was first elected to City Council in 1997 where he served two terms and came back for a third term in 2011. He was elected Mayor in 2013 and proceeded to serve two terms. As a Councilmember and Mayor, he was a strong advocate and champion for small business and transportation issues.

In addition to his service to the Westminster community Mayor Atchison is a loving husband and devoted father. He has been married to his wife Erika for 50 years, is the proud father of two daughters, and a devoted grandfather to five grandchildren.

While our state has been blessed with capable leadership throughout its history, few rise to the caliber and reputation of Mayor Atchison. I wish Mayor Atchison all the best in retirement and send gratitude for his service to the Westminster community and the great State of Colorado.
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September and lives in Japan, where he trains U.S. soldiers in field exercises. And following Ms. Yue's tragic passing, I traveled to Atlanta with several of my colleagues in the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus to pay my respects. I was honored to meet Robert and understand the hardships his family has endured. After speaking with Robert, I was pleased to invite him as my virtual guest to President Biden's first address to a joint session of Congress. It has been a privilege to hear Elliott and Robert tell their mother's story and elevate the concerns that so many in the AAPI community have.

Yong Ae Yue's life was the embodiment of the American dream. She came to the United States with a determination to work hard and raise a family, and she passed along her strength and selflessness to her children and grandchildren. My thoughts are with Ms. Yue's family and the many other families grieving from this tragic event.

HONORING CAPTAIN PAUL JACOBS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 2021
Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the remarkable life story of an American hero, Captain Paul Jacobs who passed away this past December. Captain Paul Jacobs served six combat tours in Vietnam, though it was his last tour that forever enshrined him as leading one of the U.S. Navy's greatest humanitarian efforts.

As U.S. forces began withdrawing from South Vietnam in late April 1975, Captain Jacobs was then commanding the destroyer escort USS Kirk off the coast of Vietnam. To escape being captured by Communist North Vietnamese forces, South Vietnam helicopters loaded with refugees swarmed out toward the U.S. fleet. After hearing rumors that any South Vietnamese pilot captured by the North Vietnamese would be tortured, mutilated, and imprisoned, while their families would be made outcasts or worse, they fled desperately trying to escape that fate.

Upon realizing this, Captain Jacobs offered his ship as a safe haven for the South Vietnamese refugees. Helicopters began arriving and all hands aboard the Kirk—including Captain Jacobs—pushed unloaded helicopters over the side to make room for incoming ones. In all, 12 helicopters, packed with refugees, had landed on one of the Navy’s smallest warships. Captain Jacobs then transformed the Kirk into a humanitarian aid station, providing food, comfort, medical care, and relief from a blazing sun and hope to the men, women and children they’d rescued. It is no exaggeration to credit Captain Jacobs’ steadfast leadership in the face of such hardship for saving the lives of those 30,000-plus Vietnamese sailors and refugees.

The United States Navy has a proud tradition of courageous, competent, indefatigable, and independent ship captains, who fear not what lies over the horizon, and who earn the respect and fidelity of their crews through their fair and steadfast leadership. Such a one was Captain Paul Jacobs' legacy. In California's Fourth Congressional District and in Captain Jacobs' hometown community in Maine, we share profound grief over his passing.

And so today, I rise to bid Captain Paul Jacobs—the United States Navy’s most revered humanitarian—farewell. May he always have fair winds and following seas.

CELEBRATE THE LIFE OF MS. ANITA IDICULLA
HON. TED LIEU
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 2021
Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of Ms. Anita Idiculla, who passed away on March 7, 2021 in Los Angeles, California. She was a beloved daughter, sister and aunt and valued community member in West Los Angeles.

Anita was born May 21, 1981, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania to Drs. Alexander and Anne A. Idiculla. She grew up in Philadelphia until moving to California in 1999 to attend Stanford University. She received her bachelor's degree in 2003 and continued her education, receiving her master's degree in education in 2004. Anita's career began at Tollin/Robins Productions and she spent several years working at notable companies such as Warner Brothers Entertainment, Inc., and Nickelodeon.

While living in Los Angeles, Anita continued her education at the University of California, Los Angeles’ Anderson School of Management and attended the London Business School International Exchange Program before receiving her MBA in 2013. After graduation, Anita joined Mattel Inc. as a Senior Marketing Manager for their Games Global Brand Team. Anita's career was singularly focused on creating content and products that could be enjoyed by children and families alike. She allowed her passion for creativity and tenacity to flow freely which in turn brought joy to her family, friends, and colleagues. Anita’s spirit and aspirations were limitless, and from an early age, it was clear that she could achieve any goal she set her mind to. Her family and friends were her entire world, and her love of being a kid at heart never faded away.

She was an active member of Bel-Air Presbyteriana Church and dedicated years of service to the church’s youth programs. Anita was a voracious reader and co-founded a literary society in 2007. She was an avid pop culture aficionado, a meme creator. She was a strong advocate for women's rights and loved animals, with her favorites being unicorns and kittens. Anita spent every moment she could attending live music concerts and traveling the world. She was loved by so many people and touched so many lives with her thoughtful spirit and caring heart. Anita's smile was infectious, and her loss will be felt by her friends, family, and the many communities she has affected.

Anita is reunited for eternity with her father, Dr. Alexander Idiculla who passed away in 1982. She is survived by her mother, Anne; brothers, Rajiv and Amit; sister-in-law, Elizabeth (Loughran) and nephews, Alexander and Kellan. May her many contributions to her community, family and friends live on.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
HON. TOM O'HALLERAN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 2021
Mr. O’HALLERAN. Madam Speaker, unfortunately, on May 13, 2021, I was unable to vote for H.R. 2877, the Behavioral Intervention Guidelines Act of 2021. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of H.R. 2877.

IN HONOR OF THE EXTRAORDINARY LIFE AND LEGACY OF C.T. MARTIN
HON. NIKEMA WILLIAMS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 2021
Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Councilman Emeritus C.T. Martin, known as the ‘Dean’ of the Atlanta City Council, who passed away at the age of 84. For nearly 30 years, he served Atlanta’s District 10 with distinction on the Atlanta City Council, uplifting the voices of the Southwest Atlanta community throughout his life. Mr. Martin was a fearless leader for justice and steadfast ally for marginalized communities. He served as Congressman John Lewis’ first campaign manager and played a vital role in advancing equality and justice for all Georgians. He was a dedicated member of the Hoosier Memorial United Methodist Church, and is survived by his four children and five grandchildren.

An Atlanta native, Mr. Martin was dedicated to giving back to his community from an early age. He attended Booker T. Washington High School and began his community activism as a member of the N.A.A.C.P., registering people to vote. After graduating from Shaw University with a Bachelor of Science degree with plans to become an educator, he attended Atlanta University where he earned a Master of Science degree and afterwards followed his calling for public service.

A graduate of Leadership Atlanta, Mr. Martin had affiliations with numerous service organizations. In 1972, he received a presidential appointment from the White House Domestic Policy Council. For more than 20 years, he served the National Scholarship Service for Negro Students and influenced college minority recruitment policy nationwide. During his public service career, he received over 350 community service awards for outstanding service.

A strong believer in sharing the wealth of his successes with the community, Mr. Martin was dedicated to bringing the voices of African Americans to the forefront of leadership in this country. As a civil rights foot soldier himself, Mr. Martin worked alongside Congressman John Lewis in his first run for Congress and mentored many rising Black leaders from Georgia, including his successor, City Councilwoman Andrea Boone.

Elected to the Atlanta City Council in 1990, Mr. Martin was dedicated to improving the lives of ALL Georgians. He also strongly advocated for education, social services, senior citizen protection, voter rights, neighborhood preservation, and private enterprise. He fought
tirelessly to restore our neighborhoods and provide economic opportunity in our communities.

Early on in his service on Atlanta City Council, Mr. Martin was appointed by Mayor Bill Campbell to the Atlanta City Budget Commission. In 1994, he was selected by the Labor Coalition to travel to South Africa to work for educational reform following the release of Nelson Mandela. During his second and third terms in office, he held three key chairmanships—Human Resources, Public Safety, and Transportation.

Mr. Martin was a bold visionary for the people, spearheading projects such as the construction of the Adamsville Natatorium and Community Center that completely transformed the area and provided resources to our most marginalized communities. He created the Martin Luther King Jr. Drive Merchants Association, an initiative to foster economic opportunities and growth for Atlanta’s District 10 and served on the Missing and Murdered Children Task Force. Mr. Martin was also a board member for the West End Medical Center and chairman of the City of Atlanta Employee Credit Union Board.

His off-term work included serving as a consultant on political campaigns and spearheading strategic planning activity and youth programming. He was elected by Georgia’s Democratic Party to serve as a delegate to the first Black President of the United States, Barack Obama, at the Democratic National Convention in 2008 and 2012.

Atlanta has lost one of its greatest native sons. On a personal level, I was proud to have earned his support, guidance, and endorsement in my first campaign for public office. My thoughts and prayers are with his family and loved ones at this time. The entire city of Atlanta owes a debt of gratitude to C.T. Martin that we could never repay. May his memory serve as a guiding light for future generations of leaders in the fight for full equality.

On behalf of Georgia’s 5th Congressional District, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the extraordinary life and legacy of Councilman C.T. Martin, and his incredible contributions to the Atlanta community.

HONORING OFFICER CHRISTOPHER FARRAR

HON. ANDY BIGGS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 2021

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, there is no greater love than to lay one’s life down for another.

Officer Christopher Farrar of Chandler, Arizona exemplified that love when he was killed in the line of duty on April 30th of this year. Officer Farrar gave his life on behalf of his community and indeed, the entire State of Arizona. By all accounts he was a great police officer who served his community every day.

He leaves behind a grieving family and his fellow officers of the Chandler Police Department. I thank his family and loved ones for their sacrifices and his. Our prayers are with you.

We also join in prayer for Officer Rico Aranda, of the Gilbert, Arizona Police Department who, alongside Officer Farrar, put his life on the line while responding to the same call on April 30. Although he was critically wounded, he was fortunate enough to survive the attempt on his life. We express our hope for a speedy and complete recovery for Officer Farrar.

Both these men and their families will remain in our hearts.

Serving in law enforcement takes a special kind of person. One who leaves the house each day knowing he may not return. Police officers all across this country have been vilified over the last year but I challenge you, Madame Speaker, to find a group of individuals more noble, more selfless, and more interested in serving their fellowman than police officers.

Instead of the hyper-critique they have received of recent times, they deserve the praise and admiration of this body. Police officers routinely face grave threats with great courage.

Madam Speaker, over the last year we have seen Liberal organizations and leftist cities call for the defunding of our police. I urge elected officials and the American public to support those who keep our communities safe. Let’s increase our respect to our police force. Let’s increase our gratitude by giving a positive comment, a helping hand, or saying a prayer when you see those flashing red and blue lights on the way to an emergency.

I am grateful to be participating in National Police Week so I may pay homage to the brave men and women who run towards danger when most retreat. We may never know the pressure and the courage it takes to wear the badge and perform the uniform, but we can always show the respect and honor our police officers deserve.

To those officers who demonstrated the greater love by making the greatest sacrifice we say, “Thank you.” We offer our grateful support to those they left behind.

HONORING TOMS RIVER FIRE DEPARTMENT NO. 1 ON ITS 125TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. STENY H. HOYER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 2021

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I am proud to represent more than 62,000 federal employees in Maryland’s Fifth District and to have long been an advocate for recognizing and celebrating the many contributions that federal civilian workers make to our country. That’s why I am always very excited to participate in marking Public Service Recognition Week, which is held each May. It is a moment to thank federal employees for their patriotism, their service, and the many essential roles they play in creating and delivering opportunities for the American people.

Each year, the Partnership for Public Service reviews hundreds of nominations submitted by federal workers and the Americans they serve of outstanding federal civilian employees for recognition in a number of categories. During Public Service Recognition Week, the organization unveils the list of finalists in each category, and it has named twenty-nine finalists this year. The winners, including Federal Employee of the Year, will be announced in the autumn. These Samuel J. Heyman Service to America Medals, named in memory of the founder of the Partnership for Public Service and a champion for those serving in government, are affectionately known as the Sammys, and they are considered to be the government-service equivalent of the Academy Awards.

I am proud to share with my colleagues that one of this year’s finalists in the ‘Emerging Leaders’ category is Edward Sisco from Maryland’s Fifth District. A research chemist at the Department of Commerce’s National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Ed has already made an enormous impact even at only thirty-two years old. He developed a novel procedure for testing potentially toxic substances faster than thought possible, which has yielded tremendous benefits in forensic analysis and protection for law enforcement and forensic chemists testing drugs seized in raids. The Thermal Desorption Direct Analysis in Real Time Mass Spectrometry (TD-DART-MS) technique that he has already been deployed and is having a major impact on criminal justice and laboratory safety.

Ed and many of his colleagues at NIST are among the thousands of outstanding federal employees who call Maryland’s Fifth District home, and I am proud to join in recognizing his work and his being chosen as a Service to America Medal finalist. I wish him all the best of luck in the competition, and I look forward to learning the winners in his category and all the others, as well as Federal Employee of the Year, this fall. While these awards recognize special contributions to our country that go above and beyond, I hope all of us who serve in the House will remember the contributions and hard work that 2.1 million federal employees perform every day in every state and in single one of our districts. Each and every one of them deserves our recognition and our gratitude.

CONGRATULATING EDWARD SISCO, SERVICE TO AMERICA MEDAL FINALIST FROM MARYLAND’S FIFTH DISTRICT

HON. ANDY KIM
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 2021

Mr. KIM of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Toms River Fire Department No. 1 on its 125th anniversary.

Beginning in 1896, the Toms River Fire Department was founded with no budget or fire hydrant. Within two years, the town’s running water became operational and the Fire Department was granted a $500 budget. Soon, when there was a fire, the firefighters were able to hook their hoses to Toms River’s only hydrant and push a hose cart across town to fight a fire. Through the Toms River Fire Department’s work, they protected the residents of Toms River and saved countless lives.

While the technology and tools available to the Toms River Fire Department have changed drastically over the past century and firetrucks have thankfully replaced fire carts, the mission and the work ethic of the Toms River Fire Department have not. For the past
one hundred and twenty-five years, the volun-
teer fire service has protected the grateful
residents of Toms River. Hopefully, in one
hundred years from today, another member of
Congress representing Toms River will stand
here on the floor of the House of Represen-
tatives, honoring the Toms River Fire Depart-
ment No. 1’s service. For their two hundred
and twenty-fifth anniversary, I extend my best wishes to all the
firefighters, former firefighters and their fami-
lies of the Toms River community.

THE LONG-TERM PROBLEMS
BETWEEN ISRAEL AND PALESTINE

SPEECH OF
HON. KATHLEEN M. RICE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 2021

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise
today in strong support of the State of Israel.
Hamas, a terrorist organization, is firing hun-
dreds of rockets and missiles indiscriminately
at Israeli civilians. There is no moral justifica-
tion for these despicable attacks on innocent
life.
Israel has every right to defend itself and
keep its citizens safe from these attacks.
I want to assure my constituents on Long
Island, and all friends of Israel, that the United
States stands in staunch support of Israel and
unequivocally condemns this Hamas terrorism.

I present for the innocent Israeli and Pale-
tinian civilians affected by this crisis. And I
pray that a cease-fire can be reached.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF MR.
JEFFREY SCOTT FRANKEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 2021

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, I rise to cele-
brate the life of Jeffrey Scott Frankel who
passed away on April 3, 2021 in Los Angeles,
California. Mr. Frankel was a dedicated com-
munity member on the Palos Verdes Penin-
sula in the South Bay of Los Angeles County,
who left an indelible mark on the region as a
dedicated father, volunteer and school board
official.

Mr. Frankel was born on November 24,
1962 in London, Ontario, Canada and was
raised in Baldwin, New York. He attended the
State University of New York College at Buf-
falo and had a successful career as a market-
ing consultant with King World Productions,
SharkNinja and other notable brands. In re-
keting consultant with King World Productions,
falo and had a successful career as a mar-
keeps his daughter, Jillian, who had special
needs and was the light of his life. He sought
to make a difference in her life along with
other students. He made it his mission to
ensure that every student, including those with
special needs, reached their full potential. Mr.
Frankel was elected to the Palos Verdes Pe-
insula School Board in November 2020 and
was a shining example of a community partner
who proudly assumed the role of a civic leader
and change agent.

Jeffrey loved the Grateful Dead and fast
food gave him much delight. He has left an in-
delible mark on the Palos Verdes Peninsula
Unified School District, the South Bay commu-

and to all who knew him. He is survived
by his mother, Gloria Frankel, his siblings,
Karen Rozen and Mark Frankel, his niece
Mindy, his nephews David, Louie, and Kevin,
and his beloved daughter, Jillian. For all his
success, he will forever be known as a man of
generosity, humility, and kindness. May his
memory be a blessing.

MAY 6 COMMEMORATION OF REP.
JAMES BILBRAY ON 30TH ANNIV-
ERSARY OF THE RED ROCK
CANYON NATIONAL CONSERVA-
TION AREA ESTABLISHMENT ACT

HON. DINA TITUS
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 2021

Ms. TITUS. Madam Speaker, I first want to
thank the Bureau of Land Management and
Friends of Red Rock Canyon for helping facili-
tate today’s event. I also want to thank our
guests for joining me in commemorating the 30th
anniversary of the designation of Red
Rock Canyon National Conservation Area. Although
we were not able to celebrate on the date it
was signed, November 16, because of
COVID, I felt it was important to honor the
man who introduced legislation to preserve
Red Rock Canyon for future generations, Con-
gressman James Bilbray.

Congressman Bilbray served as the Rep-
resentative for Nevada’s First District from
1987–1995. In that role, he led the legislative
effort to permanently protect more than 83,000
acres of Red Rock Canyon. On November 16,
1990, President George H.W. Bush signed
Congressman Bilbray’s bill, H.R. 4559, The
Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area
Establishment Act. In 1994, Congressman
Bilbray successfully spearheaded an effort to
expand the conservation area to more than
176,000 acres to protect Joshua tree and
desert tortoise habitat. H.R. 3050, The
Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area
Boundary Expansion, was signed by President
Bill Clinton in November of that year.

Congressman Bilbray was ahead of his
time. When he introduced legislation to protect
Red Rock Canyon, the environmental move-
ment was just in its beginnings in Nevada. It
wasn’t as easy or as popular to pass this kind
of legislation, but he had the vision to know
that this area was special and should be pre-
served for his grandchildren and future gen-
erations.

Saving this area from development was per-
sonal for the Congressman. A lifelong Ne-
vadan, he camped in the area as a Boy Scout
and frequently visited it with his family on pic-
nics and hikes. Red Rock Canyon also holds
significant cultural resources for the native
Southern Paiute Tribe. Within the canyons
exist rock walls with extensive petroglyphs, as
well as indications of prehistoric inhabitation,
such as shelter caves and agave roasting pits.
The area is home to bighorn sheep, antelope,
and desert tortoises, as well as unique flora.
And in contrast to nearby Las Vegas, a town
emphasizing entertainment and gaming, Red
Rock offers respite and recreation of a dif-
ferent nature. It is because of Congressman
Bilbray that Nevadans and visitors from
around the globe can enjoy this unique desert
landscape, the natural crown jewel of South-
ern Nevada.

In honor of Congressman Bilbray’s public
service, a new plaque will be installed at the
entrance of the Red Rock Canyon Visitor Cen-
ter where over 2,000 people enter each day.
We will see, know, and get to read about the
incredible man who made this possible.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
HON. PETER A. DEFAZIO
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 2021

Mr. DeFAZIO. Madam Speaker, on May 11,
2021, I was unavoidably detained and missed
the day’s vote. Had I been present, I would
have voted Yea on Roll Call Vote 134, on the
Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R.
1629, the Fairness in Orphan Drug Exclusively
Act.

IN RECOGNITION OF MARTIN’S
FAMOUS PASTRY SHOPPE
HON. JOHN JOYCE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 2021

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker,
I rise today to recognize Martin’s Famous
Pastry Shoppe in Chambersburg, Pennsyl-
vania for its outstanding leadership and serv-
vice to our local community and beyond.

Like many Pennsylvania businesses, Mar-
tin’s Famous Pastry Shoppe faced unprece-
dented challenges during the COVID–19 pan-
demic. Despite these obstacles, Martin’s con-
tinued its essential work to feed the American
people and protect their workers’ livelihoods.

Now led by President James “Jim” Martin,
this family-owned company was first estab-
lished as a small bakery in 1968. Since then,
it has expanded broadly in both market reach
and workforce. Today, Martin’s Famous Pastry
Shoppe employs hardworking Americans in
Franklin County and around the country.

Throughout its decades of service, Martin’s
Famous Pastry Shoppe has maintained a
clear focus on community outreach and sup-
port. Starting with founders Lloyd and Lois
Martin, the organization has prioritized com-
munity focus. Each year, this company gives
back to our Chambersburg community and
supports charities in Pennsylvania and around
the world.

On behalf of the 13th District of Pennsyl-
vania, I am honored to recognize Martin’s Fa-
mous Pastry Shoppe for its incredible work
IN HONOR OF RICHARD “DICK” HAMILTON

HON. ANN M. KUSTER
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 2021

Ms. KUSTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Richard “Dick” Hamilton for his selfless work to honor the memory of our cherished state symbol, the Old Man of the Mountain. His granite resolve has led to this beautiful plaza where you stand today.

Daniel Webster wrote, “Men hang out their signs indicative of their respective trades; shoemakers hang out a gigantic shoe, jewelers a monster watch, and dentists hang out a gold tooth. Now, up in New Hampshire, God almighty has hung out a sign to show that here he makes men.” Dick Hamilton is one of those men.

As we remember May 2, 2003, the day the Old Man gave up his perch on the side of Cannon Mountain, we also salute Dick and countless others who carry on the memory of the Old Man and what he means to the people of the Granite State. I take this time to honor Dick and keep the memory of the Old Man alive.

HONORING GARY NATIVE AND OSCAR WINNER MIA NEAL

HON. FRANK J. MRVAN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 2021

Mr. MRVAN. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure and admiration that I congratulate Gary, Indiana, native Mia Neal, and celebrate her noteworthy achievement of winning an Oscar at the 93rd Academy Awards ceremony on April 25, 2021. Presented with the Oscar for Best Makeup and Hairstyling for her work in the film Ma Rainey’s Black Bottom, Mia, along with Jamika Wilson, have become the first African American women to win in this category. For this historic and extraordinary accomplishment, Mia is worthy of the highest praise.

Mia attended Horace Mann High School in Gary, where she participated in theater and was a member of the school’s talented dance troupe. After graduating in 1997, Mia’s interest in hairstyling and makeup blossomed as she attended Merrillville Beauty College and Columbia College in Chicago before enrolling at Jackson State University in Jackson, Mississippi. After graduating from Jackson State University, Mia completed a Professional Internship for Wigs and Makeup at the famed Juilliard School in New York City where she honed her craft. After completing her studies, Mia remained in New York and has amassed an impressive career in her field, designing hair and makeup for many stage productions and feature films.

While Mia has certainly had a successful career, her greatest accomplishment is being a mother to her son, James G. Deacon. Mia is daughter of Dena Holland Neal, a longtime active community member in Gary and Pastor at Peace United Church in Merrillville, Indiana, and the sister of Nia and Thamian Neal, as well as the cherished aunt of DeWayne, Jordan, and Kennedy. Mia’s grandparents, James and Dorothy Hamilton, carry deep roots in Gary. James taught at Roosevelt High School for more than fifteen years and served as Gary’s first Deputy Mayor from 1976 to 1988. Madam Speaker, I ask that you and my distinguished colleagues join me in recognizing Mia Neal on her historic Oscar award and congratulate her for this outstanding accomplishment. She has made her family, the entire Gary community, and all of Northwest Indiana so very proud.

PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT

HON. KATHY E. MANNING
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 2021

Ms. MANNING. Madam 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 ten 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. 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 is an experience that should not be unique to me.

The Pregnant Workers’ Fairness Act will ensure that every person who needs reasonable accommodations during pregnancy will be given those accommodations so they can 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 in support.

Madam Speaker, I also include in the RECORD a letter from the National Education Association.

Clarifying existing laws and creating a uniform national standard for reasonable accommodations for pregnancy, childbirth, and related conditions;
Providing reasonable accommodations to pregnant women to reduce health risks to them and their babies;
Prohibiting employers from denying a pregnant worker employment opportunities or forcing the worker to take an accommodation that she does not want or need;
Prohibiting employers from forcing a pregnant worker to take leave when another reasonable accommodation could keep her on the job;

Requiring the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to make rules implementing the law, including a list of exemplary accommodations that should be provided unless they pose an undue hardship to employers; and

Addressing this issue through a framework modeled after the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Every pregnant worker should be able to support her family, without risking the health either of herself or her unborn child. H.R. 1065 is crucial to bringing about fairness in the workplace for pregnant workers, and we urge you to vote YES.

Sincerely,

Director of Government Relations,
National Education Association.

HONORING MARY MAGDALENE WHITEHEAD’S 106TH BIRTHDAY

HON. ANDY KIM
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 2021

Mr. KIM of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Mary Magdalene Whitehead’s 106th birthday. Mrs. Whitehead is a loving mother, grandmother, great-grandmother and great-great-grandmother.

Mrs. Whitehead is beloved by her community, where she is known as “Big Mom” for her warmth, kindness, and wisdom that she offers children and parents alike. Mrs. Whitehead has babysat generations of children and served as a sounding board for scores of overwhelmed and grateful parents. It is clear to everyone that knows Mrs. Whitehead, that she has made the most of each of her one-hundred and six years. I wish her the best at achieving this milestone.

HONORING JEFF MILLER AS IOWAN OF THE WEEK

HON. CYNTHIA AXNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 2021

Mrs. AXNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Jeff Miller, the retired West Des Moines police officer who is currently walking across the entire state of Iowa in honor of his sister, Linda, who passed away from Alzheimer’s disease.

Jeff has been hiking across the state for about a week now in the hopes of raising money and awareness for Alzheimer’s disease. He started his cross-state journey on Saturday the 24th in Akron and plans to follow...
Highway 3 to Dubuque, which is approximately 325 miles east, documenting his journey via YouTube along the way. Jeff has been camping when he can, but the kindhearted people of Iowa have also opened their homes and sponsored hotel stays for Jeff so he can be well rested enough to resume his trek the next day. He has also opened his wallet to anyone who wishes to walk alongside him, if only for a mile or two.

Jeff’s sister Linda was diagnosed with early onset Alzheimer’s in 2012 and lost her battle five years later. According to Jeff's page on the Walk to End Alzheimer’s website, their paths referred to Jeff as her “bratty little brother,” but you can’t doubt the closeness the two shared as he makes his way to the Mississippi River.

Jeff is asking for donations to the Alzheimer’s Association in honor of Linda and those who have been affected by the disease. The Alzheimer’s Association provides care to all those facing Alzheimer’s. Their goals and missions are to drive research toward treatment, prevention, and, ultimately, a cure, as well as speak up for the needs and rights of people affected by Alzheimer’s disease.

Jeff’s goal with this hike is to raise awareness and donations, but he also wishes for it to be a beacon of hope and understanding for people. He hopes it reminds lowans to love their family and friends, and to hold each other as close as they can for as long as they can.

It is incredibly honorable to use your voice to raise awareness for those who cannot always raise awareness for themselves, but actions sometimes speak louder than words. Jeff’s courage and tenacity are undoubtedly admirable, and we as Iowans will continue to cheer Jeff on in his mission to bring awareness to Alzheimer’s disease. It is my honor to recognize Jeff Miller as our Iowan of the Week.

VINYARD WIND OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

HON. ANDY HARRIS
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 2021

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Speaker, I urge today to include in the Record an article written by David Stevenson, the Director of the Center of Energy and Environmental Policy at the Caesar Rodney Institute. This article summarizes many of the various concerns raised by multiple stakeholders with regard to current plans for offshore wind development on the United States’ Outer Continental Shelf. These concerns are particularly timely in light of the Biden Administration’s approval of the Vineyard Wind Offshore Wind Project off the coast of Massachusetts earlier this week.

For years I have sought to raise concerns with proposed offshore wind projects relating to commercial and recreational fisheries, navigational safety, national security, natural resources, environmental conservation and the impacts these massive projects have on local communities. Nonetheless, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management has decided to move ahead with the approval of this project without adequately accommodating these concerns. I fear that this project is a harbinger of what is to come and that in the not-so-distant future, much of our East Coast will be pockmarked by these large industrial projects to the detriment of all of the interests I have already mentioned.

Madam Speaker, I urge my fellow members and the Biden administration to address these issues before it is too late to ensure the responsible development of our treasured coastal and marine resources.

[From CRI News, May 4, 2021]

OFFSHORE WIND TOO UGLY FOR THE HAMPTONS BUT OK FOR OTHER BEACH RESORTS?

(By David T. Stevenson, Director Center for Environmental Policy)

Officials in New York and the Federal Government determined that the proposed offshore wind turbine lease area off the Hamptons is too close and ruins the serene ocean views. Additionally, it is a threat to navigation, fishing, and endangered marine mammals.

The Fairway lease areas sit as close as 12 miles off the Long Island coast near the Hamptons.

In official comments to the US Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM), submitted July 30, 2018, New York suggested the wind turbines be no closer than 20 miles from shore. This recommendation was based upon an earlier study by BOEM that concluded that 600-foot-high turbines produced a “dominate impact” on the beach view 15 miles offshore.

Adjusting for the new 50% taller turbines, the suggested distance from the shore should be 30 miles. In Europe, the closest lease area for these jumbo turbines is 44 miles out. The New York decision begs the question of why lease areas from Maryland to Massachusetts aren’t being rejected on the same merits.

There are four proposed lease areas within 20 miles of the islands of Martha’s Vineyard, Nantucket, and Block Island. Another four lease areas are off southern New Jersey, Delaware, and Ocean City, Maryland, which range between 10 and 13 miles off major beach resorts.

Yet BOEM is about to approve the “Vineyard Wind” project just 14 miles from shore, establishing a precedent likely to influence federal decisions on all the other projects.

Visibility is a small part of New York’s concerns. The State’s extensive outreach revealed proposed lease areas posed a great concern to a high number of commercial and for-hire fishermen.

The passage around or between wind farms could pose a safety risk for vessels attempting to maintain a course heading and could increase vessel costs, especially for the fishing industry facing daily hazards and a potential loss of fishing gear.

The BOEM Final Environmental Impact Statement for the “Vineyard Wind” project concluded that the leases would have a major impact on Coast Guard Search and Rescue Operations.

They also determined a major negative impact on scientific studies used to determine the annual fishing limits for various species. Both impacts relate to the need to fly higher to find people in need of rescue and to make fish counts.

There are other potential environmental impacts.

There are only 356 endangered Northern Right Whales left, and they regularly visit many of the proposed lease areas. Recent accidental deaths were caused by vessel strikes, entanglements, and ocean noise, all of which will be worsened by offshore wind projects.

Horseshoe crab blood is the only known substance for testing antigens in vaccine development. The COVID-19 vaccine could not have been developed without it. The blood is harvested, and the crabs are returned to the sea. The crabs burrow into the sandy seafloor to hibernate for the winter, primarily in a federal reserve off the New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland coast.

Offshore wind projects, with acres of cement and rocks to prevent sand scouring, would land on top of the reserve, and electric cables and turbines will create noise and electromagnetic fields with an unknown impact on the crabs. The crab’s eggs are critical food for migrating birds like the endangered Red Knot.

The problems discussed above are common to the eight lease areas located too close to shore.

The Hamptons have some of the most expensive beachfront home values in the country. Many of those homes are owned by wealthy Manhattanites. One can only wonder how much influence these wealthy folks had on the decision to shut down the Fairways lease areas.

What’s good enough for New Yorkers should be good enough for the rest of the East Coast.

IN RECOGNITION OF STUCKEY AUTOMOTIVE

HON. JOHN JOYCE
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 2021

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Stuckey Automotive in Hollidaysburg, Pennsylvania for its commitment to the United States flag and our community.

Since 1985, Stuckey Ford has proudly flown a 50-foot American flag. This patriotic display has become a hallmark of the Hollidaysburg landscape.

This week, a flag-raising ceremony will mark the replacement of the original flagpole. I am proud to join the Stuckey Family and members of our community for this special event to witness the initial flag-raising.

As we commemorate this transition, I thank Matt Stuckey, President of Stuckey Automotive, and his team for their unwavering commitment to the flag. This longstanding tradition is an important part of our community fabric, and it showcases Blair County’s great respect for our Nation’s flag.

A leader in Blair County, Stuckey Automotive is a key part of our community and local economy. First founded as Replogle Motor Company, its history began before World War II. Will and Barbara Stuckey bought the business, which was incorporated as Will Stuckey Ford in 1959. For decades, Stuckey Automotive has grown in both size and workforce. Today, with nearly 300 employees, this family-owned business remains committed to its mission of delivering exemplary service to Pennsylvanians.

On behalf of the 13th District of Pennsylvania, I am honored to recognize Stuckey Automotive for its incredible commitment to our community and our nation, and I look forward to the continuation of this patriotic display.
HONORING RABBI ROSALIN MANDELBORG FOR 25 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. ELAINE G. LURIA OF VIRGINIA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 2021

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Rabbi Rosalin Mandelberg in celebration of her 25 years as an ordained Rabbi. Rabbi Mandelberg, also affectionately known as Rabbi Roz, serves as the Senior Rabbi of Ohef Sholom Temple in Norfolk, Virginia, where she has led the congregation for the last 16 years. Through her teachings, her relationships, and her dedication to faith, Rabbi Roz has instilled an enduring sense of community in the Hampton Roads area.

Rabbi Roz was ordained on May 16, 1996, by the Hebrew Union College. Before joining Ohef Sholom Temple, Rabbi Roz served in the Baltimore Hebrew Congregation and Westchester Reform Temple. In her 16 years at Ohef Sholom Temple, she has successfully engaged multiple generations within the Jewish faith and has fostered a growing knowledge and appreciation of Judaism within the broader community. Rabbi Roz has also embraced and demonstrated an understanding of faith-driven selflessness and compassion for others.

I am thankful that Rabbi Roz has been such a powerful voice in our community for positivity. I am proud to join the Ohef Sholom Temple congregation and the Norfolk community in congratulating Rabbi Roz upon 25 years of service and leadership.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF RABBI MORLEY T. FEINSTEIN

HON. TED LIEU OF CALIFORNIA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 2021

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of Rabbi Morley T. Feinstein, who passed away on April 25, 2021 in Los Angeles, California. Rabbi Feinstein was a pillar in Southern California’s Jewish community and worked tirelessly to serve the people of our region and to spread good will to all those who he had known.

Rabbi Feinstein grew up in West Los Angeles, attended Beverly Hills High School, and graduated Phi Beta Kappa from the University of California, Berkeley in 1975. Driven to serve those in need, he was ordained in 1981 at Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in Cincinnati, Ohio. Rabbi Feinstein served as the assistant and then first associate rabbi of Temple Beth-El in San Antonio, Texas from 1987 to 2002. Later, he took the role of Senior Rabbi of Temple Beth-El in South Bend, Indiana where he received the state’s highest citizen honor—the Sagamore of the Wabash—for his efforts to promote peace and justice.

Later, Rabbi Feinstein served as a Senior Rabbinic Fellow of Jerusalem’s Shalom Hartman Institute where he was known for his love of music, fervor for learning, and zeal for the Torah. He taught at the summer camps at Union for Reform Judaism and Olin Sang Ruby Union Institute (OSRUI) for over thirty-four years. Rabbi Feinstein formally retired in 2019, but his commitment to serving his community always remained steadfast.

Rabbi Feinstein was affectionately referred to by his colleagues as a “Rabbi’s Rabbi.” He believed in the purity of the human spirit and appreciated the traditions of community building. He transcended faith and knew what it meant to be a steward of God and to those in need.

Rabbi Feinstein’s impact will forever be remembered by those who loved him and to those he had a profound influence on. He is survived by his wife, Dr. Margarete Myers Feinstein, their twin daughters, Eliana and Renata, his first wife Nancy Lichtenstein, and their two sons, Aaron and Ari; and their three grandchildren; his brother Dr. Barney Feinstein and his sister, Sheila Merewitz. May his life be an honor and a blessing.
Friday, May 14, 2021

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action
The Senate was not in session and stands adjourned until 3 p.m., on Monday, May 17, 2021.

Committee Meetings
No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action
Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 30 public bills, H.R. 3233–3262; and 6 resolutions, H. Res. 397–402 were introduced.

Additional Cosponsors:

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:
H.R. 2167, 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 (H. Rept. 117–34).

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Cuellar to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Member Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Stivers, wherein he resigned as Representative for the Fifteenth Congressional District of Ohio, effective May 16, 2021.

Pregnant Workers Fairness Act: The House passed 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, by a yea-and-nay vote of 315 yeas to 101 nays, Roll No. 143.

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted.

Committee Meetings
H. Res. 380, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2547) and (H.R. 1065) was agreed to on Wednesday, May 12th.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote developed during the proceedings of today and appears on page H2342.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 1:01 p.m.

Committee Meetings
OPERATIONS IN CYBERSPACE AND BUILDING CYBER CAPABILITIES ACROSS THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Cyber, Innovative Technologies, and Information Systems held a hearing entitled “Operations in Cyberspace and Building Cyber Capabilities Across the Department of Defense”. Testimony was heard from Mieke Eoyangy, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Cyber Policy, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Department of Defense; and General Paul M. Nakasone, U.S. Army, Commander, U.S. Cyber Command and Director, National Security Agency, Department of Defense.

Joint Meetings
No joint committee meetings were held.
COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY,
MAY 17, 2021

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

**Senate**

*Committee on Foreign Relations:* to receive a closed briefing on the challenges and opportunities for the United States in the Horn of Africa, 6 p.m., SVC–217.

**House**

*Committee on Rules,* Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 1629, the “Fairness in Orphan Drug Exclusivity Act”; and H. Res. 275, condemning the horrific shootings in Atlanta, Georgia, on March 16, 2021, and reaffirming the House of Representative’s commitment to combating hate, bigotry, and violence against the Asian-American and Pacific Islander community, 3 p.m., Webex.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
3 p.m., Monday, May 17

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1260, Endless Frontier Act, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
12 p.m., Monday, May 17

Program for Monday: To be announced.
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