



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 24, 2021

No. 110

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GALLEGO).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
June 24, 2021.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RUBEN GALLEGO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2021, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

### THE NEED FOR 2002 AUMF REPEAL AND THE PEACE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, it is past time for Congress to reassert its role in the war powers discussion.

I proudly joined many of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle last week in voting to repeal the 2002 AUMF. This AUMF provided for military operations in Iraq, an Iraq that is far different from the one we know today.

The goal was to defend the United States against the threat posed by an Iraq of 20 years ago, specifically, that of Saddam Hussein. Saddam Hussein was captured in December of 2003 and executed 3 years later.

Despite ousting Saddam Hussein, the 2002 AUMF has remained on the books. Less than one-fifth of the current Members of the House of Representatives were present on that original AUMF vote. As you can imagine, many Members have entered Congress and left the Halls of Congress without ever taking a vote on the 2001 or 2002 AUMFs.

Repealing the existing AUMFs, like the one from 2002, can be a step in the right direction in Congress reasserting its Article I powers, but we should not stop there. We need to rethink how we approach military authorizations.

A few weeks ago, I introduced the Preventing Endless Armed Conflict and Engagement Act, or the PEACE Act for short. The goal of this bill is to ensure regular oversight is being conducted on future military authorizations.

First, this bill would require each military authorization, or AUMF, to terminate after 2 years. This is because the Constitution stipulates that military funding should not extend past 2 years. This would also ensure that every Member of Congress has the opportunity to weigh in on current military operations.

The PEACE Act would also set standards for drafting military authorizations. For instance, each authorization would need to set a geographic scope on where the military force can be used. A clear objective would need to be established for each authorization, and the countries and groups that the U.S. troops are authorized to fight must be listed.

Additionally, the Department of Defense and the State Department would be charged with publishing an annual, unclassified report on existing military

operations. This report will include information such as whether the military is meeting their objective, the number of casualties, and total cost. This will assist Congress in making the needed decisions that we have to make regarding AUMF reauthorizations. Finally, the DOD and State Department will be required to brief Members of Congress on the contents of this report once every 6 months.

It is critical that new Members of Congress, with new constituencies, have their chance at providing input into military operations. Many Members came to the floor last week to reiterate the importance of updating these existing AUMFs instead of repealing them. While I supported the repeal, I do hope that any updated or future AUMF incorporates elements from the PEACE Act.

Future AUMFs should be more concise and relied on for only a few years, not for a couple decades.

I look forward to working with Members from both sides of the aisle on future reforms to Congress' war powers authority.

### NO CLIMATE, NO DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, we are living in a climate emergency. The carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere have reached the highest levels in human history.

In California, we have our worst drought in decades. Last week, we were hit by a heat wave that stretched from the West Coast to the Great Plains. This combination of unforgiving drought and relentless heat sets the conditions for another severe wildfire season. New Federal data shows the number of new wildfires this year is at a 10-year high.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H3085

In recent years, our country has also faced record floods, deep freezes, and hurricanes. And deadly wildfires have hit States beyond California.

Climate disruption is here. Congress has a responsibility to act boldly in response. The American Jobs Plan is a once-in-a-generation opportunity to meet the moment with a transformative investment in infrastructure.

We have the opportunity to build a clean-energy future that uplifts the communities who now suffer from the impacts of the fossil fuel industry. We must do it.

We must also recognize that communities of color have been hit first and worst by climate change. They must be at the front of the line for these investments. They must be represented in discussions on any infrastructure agreement.

We can afford to protect our planet, clean our air and water, and provide a better quality of life for communities all over the country.

We cannot afford an infrastructure bill that doesn't have climate at its center. We cannot afford a bill that doesn't invest in infrastructure that will create millions of jobs and serve the needs of our communities.

We need: clean energy, a resilient electric grid, electric vehicle charging, green affordable housing, zero-emissions public transit, climate smart ports, and more.

Our constituents did not send us here to back down when faced with climate deniers and deniers of taking any meaningful climate action.

If we don't do it now, when will it ever happen? This is our opportunity. Now is the time to stand up for the health and the well-being of our communities and our planet to say: No climate, no deal.

#### RECOGNIZING DISTRICT DIRECTOR BRIAN McDONALD AND THE MINNESOTA OFFICE OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Brian McDonald and his entire team at the Small Business Administration's Minnesota District Office.

In May 2020, at the height of the COVID pandemic, Brian took on an enormous challenge when he rose to the role of district director for the SBA's Minnesota region.

Brian and his team were charged with supporting Minnesota's 500,000 small businesses and their 1.3 million employees through one of the most challenging economic crises in our Nation's history. Under Brian's leadership, the SBA's Minnesota district office team facilitated critical loans, provided valuable training, and served as true warrior advocates for businesses of all sizes during this difficult time.

At the outset of the COVID-19 outbreak, Brian and I hosted a joint town hall where he helped my constituents understand how they could keep their small businesses afloat. Brian's participation was crucial, and his willingness to offer guidance and expertise is characteristic of his office's impressive work throughout the crisis.

Brian and his team in the SBA's Minnesota district office continue to work around the clock to help businesses in our State survive. We are grateful for all of their work, and we are fortunate to have such a dedicated SBA district presence in our State. I thank them for all they do.

#### CONGRATULATING MINNESOTA ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL OF THE YEAR ANGIE CHARBONEAU-FOLCH

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Angie Charboneau-Folch, assistant principal at Big Lake High School.

In April, Angie was named this year's Minnesota Assistant Principal of the Year by the Central Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals. She received this honor after 15 years of service as a school administrator, including a decade at Big Lake.

Angie has been a longtime advocate for both students and educators during her tenure. As leader of Big Lake High School's Student Targeted Instruction and Goals program, better known as STING, she has ensured that students receive the additional instruction time and support they need. She has also worked to open the channels of communication between teachers and families through her Being Your Own Champion initiative.

I congratulate Angie on this remarkable achievement. I thank her for her years of dedication to the Big Lake community, and I know Minnesota students are better off because of her support.

#### HONORING THE WORK AND BRAVERY OF HALO TRUST AFGHANISTAN

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the bravery and sacrifice of the HALO Trust employees who were recently attacked in Afghanistan. Earlier this month, 110 demining workers in the northeastern Afghanistan province of Baghlan were attacked. Ten HALO Trust workers lost their lives and 16 more were injured.

HALO Trust staff is comprised of locals who work alongside American citizens around the world to clear the debris of war, especially landmines. Their work is vital in Afghanistan, where nearly 40 years of conflict has left the land littered with explosives and citizens living under constant threat of detonation. This forces locals to make an unimaginable choice: either let their families starve or risk their lives to farm dangerous land.

Thanks to the work of HALO Trust and the entire demining community, war-torn nations across the globe are being revitalized. Within the Herat province alone, HALO Trust workers have cleared over 600 minefields and

provided steady employment to 2,600 Afghan locals.

This devastating attack was an act of cowardice from an organization that feeds off instability and fear. I commend the profound bravery of the workers who face down death to rebuild their communities. I hope everyone will join me in recognition of their sacrifice.

#### THANKING TAMMY BIERY AND CAREER SOLUTIONS

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Tammy Biery, the executive director of the employment agency Career Solutions.

Electrolux had a long legacy in our home State, employing Minnesotans since 1946. In 1998, the plant produced 75 percent of all freezers sold in the United States.

In 2018, the business was St. Cloud's eighth largest employer, with nearly 900 employees. However, a year later, Electrolux consolidated their freezer production to South Carolina. Despite our efforts and the efforts of the community urging Electrolux to reconsider, approximately 760 employees faced layoffs.

To support these workers who faced separation from employment, Tammy and her employment agency, Career Solutions, went to work. After receiving an award from the State Dislocated Worker program, Career Solutions offered career counseling, on-the-job training, and interview coaching to 513 former Electrolux employees. By the end of 2020, 159 of those trainees were gainfully employed.

Thanks to the work of Tammy and the Career Solutions team, St. Cloud was able to weather the largest layoff in our history. I thank Tammy for that.

#### TERESA BOHNEN: A CAREER OF SERVICE

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the career of Teresa Bohnen. Teresa is retiring this year as president of the St. Cloud Area Chamber of Commerce.

Teresa led the chamber for the past 23 years. During that time, she has been a staunch advocate for small business.

Under Teresa's leadership, the St. Cloud Area Chamber earned a five-star accreditation from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce the first year it became eligible and has maintained that rating ever since.

I thank Teresa for her service to St. Cloud, and she should enjoy her well-earned retirement.

#### HONORING REVEREND RONALD V. MYERS, SR., M.D.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Reverend Dr. Ronald Myers, who was one of the real reasons that President

Biden was able to sign into law Juneteenth as a national holiday.

Reverend Myers was founder of numerous medical and cultural organizations and a committed physician, serving the poorest Americans through clinics in Tchula, Belzoni, Yazoo City, Indianola, Greenville, and Tupelo, Mississippi.

Doc was also a jazz musician, composer, and human rights activist. The New York Times stated: "There aren't many doctors like Ronald Myers, a jazz-playing, Baptist-preaching, family practitioner whose dream has always been to practice medicine in the kind of place most other doctors wouldn't even stop for a tank of gas."

In 1994, a group of community leaders from across the country gathered at Christian Unity Baptist Church in New Orleans, Louisiana, to work for greater national recognition of Juneteenth, a holiday celebrating the end of slavery. Dr. Myers was elected chairman of this advocacy effort, which led to the establishment of the National Juneteenth Observance Foundation and his recognition as the leader of the modern Juneteenth movement in America. Doc was instrumental in the passage of 45 of the 49 State and District of Columbia pieces of legislation naming Juneteenth as a day of observance in this country.

Working with the Congressional Black Caucus, which included Illinois Senator Barack Obama and Representative DANNY DAVIS, he sought legislation to recognize Juneteenth independence, hosting the annual Juneteenth prayer breakfasts.

□ 1015

He established the Washington Juneteenth National Holiday Observance and the National Day of Reconciliation and Healing from the Legacy of Enslavement, which includes the National Juneteenth Black Holocaust "Maafa" Memorial Service.

Dr. Myers organized the National Association of Juneteenth Jazz Presenters and the Fellowship of Creative Christian Jazz Musicians. Under his leadership, the Washington Juneteenth congressional event was held by the National Juneteenth Observance Foundation, Juneteenth America, Inc., and the National Association of Juneteenth Jazz Presenters.

An accomplished jazz pianist, trumpeter, and composer, Dr. Myers performed across the country promoting "June is Black Music Month!"—Celebrating Juneteenth Jazz—"Preserving Our African American Jazz Legacy!"

For over 20 years, he met with State politicians, local Juneteenth organizations, and community leaders.

Charles Taylor, author of Juneteenth, said: "Doc would give a copy of my Juneteenth book to every Governor who made Juneteenth a holiday or observance. He even gave Sarah Palin a copy when she was the Governor of Alaska after her State recognized Juneteenth."

At an award ceremony at the Beverly Hills Temple of the Arts at the Saban Theatre, founder Rabbi David Baron said: "Reverend Dr. Ronald V. Myers is an outstanding living model of all the values for which Martin Luther King stood."

Thanks to Steve Williams, who has carried on Dr. Myers' work; and my staffer, Dr. Caleb Gilchrist, who has worked closely with him.

Thank you, Dr. Myers, and may you rest in peace.

#### KANSAS IS THE BREADBASKET OF THE WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kansas farmers for their long hours during this year's wheat harvest and for their work to produce food for people all over the world.

With more than 15,000 wheat farms across the State and 5 million acres of wheat in the Big First District alone, Kansas leads the Nation in wheat production, is the largest exporter of hard red winter wheat, and is aptly named the breadbasket of the world.

The United States exports that wheat to more than 100 countries around the world, and some of that wheat from Kansas ends up abroad under the U.S. food assistance programs, like Food for Peace. In fact, it was the Kansas Farm Bureau who began sending surplus grain to those in need around the world, continuing U.S. leadership in addressing world hunger.

As I reflect on my own time on our family farm in Quinter, Kansas, I am reminded that harvest season is about more than just harvesting the crop. For Kansas farm families and communities, harvest is about coming together.

Harvest is when we share tractors and other equipment with our neighbor when theirs gets stuck. Harvest is when a grandmother takes food to the field so the rest of her family doesn't have to leave the field for a lunch break. It is when a father takes his child out on the combine to show him how the work is done. And it is when we reflect on our advancements in agriculture, thanks to land-grant universities, like the wheat breeding research at Kansas State University, yielding high-quality and plentiful harvests around the world.

Wheat harvest is a time for Kansas to be proud of the great strides they take to feed, fuel, and clothe the world. At the end of the season, we look back and know that each agricultural success is inexplicably tied to our Kansas values of faith, family, community, and grit. While we are at work here in Washington, they are back at home making the world go round, and for that we owe farmers our sincerest thank you.

THE RIGHT TO LIFE IS SELF-EVIDENT

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today in support of one of the most

basic functions of any government, the right to life.

Our Founding Fathers wrote 245 years ago, "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

To them, the right to life was so overly obvious that they called it self-evident.

But, today, in America, some policymakers insist on denying the right to life to millions of Americans. Instead, they diminish that right through murderous abortion policies, policies that fail to recognize life until a child lets out his or her first cry in the delivery room, policies that justify abortion based on the belief that any unborn child may have Down syndrome, and policies that funnel taxpayer dollars to funding abortions and abortion services.

Today's technology and science has shown us proof of life inside the womb. We see 3D ultrasounds of a baby sucking her thumb and moving around. We know unborn babies can experience pain as early as 12 weeks. At 20 weeks, we can reveal if a baby is a boy or a girl.

Yet some of our country's leaders still proceed to support policies that devalue and eliminate the innocent child's life. For decades, these elected officials have spent more time protecting the right of potentially endangered species, like the lesser prairie-chicken or sea turtle eggs, than they do protecting unborn babies, human babies.

But not to me. I strongly believe life begins at conception. I believe every life matters. I support adoptions, foster care, and crisis pregnancy centers that work tirelessly to care for mothers and their babies. I have cosponsored pro-life legislation, including H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, permanently prohibiting Federal funding for abortions and abortion services. I even introduced my own, H.R. 714, which would require the executive branch to notify Congress and the American public before issuing any new executive order pertaining to pro-life provisions and the right to life guaranteed by the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

Devaluing the life of unborn children has desensitized our Nation, and I pray we soon wake up and realize the horrors it has done. It is time to stop using taxpayer dollars to fund abortion services and focus on lifesaving resources that value the life of both the mother and the child. The right to life is self-evident, and I will fight to protect it at all costs.

#### REMEMBERING ROBERT KALEIMOMI KEKAULA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. KAHELE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KAHELE. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness that I stand before you to share the passing of a legendary news and sports broadcaster, an accomplished musician, a father, friend, and son of Hawaii, Robert Kaleimomi Kekaula, who unexpectedly passed away last Saturday in Hawaii at 56 years of age.

In order to tell you about Robert, I must do so with great respect to his chosen career path and success as the consummate communicator.

Where, when, and how quickly he acquired his excellent skills, whether at his high school alma mater, the Kamehameha Schools, the University of Hawaii, where he earned a bachelor's degree in communications, or throughout his experience as a Native Hawaiian growing up on Hawaii Island, I can't say.

Yet what I can say with certainty is that Robert held the powerful ability of talking to people; not about people, but to people. And he did it exceedingly well, with thousands, including myself, for 35 years in the broadcast industry.

It is quite possible that his talents were not learned skills at all, but, rather, God-given gifts that he so willingly shared with all of us. I would be hard-pressed to find a living room or dining table in Hawaii that did not at some point during that time welcome in Robert Kekaula and his daily evening news and sports reports.

The reason, Robert connected with people. For him, people came first, before the stories, before the news. He understood that the primary role of the news, of the media was to improve people's lives. It was not to be sensational. It was not to stoke conflict. It was to inform.

That sincerity, that genuine care, from a man with that unmistakable baritone voice and dominant presence, made people comfortable to watch him; moreover, comfortable to share the details of their lives with him, and the audience who leaned in to listen and learn.

Described as a perfectionist, he held himself and others to three requirements in the newsroom. What went out of his newsroom and into the living rooms had to be correct, pertinent, and helpful to Hawaii.

He had a photographic memory for detail. He was a wordsmith. He had the ear of key figures in Hawaii sports. He was proud of the local kids who made it. He was all about Hawaii.

His reach into our homes did not stop with him, however, because Robert made it a point to share his knowledge. As a mentor, he could see in young journalists what others could not see.

He opened his door to those who otherwise had doors closed in their faces. And just as folks welcomed him into their homes, Robert would welcome aspiring broadcasters into his home of sports and news.

Many young men and women he mentored went on to become sports anchors, as well as news reporters, and

every single one of them was better for having Robert in their lives.

His bright Aloha shirts became his mainstay. He became synonymous with them. He was rarely seen without one. And on the national circuit, the Daily Show with Trevor Noah shared a shot of Robert in his Aloha shirt, and Noah commented: "Even their newscasts are so chill."

The brightness of Robert's shirts only mirrored the brightness of his smile and the endless radiance of his Aloha spirit.

Within this skilled communicator and mentor lived a Native Hawaiian who inspired others, including myself. To see Robert on the news and the small screen gave way to other Native Hawaiians to believe they could have a career on TV, too.

In public, he was just as approachable, and friends tell me he often covered the tab for those he didn't know.

His legacy lives on through the people fortunate enough to learn from him and work with him and in the music he composed, produced, and performed alongside his daughter, Tiera, and through his family and friends whom he loved dearly.

"A'ohe mea nana e ho'opuhili, he moho no ka la makani," "there is no one to interfere, for he is a messenger of a windy day," said in admiration of a person who lets nothing stop him from carrying out the task entrusted to him.

To me and to so many others, that is the essence of Robert, who carried out the task as the consummate communicator with extreme love for Hawaii and its people.

Mahalo, Robert Kaleimomi Kekaula, for your immeasurable contributions to Hawaii. We are forever grateful, and you will be forever missed.

#### DR. DREW VAN HORN IS A TREMENDOUS ASSET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the president of Young Harris College, Dr. Drew Van Horn.

In 2017, Dr. Van Horn was selected as the 23rd president of Young Harris College and has been a tremendous addition to the school with his wealth of knowledge and expertise.

Dr. Van Horn has brought more than 30 years of experience in higher education to Young Harris College, including nine years as president of Brevard College in North Carolina.

As a graduate of Young Harris College, and a friend of Dr. Van Horn, I appreciate his dedication and his work on behalf of Young Harris College. I know the entire Mountain Lion community joins me in thanking Dr. Van Horn for his service to our beloved college.

Dr. Van Horn, we love you and appreciate you.

CONGRATULATING FORT STEWART

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Fort Stew-

art as the winner of the Army Environmental Award for Natural Resources Conservation for a large installation.

Located southwest of Savannah, Georgia, Fort Stewart is the largest Army post east of the Mississippi River. Fort Stewart is home to the 3rd Infantry Division and seven species protected by the Endangered Species Act on 284,000 acres of pine forest, wetlands, and blackwater rivers.

The Fort's land is managed by a team tasked with balancing military readiness and environmental stewardship. This dedicated team ensures that conditions are set for soldiers to train and prepare for deployment, while also managing environmental assets that include wildlife management and cultural resource management.

The Army Environmental Award for Natural Resources Conservation reflects the hard work of Fort Stewart's leadership, staff, and personnel in defending not only the people of the United States, but its environment as well.

I am proud to rise today to recognize this tremendous achievement and commend the hard work of Fort Stewart soldiers.

#### FREDDIE'S GARAGE AND TOWING CELEBRATES 75 YEARS IN BUSINESS

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 75th anniversary of Freddie's Garage and Towing in Tybee Island, Georgia.

In August of 1946, Freddie's opened on Tybee Island, Georgia. Although Freddie's transitioned from a gas station to a garage over the years, Freddie's continues to operate in their original location.

Residents of the Tybee Island community have trusted Freddie's through multiple generations. For 75 years, customers are relieved to know that Freddie's dependable service will always be there to keep their car running.

Freddie's Garage and Towing is a perfect example of a hardworking American business. As a small business owner for more than 30 years, I commend the hard work and dedication that Freddie's Garage and Towing has shown to their customers.

The team at Freddie's Garage and Towing works hard to maintain the trust of the Tybee Island community, and I congratulate them for 75 years of success.

#### CHECK YOUR ELIGIBILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues who worked diligently to pass the advanced child tax credit, which will cut child poverty in half in just one year. We have a responsibility to make this money accessible to every child.

While our elder daughter, Emmy, is accounted for, our pandemic baby,

Caroline, is not. In my district, the IRS estimates that more than 6,000 children are unaccounted for.

My team has worked tirelessly to get relief to our constituents. I encourage our constituents to visit the IRS website to check their eligibility. There is even a tool for nonfilers.

The IRS is underfunded, and we need to fix that, but they have done a phenomenal job getting this set up.

While our caseworkers are always happy to help, our constituents shouldn't leave money on the table. So, check your eligibility and find out what makes sense for your family.

□ 1030

#### AMERICA NEEDS TO DO THE RIGHT THING

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, our Afghan allies and friends risked their lives, not just for their country, but for ours. They put their lives on the line, not just for Afghanistan, but for America. And they are not just Afghan heroes, but American heroes, too.

They risked their lives because we made a solemn promise to them: We have your backs. Because we said that we have their backs, they now have a target on theirs.

Today, the Biden administration has heard the call of veterans across America who have said: Save our allies. Do the right thing by the promise that we made.

They have heeded our calls to pursue an evacuation because there simply is not enough time for special immigrant visas to be processed. It is 80 days until our withdrawal. The average time to process an SIV is 800 days.

Today is, therefore, a bright chapter in the long story of the advocacy of veterans all over this country, Democrat and Republican, who have called on the administration to execute a plan for evacuation.

But the story is far from over. We need to see a detailed operational plan, including a way to collect our allies from across this war-torn country, a way to ensure that their family members are saved as well, and a clear plan to get them COVID vaccines so they can travel safely to other countries, or to Guam, and not carry a risk of carrying the disease.

We also need to see an operational commander named to lead this effort, and we need a guarantee that this evacuation mission will continue until it is complete.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Milley, said yesterday that we have a moral obligation to fulfill this promise. I would add that that moral obligation is not just to our Afghan friends and allies. It is to every future young American on the ground in some conflict overseas who needs a friend, who needs an interpreter, who needs an ally and makes that promise once again: Come work with us. Come risk your life for us because we have your back.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF CHRIS OBERHEIM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and work of Champaign Police Officer Chris Oberheim.

Our communities in Illinois and across the Nation continue to mourn the loss of this fallen hero.

Officer Oberheim was called home to be with the Lord on May 19, 2021. Officer Oberheim was on duty when he was shot and killed while attempting to protect a mother and her children.

Officer Oberheim put his life on the line and made the ultimate sacrifice. As Champaign Police Chief Anthony Cobb stated, the debt of gratitude we owe Officer Oberheim and his family goes beyond written and spoken word.

Throughout his career, Officer Oberheim put the people of his community first, and he was a true credit to the badge he wore, receiving two medals of valor for courageous acts of selfless bravery, as well as countless letters of accommodation.

Officer Oberheim's life and service will not and should not be forgotten. My prayers are with his wife, Amber, as well as his four daughters, Hannah, Avery, Addison, and Aubrey.

I had the great honor of speaking with Amber Oberheim, a devoted wife and a strong woman of faith. She told me that her husband had a servant's heart. His life revolved around his family and protecting others.

Chris was a son, brother, coach, friend, and leader, but his family was his first priority.

To honor her husband, Amber Oberheim wants to create change. She started a foundation, Peacemaker Project 703, to support brothers and sisters in blue. Amber's goal is to promote the support of our law enforcement officers and their families and to shine a light on their service and sacrifice.

These are dangerous times. Please love and appreciate our officers. May God bless the Oberheim family.

#### ANTI-SEMITISM IS UNACCEPTABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HOULAHAN). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the very concerning uptick in hate crimes against members of the Jewish community in recent weeks. To be clear, these incidents have not been isolated, and their sheer volume should frighten us all.

We must do more to acknowledge these crimes against our Jewish brothers and sisters and ensure the perpetrators of these crimes are held accountable.

Perhaps the most telling sign of how dangerous things have gotten is the

statistical data. Those who clearly identify as Jews, with their garb and outward trappings, have been viciously and frequently targeted.

According to the ADL, there has been an 80 percent increase in anti-Semitic incidents in the United States. Some include Nazi propaganda in public parks and synagogues as well as suspensions in schools related to anti-Semitic attacks.

In Lincoln, Nebraska, the South Street Temple was spray-painted with swastikas and racial epithets. In Omaha, about 75 headstones were toppled and more than \$50,000 in damage caused at the Temple Israel Cemetery.

I have repeatedly condemned this behavior and stand with Nebraska's Jewish community and all of those across the U.S. who have experienced similar situations.

Recently, I had the pleasure of meeting one of the most prominent leaders of the orthodox Jewish community, Rabbi Dovid Hofstedter, the son of Holocaust survivors who founded the Dirshu, the largest Torah organization in the world.

Rabbi Hofstedter was compelled to come to Washington to address my colleagues and me about the very serious issues related to the safety and security of the State of Israel, including the hatred toward Israel that has manifested itself in many cases toward the entire Jewish people.

I committed to Rabbi Hofstedter that we, in Congress, will do everything in our power to continue standing up for the Jewish people and ensuring their safety, from New York to Nebraska and all across the United States.

During his address to my colleagues and I, Rabbi Hofstedter remarked that perhaps at no time since the 1930s have we found ourselves in a more similar situation. Jewish lives are being threatened both domestically and on a global scale. However, after watching the hate crimes against our Jewish brothers and sisters over the last few weeks, it is abundantly clear that the rabbi's words were sadly and tragically understated.

It is time for all of us in Congress to wake up to the reality of the hatred that is being directed toward the Jewish people and ensure that "never again" truly means "never again."

Cowardice emboldens the enemy. What Rabbi Hofstedter and Dirshu represent is the true antidote to this venomous hatred that has been exhibited toward the community he leads.

We must not buckle under fear but, rather, call out the haters and show that the Jewish people as a community will never stand down. They will continue to practice their Jewish heritage with their heads held high.

Out of the darkness of the Holocaust, Rabbi Hofstedter decided to dedicate his life to reviving the levels of Jewish scholarship and education to the levels that were predating the Holocaust. As the son of Holocaust survivors, Rabbi Hofstedter's personal life's mission

that he has chosen to undertake and execute upon ought to serve as a source of inspiration for every Member of this legislative body. Just as Martin Luther King once said: "Darkness cannot drive out darkness; only light can do that. Hate cannot drive out hate; only love can do that."

I thank Rabbi Hofstedter for all that he and the members of the Dirshu continue to do to advance Jewish scholarship and education in the face of the evil that has been perpetrated on their community in recent weeks. May God bless them all. May God bless the United States of America.

#### RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF SERVICE OF W.L. PATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the exemplary life of one Mr. W.L. Pate from Beaumont, Texas.

Words cannot adequately express how deeply saddened Brenda and I were to hear of W.L. Pate's passing just the other day. As I think back, Madam Speaker, we are hard-pressed to remember anyone who gave more to their community than W.L. did to his—or ours, for that matter.

The list of W.L.'s considerable accomplishments and contributions are far too numerous to be listed here, but here are just a few.

W.L. was a two-term mayor of Beaumont. He was an Army veteran and had 14 years of service as a city councilman. W.L. was the past president of the Texas Association of Mayors, Council Members and Commissioners. W.L. was on the board of the Texas Municipal League and served as TML president for Region 16.

Never missing a chance to give back, W.L. assisted the District 14 office every single year with military service academy nominations, and he was good at it and proud to be able to do it.

I am particularly proud of W.L.'s passion project in recent years. W.L. was the driving force behind obtaining the Presidential Medal of Freedom that was posthumously awarded to Babe Didrikson Zaharias, a fantastic female athlete, given by President Donald Trump.

I recognize and thank W.L. Pate for his servant leadership. Our deepest sympathy goes out to his family and friends, especially his daughters, Jennifer and Suzanne.

This is a tremendous loss for Beaumont and the Nation. W.L.'s remarkable legacy of service and sacrifice is the epitome of what it means to be a great American. Our country would be well-served to have many more with such a servant's heart.

Rest in peace, my friend. W.L. Pate, you done good.

#### REMEMBERING THE INCREDIBLE LIFE OF LOUISE DUNLAP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember the incredible life of Louise Dunlap.

A native of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, Louise was a dedicated advocate for coal communities, our environment, and especially the reclamation of our historic abandoned mine lands.

Louise's career began with the grassroots, advocating for more support for the environment and Pennsylvania's mine lands. In 1972, Louise cofounded the Environmental Policy Institute and the Environmental Policy Center. There, she spent years working to pass legislation to support mine reclamation in Pennsylvania and was an important advocate for the passage of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977.

This law created the first Federal standards on the reclamation of new and subsequent surface mining. Importantly, it also established the Abandoned Mine Land Trust, which was created to provide consistent funding for the reclamation of coal mines that were abandoned prior to the law's enactment in 1977.

For over 40 years, this trust has been the central funding source for the reclamation of abandoned mine lands in 20 States, generating over \$11.6 billion since its creation by Congress.

Beginning in 2004, she joined the Foundation for Pennsylvania Watersheds, where she continued her life's work. In 2006, she again played a key advocacy role when Congress authorized the AML for an additional 15 years.

This September, the Abandoned Mine Land Fund is set to expire. The trust must be reauthorized in order to continue opportunities in funding to clean up these un-reclaimed lands, not only in Pennsylvania but around the country. Congress has the opportunity to do right by our coal communities by reauthorizing this fund and also expediting the release of the existing balance.

Reauthorizing the AML was a project close to Louise's heart. She fought for coal communities up until her final days. She spent the last few weeks continuing to secure support for the reauthorization of the Abandoned Mine Land Fund.

□ 1045

In Pennsylvania, there are over 5,500 miles of streams polluted due to legacy mining, and over 280,000 acres remain toxic. Nationwide, the unfunded liabilities exceed \$12 billion, with \$5 billion in Pennsylvania alone. Louise made it her mission to work toward restoring these areas.

My district alone has the most abandoned mine land in the country. I understand the urgency in reauthorizing

the AML fund, which is why I am an original cosponsor of the RECLAIM Act and the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act Amendments of 2021 with fellow Pennsylvanian, Representative MATT CARTWRIGHT. We both worked closely with Louise on this act.

Louise Dunlap was an inspiring force as she spent her life advocating to reclaim and revitalize former mining communities. She was a friend and marshaled key legislation victories over the span of a 50-year career.

In honor of her legacy, it is important that we continue her life's work and continue to support our historic coal communities.

My heartfelt condolences to the family and friends of Louise Dunlap. She was so fiercely passionate, and she will be greatly missed.

#### HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL WILBUR L. "W.L." PATE, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor my dear friend of more than 65 years, Lieutenant Colonel Wilbur L. "W.L." Pate, Jr.

W.L. and I grew up together in Beaumont, Texas, where he was better known by his nickname, "Bubba." We became close friends playing football together at Austin Junior High School, and eventually, my family moved across town, which, unfortunately, sent us to different high schools. I still remember the football game in 1965 when French High School—led by W.L. Pate at quarterback—dealt me and my team, Forest Park High School Trojans, a close loss.

The final score of 8-7 stung, but I couldn't help but be proud of the skill and sportsmanship demonstrated by W.L. and his French High Buffalos.

A year later, W.L. and I both ended up at Lamar University in Beaumont and served in the same unit in the Army Reserves, as well. In 1969, he was commissioned as an infantry officer, and in 1978, he graduated from Command and General Staff College.

After leaving the military as a lieutenant colonel in 1994, he dove into another form of public service—serving his community on Beaumont's City Council as mayor pro tempore, and on several boards, including the Beaumont Rotary Club, Better Business Bureau, the American Legion, Lamar Institute of Technology, and many more.

One of Bubba's most significant accomplishments was his advocacy for the late Babe Didrikson Zaharias to be awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom. Babe was from our hometown of Beaumont, Texas, and was a gold medal Olympian, and later, professional golfer, winning ten LPGA major tournaments. She is considered by many to be one of the world's greatest female athletes.

I was honored to attend the White House ceremony with W.L. when he

proudly accepted this award from President Trump on behalf of the Babe Zaharias Foundation in Beaumont, Texas. W.L. Pate was the very man who inspired me to run for Congress back when he nearly threw longtime incumbent Representative Jack Brooks into a runoff. Bubba certainly got Brooks' attention.

W.L. was a dear friend and a respected leader. My heart goes out to his loved ones, his daughters, Suzanne and Jennifer; fiancée, Sherrene; brother, Robert; sister, Pam; and many nieces, nephews, and cousins. My prayers are with all of them.

#### RPM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POSEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to direct the House's attention to H. Res. 3281, the RPM Act.

The RPM Act is necessary because of a gross abuse of the Administrative Procedures Act by unelected, unaccountable, unrecalable bureaucrats.

Madam Speaker, most people aren't aware that the chances are better than a thousand to one if you are ever hauled into Federal court under charges, it is more than likely you will be subject to a violation of rules, administrative rules, that are enforceable as laws.

Most Members of Congress seem oftentimes to forget that, and we have allowed the rule-makers, the unelected, unaccountable people, to make an incredible amount of laws that become a heavy burden on our society.

So we are hoping, with the RPM Act, H. Res. 3281, we can right some of those wrongs.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 51 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BUSTOS) at noon.

#### PRAYER

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

Sovereign God, speak to us this day. Speak to us in words that we can hear and understand. Give us humbleness of spirit that we would be receptive to the promises You provide.

Open our ears to Your word, even as You speak through the voices of those

around us, both in the compassion of our friends and in the criticism of our counterparts.

May we not just take the time to heed guidance that comes from the counsel of our colleagues, but to listen to concerns You would have us hear, even when it comes from the mouths of our adversaries.

Then, having listened for Your truth and discerned Your voice amid the commotion and the calm, may we not just hear, but listen carefully to the perfect law of liberty You have established. Inspire us to obey Your guidance and put Your wisdom into practice.

We ask Your blessing on the work You have called us to do this day. In the strength 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 gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina 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 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### THREE MILLION FREE MEALS

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

Mr. SIREs. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend the West New York School Nutrition Service Department and Nu-Way Concessionaires for serving the West New York, New Jersey, community throughout the pandemic.

Nu-Way Concessionaires was founded in 1958 by a longtime West New York resident, Joseph Pantaleo, who sadly passed away in December at the age of 90. Joe understood the importance of giving back to his community and fully embodied the spirit of service.

It is in this light that I wish to recognize the West New York School Nutrition Service Department, managed by Nu-Way, which has provided over three million free meals to the West New York community since the beginning of the pandemic and will continue providing meals throughout this summer.

Free breakfast and free lunch have been provided every day, including

weekends, and have provided a lifeline during a turbulent and uncertain year.

I would also like to commend Sal Valenza and Jose Sabater and their 21 employees who have worked tirelessly every day for their community to ensure students have access to healthy and locally sourced meals.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO EDWARD BURR AND THE MONIQUE BURR FOUNDATION FOR CHILDREN

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

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Edward Burr and the Monique Burr Foundation for Children located in northeast Florida.

Established in 1997, the Monique Burr Foundation works to prevent abuse, bullying, cyberbullying, exploitation, and human trafficking of children.

They have trained more than 5,000 facilitators in schools all across 67 Florida counties, 28 other States, and 3 foreign countries.

Madam Speaker, as the former sheriff of Duval County, I can personally attest to the difference the Monique Burr Foundation is making in the lives of children across Florida and across our country.

Recently, Mr. Burr received the Hearthstone BUILDER Humanitarian Award in recognition of his decades of public service to support and protect children in need.

On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Florida, I congratulate Edward Burr for his well-deserved honor, and I thank the Monique Burr Foundation for Children for their excellent work in our community.

#### BIPARTISAN AMERICAN GOALS

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I rise to lament the failure of the For the People Act, H.R. 1, in the United States Senate. It is a sad week that this has happened.

H.R. 1, the For the People Act, ought to be a bipartisan American goal. It ought to be a bipartisan American goal that we get big secret money out of politics. It ought to be a bipartisan American goal that we protect people's right to vote throughout this land. It ought to be a bipartisan American goal that we end gerrymandering and let the people choose the politicians instead of the politicians choosing their voters.

I am here to say that we are not done with the For the People Act and its goals. Let's make it bipartisan and let's make it an American goal.

#### CHINA LIED, AMERICANS DIED

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



Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, after a year of belittling Wuhan virus reports, incredibly, The New York Times published a front-page admission last Tuesday acknowledging that the Wuhan virus could be a lab leak.

With the headline "Lab-Leak Theory Flourishes," it cited: "... whether the world will ever learn if the virus ... escaped from a Chinese lab. ... The idea that the virus may have escaped from a lab had long been ... dismissed ... and shunned ... for its connection with former President Donald J. Trump."

The article accurately reviews the refusal of China to allow an independent investigation, ultimate control by the Chinese Communist Party, 2017 creation of hybrid bat coronaviruses at the Wuhan lab, the bizarre U.S. taxpayer lab funding by the National Institutes of Health through EcoHealth Alliance, Wuhan researchers in November 2019 being hospitalized, 2012 bat viruses withheld, and an attack in July by Dr. Shi Zhengli on President Trump and others demanding that they should "shut their stinky mouths."

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. Our sympathy to the family of Milton Moore and his wife, Jean, who are beloved civic leaders of South Carolina.

#### ZIP CODE 61605 DESERVES BETTER

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the Social Determinants Accelerator Act.

The community that lives in the 61605 ZIP Code in Peoria, Illinois, is vibrant and beautiful, but they face significant challenges. It is one of the most distressed ZIP Codes in the entire Nation, a food desert. And soon its only pharmacy will shut their doors, leaving them with fewer options for basic healthcare.

Each of these factors can have a big impact on the health of every person in the community. All 14 of the counties in the district that I serve face healthcare provider shortages. Half of those counties face provider shortages for mental, physical, and dental healthcare.

That is why I introduced the Social Determinants Accelerator Act, to empower our local communities to address the day-to-day factors that affect their lives. Today, the Energy and Commerce Committee heard my bill. I thank Chairman PALLONE for his leadership on this issue. I urge my colleagues to support it because communities like 61605 in Peoria, Illinois, deserve better.

#### A UNIQUE RECIPE FOR DISASTER

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

Mr. NEHLS. Madam Speaker, after months of record taxpayer spending, the Biden administration has underperformed job growth expectations in back-to-back months. Inflation is higher than any point in more than a decade, and people across our country are still being paid to sit home and not work.

When you pay people not to work and pump untold amounts of money into liberal special interests, you get a unique recipe for disaster.

The Biden economic model is failing, and now the administration is fighting crises on two fronts, border and economic. The American people and small businesses across our country need real leadership that puts the American people first.

We will not spend our way out of this Biden-made economic crisis. We will get out of it if we reduce regulations, lower taxes, and increase economic freedom. This model did work under President Trump, and it will work again if only the Biden administration and Democrats would put the American people first and not special interests.

#### CONGRATULATING MIA NEAL

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

Mr. MRVAN. Madam Speaker, it is with great admiration that I rise today to congratulate Mia Neal of Gary, Indiana, and celebrate her noteworthy achievement of winning an Oscar in the 93rd Academy Awards for best makeup and hairstyling.

Mia Neal attended Horace Mann High School in Gary, Indiana, and after graduating in 1997, Mia's interest in hairstyling and makeup blossomed as she attended Merrillville Beauty College and Columbia College in Chicago.

I would note that Mia's family has been actively involved in northwest Indiana's community, as her mother, Dena Holland Neal, was pastor of Peace United Church in Merrillville; and her grandfather, James Holland, taught at Roosevelt High School for more than 15 years and served as Gary's first deputy mayor from 1976 to 1988.

Madam Speaker, I ask you and my distinguished colleagues to join me in recognizing Mia Neal on her historic Oscar award and again congratulate her for this outstanding accomplishment.

#### HONORING THE SACRIFICE OF NEAL TODD

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

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of a true American hero. Neal Kenneth Todd of Akeley, Minnesota, enlisted as a Fireman First Class in the U.S. Navy and was stationed on the USS *Oklahoma* in Pearl Harbor.

He tragically lost his life on Sunday, December 7, 1941, when Japanese torpedoes caused the ship to capsize.

Initially, Neal Todd was reported missing in action, and his family went almost 3 months without answers before learning of his death. To make matters worse, his body was never identified, leaving his family without the closure that they deserved.

After nearly 80 years of unimaginable grief and unanswered questions, Neal's remains have finally been identified, beginning the process of returning him home to Minnesota.

On July 10, Neal Todd will be buried with full military honors next to his brother and parents. It will be my distinct privilege to join his family in Akeley when he returns home.

Witnessing this American hero laid to rest after decades will be an honor, but it will also be a somber reminder that freedom comes at such a heavy price.

Madam Speaker, we can never forget the sacrifices made by heroes like Neal Todd. Americans like him are the reason that this Nation is known as the land of the free and the home of the brave.

God bless Neal Todd and God bless his family.

#### LIFTING FAMILIES OUT OF POVERTY

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

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share in the relief that families across New Mexico will be receiving starting next month.

Thanks to the American Rescue Plan, about 95 percent of New Mexico's children will be eligible to get money through the child tax credit. Working families with kids will get payments of up to \$300 monthly per child. That means more money for childcare and to put food on the table and to support our hardworking families.

I personally know the struggles that many New Mexican families face, and that is why here in Congress I am continuing to work to tackle childhood hunger and create more opportunities to lift our families out of poverty. We must make these tax credits permanent and put more money into the pockets of hardworking parents so they can get back to work and fuel our economy.

□ 1215

#### KEEP OUR POLLINATORS BUZZING

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today during National Pollinators Week to recognize the important work of our natural pollinators.



Each year, Pollinator Week focuses on promoting the health of pollinators, critical to food and ecosystems, through conservation, education, and research.

It is time we protect natural pollinator species, such as honeybees, native bees, birds, bats, and butterflies, as essential partners of farmers and ranchers in producing food.

These pollinators are vital to keeping items like fruits, nuts, and vegetables in our diets. And healthy pollinator populations are crucial to the continued economic well-being of rural America and the U.S. economy.

Pollinators provide pollination services to over 180,000 different plant species and more than 1,200 crops. This equates to one out of every three bites of food eaten being there because of pollinators.

In addition, pollinators added \$217 billion to the global economy, and honeybees alone are responsible for between \$1.2 and \$5.4 billion in agricultural productivity in the United States.

Madam Speaker, as someone who has a beehive in his backyard, I fully support efforts to raise awareness and keep our pollinators buzzing for generations to come.

#### CONGRESS MUST PROTECT THE UNBORN

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

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to voice my deep disappointment with President Biden's fiscal year 2022 budget request—more specifically, the President's removal of long-standing pro-life protections such as the Hyde amendment.

The Hyde amendment prohibits Federal funds from being used to pay for abortions. Historically, this policy has shared strong bipartisan consensus in the House.

I made a promise to my constituents to protect the unborn and to give a voice to those who have no voice. Since coming here to Congress, I have consistently supported pro-life policies. This is a value in the First District of Michigan that is shared across party lines.

Yet, this President's budget request forces American taxpayers to fund abortions, a denial of the basic human right to life.

I strongly urge my colleagues in the House to not follow in those footsteps and to oppose this proposal.

As we work through the Federal appropriations process, it is imperative Congress maintains these basic protections and opposes any other policies that would promote abortions here in the United States and throughout the world.

Let us, the United States of America, be an example to the rest of the world that, no matter how much we may dis-

agree, we can come together for the protection of human life both before and after birth.

#### COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF CAROL CLEWS

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

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Carol Clews, a pro-life leader in Maryland who passed away from cancer this spring. Archbishop Lori, without exaggeration, called her a "towering figure" in the pro-life movement.

Carol's vocation was to help women in their crisis pregnancies by directing the faith-based Greater Baltimore Center for Pregnancy Concerns, where pregnant women could go for support until and after their children were born. Her pregnancy center, staffed mostly by volunteers, helped thousands of women and their children in a time of need.

When the City of Baltimore decreed that her pregnancy center had to display a poster that promoted abortion, she refused to do so and took the case to Federal district court, where she prevailed. On appeal, the Fourth Circuit upheld the important religious protections and free speech rights of pregnancy centers from attacks by pro-abortion governments that want to deny the choice of life for women during one of the most vulnerable times of their lives.

The pro-life and pregnancy center movements in Maryland will greatly miss Carol Clews and her faith and courage. The thousands of women and their children who were helped by her pregnancy centers are her legacy.

#### SEEKING URGENT RESPONSE TO CALIFORNIA'S DROUGHT

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

Mr. VALADAO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to request an urgent response to California's drought.

Since returning to Congress, I have introduced two pieces of critical water legislation. I have stood here before my colleagues asking the House majority to address the drought. I have requested hearings be held and sent letters. Yet, the majority has done nothing to help those suffering from this crisis.

Communities in my district, like Avenal, Coalinga, and Huron, totally rely on 100 percent of their water from the delta. That is about 37,000 of my constituents relying solely on the delta for water.

My bill, the NEED Water Act, would allow communities like these and communities growing our food the ability to purchase and transfer water more easily.

As if water wasn't scarce enough, now communities in my district, like Teviston, are completely out of water. They are forced to rely on bottled water delivery programs to receive water because their wells have failed. It is only a matter of time before there are more towns in my district in the same situation as Teviston.

I implore my colleagues across the aisle to work with me to combat this crisis. This is an emergency, and it is unacceptable to stand back and watch these communities suffer and completely run out of water while the real solutions available can bring immediate relief.

#### CONGRESS MUST INVESTIGATE COVID-19

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, we know that more than 600,000 Americans and 3.8 million people worldwide have died as a result of COVID-19. A recent study found that cases could have been significantly reduced around the globe if interventions in China could have been conducted just weeks earlier.

It is a widely accepted fact that China's obstruction and coverup cost lives. It is simple: China lied and Americans died.

Also, despite mounting credible evidence that COVID-19 may have actually originated from a Chinese lab, Congress has not held a single hearing on the origins of COVID-19.

I am proud to be one of 200 Republican Members calling for these necessary investigations. Americans have a right to know the truth, and we must hold China accountable for their COVID coverup.

#### RECOGNIZING TRAVIS BURROW

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

Mr. ROSENDALE. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Detective Travis Burrow for his remarkable contributions to his community as general case detective for the Great Falls Police Department.

This past week, Detective Burrow was named Officer of the Year by the Montana Police Protective Association for his service as lead investigator for major criminal activity in Great Falls. His investigations included high-profile cases such as homicides, kidnappings, robberies, arson, missing persons, and suspicious death investigations.

Detective Burrow's competence and experience has made him a valuable resource to the department, where he consults on his coworkers' cases and serves as a leader and mentor to his colleagues.

Detective Burrow continues to serve the Great Falls Police Department with honor and distinction.

I commend Detective Burrow for his outstanding service to Great Falls and the State of Montana and wish him and the department continued success.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PIN-GREE) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 24, 2021.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 24, 2021, at 9:47 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2184.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON,  
Clerk.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable KEVIN MCCARTHY, Republican Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 23, 2021.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 104(c)(2)(C)-(D) of Title I, Division T of the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2021 (Public Law 116-260), I am pleased to appoint the following Members to the Smithsonian American Women's History Museum Council:

Mrs. Jackie Walorski of Elkhart, Indiana

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

KEVIN MCCARTHY,  
Republican Leader.

#### EQUAL ACCESS TO CONTRACEPTION FOR VETERANS ACT

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 486, I call up the bill (H.R. 239) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for limitations on copayments for contraception furnished by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 486, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 239

*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 "Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act".

##### SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON COPAYMENTS FOR CONTRACEPTION.

Section 1722A(a)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "to pay" and all that follows through the period and inserting "to pay—"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

"(A) an amount in excess of the cost to the Secretary for medication described in paragraph (1); or

"(B) an amount for any contraceptive item for which coverage under health insurance coverage is required without the imposition of any cost-sharing requirement pursuant to section 2713(a)(4) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg-13(a)(4))."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs or their respective designees.

The gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 239.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, this is not the first time I speak in favor of Representative BROWNLEY's bill, H.R. 239, the Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act, but I continue to advocate for this bill because it is an essential component of supporting the fastest-growing population of our Nation's heroes, our 2 million women veterans.

Last week, this bill was defeated on the suspension calendar when the Family Research Council mobilized efforts with my colleagues in the Freedom Caucus who suggested that the bill pushes a "harmful ideology." Distorting this debate into one about abortion, frankly, does not make any sense at all.

I again remind my colleagues that this legislation passed out of our committee with the support of Ranking Member BOST and through the House last Congress with the support of former Ranking Member Dr. Roe. I know that Dr. Roe is a fierce pro-life advocate, but as an OB/GYN, he understood the importance of access to contraception.

Let me be clear. This bill brings veterans' contraception coverage on par with care they received while on Active Duty from the Department of Defense and coverage required by private health insurance providers to all women in the United States since 2010—all women except those who seek care from the VA.

Now, this bill is about healthcare. This bill is about access. This bill is about equity, especially for our women veterans.

I thank Ranking Member BOST and Minority Leader MCCARTHY for their leadership in support of this bipartisan bill.

Simply put, a "no" vote today is saying directly to veterans that they deserve less healthcare than all other Americans. To me, the choice is easy. Vote "yes" on H.R. 239. We cannot permit veterans to be made second-class citizens.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 239, the Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act. This bill is sponsored by Congresswoman JULIA BROWNLEY. I thank her for introducing it.

The Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act passed the House last year with the support of the Trump administration.

It would eliminate copays for birth control at the VA healthcare system. In doing so, it would remove a barrier to care for women veterans. It would bring VA in line with the Department of Defense and the private sector. It would correct a fundamental unfairness that means women pay more for birth control at the VA than elsewhere. And it would not in any way contradict or undermine the prohibition against abortion and abortion counseling at the VA that already exists in law and regulation.

Women are the fastest-growing group of servicemembers and veterans. They are raising their right hands to serve this country in record numbers. Ensuring they are cared for as veterans is one of my top priorities as the lead Republican on the VA Committee.

We have made progress in making the VA safer and more welcome to women, but we still have a long way to go. Women veterans die by suicide at two times the rate as nonveteran women. Most of the veterans who die by suicide are not engaged in VA care at the time of their death. That is why connecting more veterans with the VA is key to stopping veteran suicide.

□ 1230

One of the primary ways we can connect more veterans with VA is by removing barriers that prevent them from seeking the care and benefits they have earned. This bill will help to do that.

Women seeking birth control in the private sector do not pay copays.

Women seeking birth control on Active Duty do not pay copays.

This bill will make it so women seeking birth control at VA do not pay copays either. That is all this bill does. Once again, that is all this bill does.

Why would we want a woman to pay more for birth control as a veteran than she did while on Active Duty?

Why would we want a woman to pay more for birth control at the VA than she would in the private sector?

Is that any way to thank her for serving her country and defending our freedoms? I don't think so.

Neither does Leader MCCARTHY, neither did the Trump administration. Neither do many of my conservative pro-life lawmakers both in this Congress and last Congress.

To be clear, this bill does not require allowing VA to provide any additional form of birth control other than those already available at the VA.

And once again, it does not in any way contradict or undermine the prohibition against VA providing abortions and/or abortion counseling to veterans. That is vitally important to me. I know it is for many of my colleagues, as well.

I have really weighed this out and prayed this out and sought the language and read the language. My life has been a pro-life life. I am not changing those positions, and this bill doesn't change that position either. I have taken the counsel of doctors who are familiar with the mechanics of birth control that are being afforded here. They are not abortion.

I am confident that supporting this bill is the right thing to do for our Nation's veterans. I am confident that it is consistent with pro-life principles.

Madam Speaker, I hope all of my colleagues join me in voting this afternoon, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY), my good friend from my home State, and the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Health, and also the author of this very important piece of legislation.

Ms. BROWNLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 239, the Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act.

Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman and Ranking Member BOST for their support. This bill is a simple one. It only addresses the disparity between veterans who must pay for contraception, and civilians and women currently serving in uniform, who do not have to pay for contraception.

As the chairwoman of the Women's Veterans Task Force and chair of the House Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Health, I have worked to identify disparities in healthcare for our women veterans, and where necessary, introduce, advocate for, and pass legislation that eliminates those gaps.

Madam Speaker, I was proud to work with my Republican colleagues to pass the bipartisan Deborah Sampson Act last Congress. This legislation, which was the most comprehensive bill to address the needs of women veterans in more than a decade, received overwhelming bipartisan support. But there are still far too many areas where women veterans have to pay more for their healthcare than men; and in this case, they have to pay more than non-veteran women.

These inequities create an environment that perpetuates the notion that

women are not equal to men, and in this case, veteran women are not even equal to other women. This bill passed through the House last Congress by voice vote. It also passed out of the VA Committee this Congress with strong bipartisan support.

It was deeply troubling that misinformation and politics got in the way of helping our women veterans last week, when the bill failed to pass under suspension, which is why we are back here again this week.

Let us be clear, this was a direct slap in the face to nearly 2 million women veterans living in the United States. Because of the Affordable Care Act, women using civilian health insurance may access basic contraceptive services, like the pill, or an IUD without any copay. Additionally, Active Duty servicemembers receive contraceptive care without any copays. So current law is specifically penalizing our women veterans. As we know, choosing when, or if, to have a family is essential to women's health and to their economic security.

Madam Speaker, 87 percent of Americans agree that everyone deserves access to the full range of birth control methods, no matter who they are, where they live, what their economic status is. The vast majority of the American people believe veteran women deserve to be recognized and deserve to be treated with the respect they have earned. The vast majority of the American people also believe that birth control should be a basic part of women's healthcare.

I am particularly disappointed that this bipartisan commitment to supporting our women veterans seems to have hit a roadblock this Congress. Our veterans, both men and women, have sacrificed so much for our country. It is past time that we ensure they get the equitable healthcare they have earned and deserve.

Let us do the right thing today on behalf of our women veterans, for their equality, for their liberty, for their healthcare, and for their economic security.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 239.

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE).

Mr. ROSENDALE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, my constituents sent me here to Washington to fight tooth and nail on behalf of the unborn.

I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 239, the Equal Access to Contraception Act for Veterans. This radical piece of legislation would require taxpayers to subsidize the full cost of all contraception through the Department of Veterans Affairs, including Plan B and Ella.

Let me be clear, drugs like Plan B and Ella are not contraception, they are abortifacients. These chemical drugs prevent a newly conceived em-

bryo, a human embryo, from implanting in the uterus and continuing to develop as a child. Again, that is not contraception, that is abortion.

Using taxpayer funding for abortions is not only wildly unpopular, it is immoral. It forces tens of millions of people who have personal or religious objections to abortion and abortifacient drugs to fund the termination of life. That must not and should not be the public's obligation. The true measure of any society can be found in how it treats its most vulnerable, especially the unborn.

Since the ruling of *Roe v. Wade*, well over 62 billion abortions have occurred in the United States. To put it in perspective, that is more than the amount of worldwide casualties directly caused by World War II, the most deadly military conflict in the history of the world.

The loss of life on such a tragic, massive scale due to abortion is heinous. If passed, this legislation will increase abortions committed in the United States, and that is at the taxpayer's expense. This is absolutely unacceptable. We must do better as a Nation.

When this bill was considered in committee last month, a majority of the Republicans voted against it. Last week, we considered this bill under suspension of the rules, and fortunately, 187 of my Republican colleagues joined me and stood for life. Due to this strong showing of opposition, we were able to prevent the two-thirds supermajority needed to pass this bill under the suspension of the rules, dealing Speaker PELOSI a significant legislative defeat.

That is why Democrats—and even some Republicans, unfortunately—have brought this bill back to the floor today under a rule for debate. I hope the Republicans will be just as unified in opposition of this bill today. Another strong vote would send a message that the Republican Party is the party of life.

Our constituents expect us not to compromise in our defense of the unborn. To support legislation like H.R. 239, which promotes the killing of the unborn, at taxpayers' expense, is the ultimate betrayal.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I just want to say that extremism in the defense of nonsense is not conservatism, it is still nonsense.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MRVAN), my good friend, and member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Technology and Modernization.

Mr. MRVAN. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman TAKANO for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 239, the Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act of 2021. I first commend my colleague on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Congresswoman

BROWNLEY, for her leadership and perseverance to see that this critically important legislation is passed by the House.

It is not acceptable that today women veterans do not have access to the same contraception coverage all Americans currently have available through the Affordable Care Act or private insurance, and all Active Duty servicemembers have through the Department of Defense.

Women veterans are the fastest growing group of veterans enrolling in the Department of Veterans' Affairs healthcare system, and it is time that our policies for women veterans show them the support, respect, and fairness that they deserve.

Madam Speaker, I thank my chairman, again, for the time, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I would like to just take a minute to remind everyone that words matter, and their meanings need to be exactly clear.

Contraception stops a woman from becoming pregnant. The Plan B pill kills a baby in the womb once a woman is already pregnant. You see, the Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act is not contraception, it is providing, with taxpayer dollars, the ability for women to have an abortion. The government should not be paying for abortion. The VA should not be paying for abortion. The American taxpayer should not be paying for abortion. So this is why this is very important for all of us to do what we are called to do and not play a part in killing a baby in the womb.

Madam Speaker, this is why I am asking all of my colleagues to vote against the Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act. It is time to defend life in the womb.

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

Madam Speaker, I thank both Congressmen ROSENDALE and Congresswoman GREENE, and I appreciate their comments on the sanctity of life, and as freshman Members, their commitment to our Nation's veterans.

Now, I agree with both of their comments on life. I disagree on this bill. This is a bill that we have discussed many times, and the fact is, the emergency contraception is available to veterans at VA today and has been for many, many years.

You mentioned some of the groups who are opposed to this legislation, and I respect their viewpoints, and most often agree with them. But I do think it is appropriate to note right now, however, that just a couple hours ago, the Heritage Action for America clarified their position on this bill.

Importantly, Heritage Action noted that the emergency contraception is not—I repeat—is not a chemical abortion drug and cannot be used to induce

abortion. I think it is important for our Members to keep that in mind today.

And I also think it is important that you understand that many of our colleagues who are pro-life should not be questioned on this bill because it has been people who are pro-life that have not only worked on this bill this session, but last. And it is vitally important that not only the Members know this, but the American people know it as well.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1245

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD), my good friend and a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and also a very active member of the Health Subcommittee.

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 239, the Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act, led by the chairwoman of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Health, Congresswoman JULIA BROWNLEY.

Chairwoman BROWNLEY and I have worked together on this issue for years. It is about fairness, fairness for the nearly 2 million women veterans who currently don't have access to the same healthcare as civilian women.

The Affordable Care Act requires private insurance plans to provide contraceptive services without copays, but veterans using VA care have to pay out of pocket for those same services. It is unacceptable that women who have served our country bear financial burdens that most other Americans don't have to worry about.

This fix is long overdue. And last week's unconscionable delay by our Republican colleagues harmed our veterans even more.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to put partisanship aside and vote for H.R. 239.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 22 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois has 20 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL), my good friend and new member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, where she also serves on the Health Subcommittee.

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. TAKANO and Ms. BROWNLEY for their magnificent leadership advancing the health and safety of our women veterans.

Madam Speaker, my, my, my, this bill, which passed unanimously last session, is just mind-boggling that now some Republicans are opposing it.

Really?

I am going to say this: As a very proud mother of a son of a United States Marine Corps veteran, I know the risks and sacrifices of our brave military. So I say without hesitation, after service to our country is completed, no veteran of the United States Armed Forces should be forced to pay out-of-pocket expenses for preventative care, including contraception, that their civilian counterparts do not pay.

Small copays can be prohibitive for veterans struggling to make ends meet. In fact, studies show that costs associated with contraception, even when small, lead some people to forego it completely, to choose less effective methods, or use it inconsistently.

Here is the thing, Madam Speaker; the decision about whether or when or how to become a parent is one of the most important decisions a person can make. Our veterans were willing to stand up and take bullets for our freedom, so we need to stand up for theirs. Let's make it clear, today we are focused on access to birth control.

The Republican position conflating abortion and contraception is part of a broader extreme effort to block access to any type of reproductive healthcare. So let's eliminate the barriers and get the veterans the healthcare they need.

Madam Speaker, I call on my colleagues to demonstrate their commitment to the patriotic people who make up our military and veteran communities by passing this very good bill, Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), my good friend and a member of the Financial Services Committee, where he is chairman of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, when I arrived here in Congress in 2005, there was a necessary facility, also known as the men's room, right across diagonally from me outside of this Chamber. There was no such facility for women. In fact, it was the Parliamentarian's office to my left, just outside of this facility.

Madam Speaker, it was under the leadership of the Honorable NANCY PELOSI that we now have equal facilities for men and women just off the floor of the House. Things change, but they don't change on their own volition. The arc of the universe, the moral universe, bends because of the hands of women and men.

Today, we have an opportunity to again treat women with the same level of dignity and respect who are in the military as we do those who are without the military, and, to a certain extent, the same way we were treating men when I arrived in this Congress.

Things change. This is an opportunity to be a part of an historic change. It may seem small to you, but

to the people who have to bear the burden of this invidious discrimination, it is not the same.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I greatly appreciate it. I shall be terse and laconic and pithy and concise.

It is time for change to again come to the House of Representatives. I support this legislation, and I beg that my colleagues would do so. It is time for change.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU), my good friend and the chair of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus.

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, as the chair of the Pro-Choice Caucus' Contraception and Family Planning Task Force, I rise in strong support of Congresswoman BROWNLEY's Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act.

Every day, servicemembers are willing to sacrifice their lives for our constitutional rights. So we must ensure that those rights are available to them when they come home, and that includes the right to contraception.

That is what this bill does, by ensuring that veterans, just like their civilian neighbors, have access to the contraception that works best for them, without the burden of copays. And since we know that not every method of birth control works for every person, this bill requires the VA to cover all FDA-approved contraception, including emergency contraception, which is an especially important option in sexual assault.

Contraception helps people plan for their futures, for their families, and for themselves. This bill removes unnecessary barriers to care for our veterans who have already given this Nation so much.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important legislation.

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

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

Madam Speaker, let me just say that this bill by Ms. BROWNLEY is about providing equal access to contraceptions for our Nation's veterans. To oppose this bill is to advocate for a situation where veterans are made second-class citizens.

This bill is about contraception. Nowhere in the bill's text or in the title does the word "abortion" even appear. I would ask my colleagues who are in opposition to the bill to read the one-page text very carefully. I think they will see that there is no reference to, in any way, the word "abortion."

Madam Speaker, I would also say, I think it was H.L. Mencken who said

that consistency is often the hobgoblin of little minds.

For those Members who voted against this bill, you know, in fear of the moment, they can reconsider their vote and, I think, get on the right side of the issue in terms of equality for our veterans.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), my colleague and very good friend, the chairwoman of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Commerce.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I thank the chair for his friendship and for letting me speak.

Madam Speaker, you know, I rise with great enthusiastic support for the Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act.

No veteran of the United States of America should be forced to pay out of pocket for basic preventative care. You know, this is 2021. Birth control should not be controversial. Veterans' access to healthcare should not be controversial.

And I really think, how dare Members on the other side even consider shutting down this bill on suspension.

Our veterans deserve access to all of the healthcare services that they need, and that would include every method of birth control.

Really? Are we still arguing this?

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to just say—this is something that is basic right now, we all believe that contraception should be available. And, you know, it can end up actually being quite expensive.

And why?

I don't understand. So I think this legislation is long overdue. Let's pass it today.

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

Madam Speaker, if I may, I just want to reiterate to my friends and colleagues that I am pro-life. Many of the people that have supported this and will support this are pro-life, even groups now that are saying and mentioning this is contraception. It is contraception. It is not abortion.

Let me also say that this includes no other drugs or expansion of drugs that are available. We want to be very, very clear on that. It does not change the position of VA on abortion in any way, shape, or form. This is only doing what is right for our veterans and allowing them the opportunity to receive exactly what someone in the private sector receives and/or someone on Active Duty receives.

I am hoping that my colleagues will understand this and understand those of us who support this and why.

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

□ 1300

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

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the honor and courage with which my counterpart, Ranking Member BOST, has defended and stood up for the truth. And the truth is, H.R. 239 by Chairwoman BROWNLEY is about providing equal access to contraception to America's veterans.

A "no" vote on this bill—and I will say it again—a "no" vote on this bill is a vote to make our veterans second-class citizens.

Every other American under every other plan in this country, whether it is in private healthcare, because we passed the Affordable Care Act and said that every American is entitled to preventative services, including contraception, since 2010, or Active Duty servicemembers under the Department of Defense who are able to access contraception without copays—Ms. BROWNLEY's bill simply makes veterans on equal footing with all other Americans.

A "no" vote on this bill is to make our veterans second-class citizens, and I say of those who make that vote: Shame on them.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes," and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 486, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### LGBTQ BUSINESS EQUAL CREDIT ENFORCEMENT AND INVESTMENT ACT

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 486, I call up the bill (H.R. 1443) to amend the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to require the collection of small business loan data related to LGBTQ-owned businesses, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 486, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services printed in

the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-7 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 1443

*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 “LGBTQ Business Equal Credit Enforcement and Investment Act”.*

**SEC. 2. SMALL BUSINESS LOAN DATA COLLECTION.**

*Section 704B of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (15 U.S.C. 1691c-2) is amended—*

*(1) by inserting “LGBTQ-owned,” after “minority-owned,” each place such term appears;*

*(2) in subsection (e)(2)(G), by inserting “, sexual orientation, gender identity” after “sex”; and*

*(3) in subsection (h), by adding at the end the following:*

*“(7) LGBTQ-OWNED BUSINESS.—The term ‘LGBTQ-owned business’ means a business—*

*“(A) more than 50 percent of the ownership or control of which is held by 1 or more individuals self-identifying as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer; and*

*“(B) more than 50 percent of the net profit or loss of which accrues to 1 or more individuals self-identifying as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer.”.*

**SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**

*The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.*

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

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1443 and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1443, the LGBTQ Business Equal Credit Enforcement and Investment Act, for the second time this month.

As we discussed on the floor last week, this bill, led by Representative RITCHIE TORRES, would provide much-needed transparency in lending to

LGBTQ-owned businesses by updating the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to ensure financial institutions report the sexual orientation and gender identity of applicants for business loans.

This legislation is needed because research shows that LGBTQ individuals have experienced discrimination when applying for a mortgage or other forms of credit. However, due to a lack of data collection, we do not know the extent of discrimination when it comes to business loans, who has been affected, and, more importantly, how it can be corrected.

According to one estimate, there are approximately 1.4 million LGBTQ-owned businesses across our country. These entrepreneurs should be treated fairly, and the data collected on small business owners by Mr. TORRES’ bill will help to identify and prevent discrimination and will enable communities, policymakers, and lenders to support the development and investment needs of LGBTQ-owned businesses.

I thank Representative TORRES for his leadership on this important bill.

But I also want to express my disappointment that so many of our Republican colleagues decided to vote down this bill last week when it was considered under suspension of the rules. This bill passed the committee on a voice vote, and we worked with the ranking member, Mr. MCHENRY, to address concerns he had.

I thank Ranking Member MCHENRY for working with us and for his support.

I hope my colleagues who voted “no” will reconsider their position and vote “yes” on H.R. 1443. Whether or not they do, let me assure our friends, neighbors, constituents, and colleagues in the LGBTQ community that, one way or the other, this House will pass this bill. After all, this is the people’s House, and we simply cannot let lending or other forms of discrimination against any of our people stand.

As we discussed last week, this is Pride Month and a time to celebrate all the wonderful contributions the LGBTQ community has given to our economy and our country.

So, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, we can all agree that data is important, but we need to recognize, particularly as it relates to obtaining data on companies, that each one is unique.

Mandatory reporting metrics do not accurately measure progress. Just look at the mandatory disclosure bills that we had on the floor last week. The only outcome we can expect to see is higher compliance costs on companies, leaving fewer resources to build our workforce and invest in research and technology to compete globally. Simply put, one size fits all does not work.

However, this bill, the bill we have before us today, does not impose a mandatory reporting regime. Data is collected on a voluntary basis. Any loan applicant who does not want to provide information can decline to provide it, meaning there are fewer concerns over privacy because it is voluntary and fewer concerns over one-size-fits-all data reporting.

I appreciate my Democratic colleagues having offered a solution to promoting diversity inclusion without imposing requirements on businesses or business owners that do not effectively measure their success.

Thus, Madam Speaker, I support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, it has been a preeminent privilege to serve under Chair WATERS’ leadership on the Financial Services Committee. I think I can say without question, reservation, hesitation, or equivocation that, under the gentlewoman’s leadership, we have seen great change. But I also know this: that under her leadership, there is greater change to come. It is my honor to serve under the gentlewoman’s leadership.

And still I rise, Madam Speaker, and I rise today to support H.R. 1443, the LGBTQ Business Equal Credit Enforcement and Investment Act. And I rise to thank the ranking member for his support of this legislation. He has been steadfast, and he has been true to his word.

I am honored to support this legislation, and I think that it is appropriate for me to address, first, the question of whether invidious discrimination exists.

Madam Speaker, if you deny that invidious discrimination exists, then you have to deny the existence of the KKK. To deny the existence of invidious discrimination would necessitate a denial of those who were in Charlottesville screaming: “Blood and soil,” “Jews will not replace us.”

I believe the case is self-evident: invidious discrimination exists.

Currently, we have a system that allows us to collect the empirical evidence necessary to not only identify the invidious discrimination but also help us to prevent the invidious discrimination. This legislation is absolutely necessary to acquire the empirical intelligence so that we may go forward and prevent invidious discrimination.

By acquiring this intelligence, I might add, we will also deter some of the people who have good sense such that they won’t commit invidious discrimination because they will be aware of the intelligence acquisition.

How do we do this? Here is how it happens: Currently, when you make your application, Madam Speaker, there is a place for you to indicate whether you are a minority person. If I



am filling out the application, I would probably indicate that I am a minority person, although I don't like the term. I use it only to communicate. I do not like the term "minority." But for the purpose of communicating today, I would indicate that I am a minority person.

The only thing this bill will do, as it relates to acquiring the intelligence, is give us another space so that we can now indicate that, if you so choose, Madam Speaker, you are a member of the LGBTQ-plus community.

In filling out this form, if I chose not to indicate I was a minority person, I wouldn't have to. I would just sign it, completing the other aspects of it, and I would be done with it.

It only allows for the placement of additional language on the document so that persons who desire to—and it is important to note, Madam Speaker, that you must have the desire; it is with intentionality, and you voluntarily do this—would indicate, if you choose to, that you are a member of the LGBTQ-plus community.

□ 1315

I must say, candidly, I really don't see how this can become the debate that it has become. At some point in this country, we have to understand that discriminating against people because of who they are is inappropriate. It is unlawful.

I am the son of a segregated South, where I was lawfully discriminated against. I know what it looks like. I know what it smells like. I know what it sounds like. I know what invidious discrimination tastes like. I drank from filthy colored water fountains in my lifetime.

I don't wish any of this type of behavior that I had to endure on anyone else, so I rise today in support of this legislation as a continuation of my mission to do all that I can to help others avoid the horrors of invidious discrimination.

I am so grateful to Chairwoman WATERS for all she has done. She has always been a friend, not only to me, but to those who are among the least, the last, and the lost. And I thank the gentlewoman for all that she has done.

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

Madam Speaker, I think my colleague Mr. GREEN outlines this well. This is not a mandatory reporting bill, but data collection. Though the terms may not be perfect to Chairman GREEN's points and perhaps we need to look at the language of this reporting, for sure, but this is not a mandatory reporting bill. This is voluntary information that borrowers can offer up or not. Data is a good thing, especially if it is provided voluntarily.

For those reasons, I support this bill and I urge its adoption.

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

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, this bill takes necessary action to help ensure that LGBTQ-owned businesses are treated fairly by financial institutions and protected against lending discrimination. The bill passed unanimously out of the House Financial Services Committee with a voice vote. So I am pleased that the majority leader has worked with me to bring this bill back up for a vote quickly.

This bill is supported by the Human Rights Campaign, the National Center for Transgender Equality, Out Leadership, the National Gay and Lesbian Chamber of Commerce, and many others.

Although some of my colleagues did not support this bill last week, I urge them to reconsider, to support all small businesses this week, and vote "yes" on H.R. 1443.

I would like to thank the ranking member for his consideration, his support. In closing, I would just like to add that, as Mr. GREEN identified, I, too, am a victim of discrimination for most of my life, and all of my family and my dear friends and sometimes the entire neighborhood that I have lived in.

So we know what it feels like, and we know that there is, for example, today, a huge wealth gap because of discrimination, a lack of being able to borrow from the banks that were making credit available to so many others. It was not made to us. So oftentimes we were not able to buy a home. We were not able to get a loan for the basic kind of things that any family would need.

So we cannot, and I cannot be a part of public policy and systems and protocols that would exclude the LGBTQ community from being able to get loans in the ways that others are doing. It is pure discrimination. It must stop.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "yea" on H.R. 1443, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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 these businesses with equal access to credit, which is the beating heart of the American economy.

As a former New York City Council Member, I partnered with the National LGBTQ Chamber of Commerce to establish the nation's largest municipal certification program for LGBTQ business enterprises, enabling those businesses to enjoy equal access to a \$25 billion pool of government procurement.

The legislation before us, H.R. 1443, builds on a foundation laid by several statutes and regulations. The Equal Credit Opportunity Act (ECOA) prohibits credit discrimination, including but not limited to sex discrimination. A new interpretive rule from the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) clarifies that the ECOA's prohibition against sex discrimination applies to sexual orientation and gender identity. Section 1071 of the Dodd-Frank Act, which exists to enable and enhance the en-

forcement of the ECOA, requires financial institutions to report information about the race, ethnicity, and sex of credit applicants who serve as 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. It would enable anti-discrimination enforcement where none might exist.

Even though the United States has made substantial strides toward LGBTQ equality, the mission is far from accomplished. Seventy percent of the LGBTQ community remains unprotected by anti-discrimination laws. When it comes to credit, according to the Williams Institute, more than 7.7 million LGBTQ adults live in states that offer no protection against discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity.

It is often 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 the legislation before us. Both the National Community Reinvestment Coalition and Iowa State University reviewed data from the HMDA and found that same-sex couples were denied loans at higher rates than heterosexual couples, despite having comparable creditworthiness. It also found those same-sex couples paid higher fees and interests. The lesson of the HMDA is that sunlight can be a powerful disinfectant against discrimination.

H.R. 1443 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.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 486, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF CURRENCY RELATING TO "NATIONAL BANKS AND FEDERAL SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS AS LENDERS"

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 486, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 15) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by



the Office of the Comptroller of Currency relating to “National Banks and Federal Savings Associations as Lenders”, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 486, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 15

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of Currency relating to “National Banks and Federal Savings Associations as Lenders” (85 Fed. Reg. 68742 (October 30, 2020)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for one hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designee.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S.J. Res. 15 and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of S.J. Res. 15, a resolution to invalidate the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency’s so-called True Lender Rule under the Congressional Review Act.

This resolution would end a dangerous Trump-era rule that would allow predatory lenders to evade State usury laws and target consumers with high interest rate loans of 150 percent or higher through sham partnerships with banks.

I would like to thank Representative GARCÍA from Illinois for introducing the House companion to this measure and for his leadership in fighting to protect consumers from predatory lending schemes.

My committee has held several hearings that have exposed the consumer harm that results from these rent-a-bank schemes and explored how the Trump administration’s harmful rule erodes the consumer protections.

The OCC’s rule undoes centuries of case law that ensured that nonbank financial institutions were subject to State interest rate caps when they

partnered with banks, so long as they held the primary economic interest in a consumer loan.

Trump’s OCC allowed nonbanks to launder their loans through OCC-chartered banks, as long as the bank is listed on the loan origination documents, effectively allowing nonbanks to ignore State usury laws.

Simply put, before this Trump-era rule was finalized, if a nonbank in California, which has an interest rate cap of, for example, 36 percent, wanted to make a loan to a customer in California, the nonbank can’t charge more than 36 percent. OCC’s True Lender Rule turns this commonsense legal doctrine on its head.

What the Trump-era rule says is that this nonbank can now partner with a national bank that is based in, for example, Utah, which doesn’t have an interest rate cap, to now legally charge virtually any interest rate to the consumers in California.

This is true even if the bank in Utah has done nothing but put its name on the loan paperwork and intends to immediately transfer the loan to the nonbank in California. We have seen interest rates of more than 150 percent charged to consumers in this way.

The committee’s work has shone a spotlight on heartbreaking stories of the harm that this rule has caused to consumers and small business owners. Let me give you a real-world example of a Black-owned small business that was harmed by one of these rent-a-bank schemes authorized by Trump’s OCC.

A recent news report detailed the case of Carlos and Markisha Swepson, who were the owners of Boulevard Bistro, a restaurant in Harlem, New York. As they told NBC News, they took out several business loans for \$67,000 and were charged a whopping 268 percent APR.

For all intents and purposes, their lender was World Business Lenders, a nonbank lender that has a partnership with Axos Bank. This is a bank in New York State. Even though the loan was made by World Business Lenders, because Axos Bank’s name was on the loan documents, the nonbank could bypass the New York usury limit of 25 percent APR.

Due to the pandemic, the Swepsions are now behind on their loan payments. They are now facing foreclosure proceedings filed by World Business Lenders on a home they own that acts as collateral for the high interest rate loans. If not for Trump’s rule, the Swepsions would have only been charged a 25 percent interest rate and would probably not be facing financial ruin.

If Congress lets this Trump-era rule stand, these kinds of predatory, triple-digit interest rate loans will continue to be made through these kinds of rent-a-bank schemes, and lenders will continue to take advantage of small business owners and other consumers desperate to stay afloat.

Additionally, let’s not forget that during the last election, Nebraska joined 45 States and the District of Columbia that have already passed legislation to limit usury rates for small-dollar installment loans.

The Trump-era True Lender Rule is a backdoor way for nonbanks to charge triple-digit interest rates on loans at the expense of consumers in States where voters turned out to pass interest rate cap laws.

No wonder some called this the “fake lender” rule.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this bill. And for those who did not understand what we were talking about when we talked about the True Lender Rule, I think I have laid it out in such a way that you understand this is predatory. This is a rip-off. And for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution.

Earlier this week, President Biden met with financial regulators. From the four-sentence recap released by the White House, we know one of the topics they discussed was “promoting financial inclusion and responsibly increasing access to credit.”

I agree with that concept, and I think we should all agree with that concept. Unfortunately, my Democrat colleagues here in the House and the Senate don’t seem to be on the same page with the Biden administration. This resolution we are considering today would actually make financial services more expensive and credit less available to consumers and to small businesses and families across the country.

So why are my Democrat colleagues strong-arming this resolution through Congress?

Well, the answer is pretty simple. It is politics. That is what it is. Let’s call this what it is. It is blue States and their leftwing, so-called consumer protection advocates who want to, again, limit the reach of national banks and partnerships under the guise of “consumer protection.”

Democrats are more interested in scoring political points with leftwing activists than supporting the borrowers and small businesses that this OCC True Lender Rule helps.

□ 1330

We have witnessed Democrats work for decades to limit the scope of national banks through one measure or another.

The National Bank Act was signed into law in 1864. We have national banks. We have had national banks for 157 years in this country similar to today. What they are striking at is opposition to what we have lived with for over 157 years of well-regulated national banks doing business across the country.

The left, my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle, will provide misleading statements about interest rates and spurious arguments about State versus Federal regulation. They will argue consumers are harmed and this so-called partisan rule that they are driving invites bad banking practices.

Above all else, my colleagues across the aisle see this as an opportunity to rebuke the last administration, simply because they don't like the former President. I understand that. There is plenty of debate about that. But we should not tinker with existing law that is longstanding and predates this President or any other President. We should be talking about the contents of that law.

I would like to remind my friends as well that it was the Obama administration who supported the risk-management principles underlying the true lender rule. It was an effort to regulate, to ensure that instead of having shadow banking provide these services, that you have well-regulated consumer protection laws at the Federal level as a part of this process.

So once again, we have the opportunity to come together to support good, bipartisan policy, rather than doing what the Democrats would rather do, which is appease the woke left.

So let's stop the political theatrics and talk about what the true lender rule actually does, not what my Democrat colleagues claim it does.

The rule specifies that when a bank makes a loan, the bank is the true lender if, as of the date of origination, it is named as the lender in the loan agreement or funds the loan. That loan would be regulated by the entity making the loan, funding the loan, and the regulation would fall upon them. So the consumers have Federal consumer protection laws that would act on that loan. That is what it does.

My friends that created the Consumer Protection Bureau, I thought you wanted that, and yet you are arguing against that with this rule today. It is pretty straightforward; it is a pretty straightforward law. It shouldn't be political.

This rule also clarifies that as the true lender of a loan, a bank holds the responsibility of complying with Federal law. This eliminates the greatest risk associated with abuse of rent-a-charter schemes, which we agree are bad, and I think we could be doing something about that rather than this spurious argument we have today.

In October of last year, the OCC finalized the true lender rule that is being debated today. This was a second step in a decades-long process to clarify the bank-third-party relationship when issuing a loan. It has been longstanding practice, but there have been lawsuits, a great deal of uncertainty about it, a lot of questions in particular jurisdictions around the country on the nature of those partnerships, and it clarifies those partnerships in a rules-based regime.

This legal clarity enables bank and fintech partnerships to provide their customers with the financial products they want and need.

Consider this: According to the New York Federal Reserve, one in four African-American-owned firms used fintechs to access PPP loans, one in four. And they did so using this legal doctrine that enabled that to happen in partnerships with national banks.

Technology helps create greater financial inclusion. So why are my Democrat colleagues so afraid of technology, so afraid of innovation?

Per usual, my Democrat colleagues are willing to ignore facts in favor of myths that back up their preferred narrative. That is unfortunate, especially for something this important.

The left likes to say that banks can charge whatever interest rate they want. That is simply not true. Federal law gives national banks and Federal savings associations the same authority that State banks have regarding exportation of interest rates.

Now, both Federal- and State-chartered banks must conform to applicable interest rate limits in those States. States retain the authority to set interest rates, which varies from State to State.

Here is another myth: Third-party bank partnerships will use this rule to skirt State supervision and usury laws. Simply not true.

The truth is, banks primarily partner with third parties to reach additional markets, benefiting from a particular expertise or technology to improve their efficiency. Partnerships with third parties do not change the bank's authority or expose interest rate differentials.

And last, but not least, progressive activists cite the interest rate as a real problem with the true lender rule. They are pushing a 36 percent best rate cap. They have even pushed it at the national level. The math simply doesn't back up this falsehood.

The true lender rule was not some sinister plan by the previous administration to trick borrowers. It was not. It simply was not the case. This legal principle was established in 1864 with the National Bank Act. It is being undermined by an attempt at politics rather than sound policy, and what we should support is good, bipartisan policy that provides clarity to banks and fintechs so they can better serve our constituents and the consumers of America. That is it.

We have a well-regulated banking system. We do. It is not perfect. We have States that have various laws that are operable in their States, but we also have a national system here as well.

We have worked harmoniously, not perfectly, over the last 157 years since we established the national banking system. But why undermine a key principle of that national banking system by spurious arguments that actually don't have to do with the true lender

rule? They don't. There are other elements that the left opposes that actually, on a bipartisan basis, we oppose, but the true lender rule is not it.

It is a question of whether or not the bank that is providing you the loan is, in fact, the true lender. That is it. It is not fancier than that, people. That is what it is. That is what we are arguing about today, and that is kind of the absurdity of this stuff that we are debating right now, because it is that simple.

So let's promote financial inclusion the way that the President outlined, which was promoting financial inclusion, making rates more competitive and the cost of credit cheaper for individuals. Let's do that. Let's oppose this resolution before us so we can have sound principles, so we can drive that inclusion that is necessary and very important.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership in bringing this important legislation, more than one piece of legislation, to the floor today.

As I rise to speak in support of reversing the anti-consumer fake lender rule pushed through in the final weeks of the previous administration, I just want to take a moment to put it in perspective.

Madam Speaker, in November, the people elected Democratic majorities in the Congress that would be for the people, fighting for the public interests, not the special interests.

To that end, they elected majorities that would reverse the damage inflicted on their health and financial security by the last administration.

That mission is why the House this week is passing legislation under the Congressional Review Act to reverse three of the past President's most egregious assaults on families' well-being.

The Congressional Review Act is one of Congress' most important tools to reassert the power of the people's House to deliver for the people and to reclaim our authority under the Constitution, upholding the balance of powers that is the foundation of our American democracy.

With the gentlewoman's permission, I wish to speak to the anti-consumer fake lender rule, but also speak to two other issues under the Congressional Review Act this afternoon.

On the floor today is legislation, again, to reverse the anti-consumer fake lender rule pushed through in the final weeks of the previous administration.

This fake lender rule greenlights rent-a-bank schemes in which predatory lenders evade bank interest rate limits to swindle vulnerable consumers. This is done by putting a bank

name on loan paperwork and claiming that the bank, not the predatory lender, issued the loan.

To take one example, in California, where the interest rate on a 2-year \$2,000 loan is capped at 25 percent, lenders can use rent-a-bank partnerships to make loans with rates up to 225 percent.

This bipartisan resolution to end the fake lender rule is supported by many: a bipartisan coalition of 25 State attorneys general; faith leaders, including the National Latino Evangelical Coalition, the National Association of Evangelicals, the National Baptist Convention USA, hundreds of banking law and consumer finance regulation scholars, and Americans across the country and across parties, urging us to support this Congressional Review Act reversal of the anti-consumer fake lender rule.

Also today, we are considering legislation to undo the antiworker, pro-discrimination rule forced through in the final week of the past administration.

The EEOC was established to protect working people from discrimination and ensure that discrimination charges are resolved fairly. But this rule would impose draconian new obligations that bias the conciliation process against employees, toward employers; escalate the potential for retaliation, because retaliation claims make up half of EEOC's charges filed at the EEOC last year; siphon off scarce EEOC resources and saddle the EEOC with wasteful collateral litigation, prolonging harm to workers through delays; and contravene both the Supreme Court precedent and Congressional intent.

This month, civil rights and workers' rights organizations wrote to Congress in support of S.J. Res. 13, writing: "The EEOC must be able to conduct its work efficiently . . . to prevent and remedy workplace discrimination.

"This mission is even more critical in the middle of a global pandemic that continues to have severe economic repercussions for women, people of color, and other marginalized communities.

"The final rule will only deepen the barriers working people face coming forward to report discrimination and obtain justice."

This Congressional Review Act legislation passed the Senate. Hopefully, it will pass the House today.

Finally, tomorrow we take up bipartisan legislation that paves the way to restore the Obama-era protections against harmful methane pollution, which the most recent past President rolled back.

Briefly, these safeguards are key protections for public health that will also make a serious difference in combating the climate crisis. Methane is responsible for at least one-quarter of the warming of the planet. And it is 25 times more potent than carbon dioxide in trapping heat in the atmosphere.

This resolution passed on a bipartisan basis in the Senate and in the Energy and Commerce Committee. It

builds on the commitment of the President and the Democratic Congress to tackle the climate crisis.

As the administration has stated, addressing methane pollution is an urgent and essential step.

Madam Speaker, with that, as Speaker, I am proud to be able to use the Speaker's prerogative to speak beyond the item on the floor right now.

I am proud to support these important actions to reverse the Trump damage and to deliver results that make a difference in the lives of hardworking American families.

I thank all of our leaders for this legislation for the people: Chair BOBBY SCOTT and Representative SUZANNE BONAMICI on the EEOC resolution; Representative CHUY Garcia for his work on the true lender resolution; Representative DIANA DEGETTE and Chairman FRANK PALLONE, and many others, on the methane resolution from the Energy and Commerce Committee.

I urge strong votes for S.J. Res. 13, 14, and 15.

Coming back to the resolution on the floor right now, I thank the distinguished chair of the Financial Services Committee for her leadership in looking out always for the consumer, for competition, for fairness, for the people.

□ 1345

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), who is the ranking member on the Consumer Protection and Financial Institutions Subcommittee of the Financial Services Committee, and also the ranking member on the Small Business Committee.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss S.J. Res. 15, House Democrats' attempt to limit the ability of our Nation's banks to serve consumers by overturning the true lender rule.

The true lender rule was finalized by the OCC in 2020, in an effort to clarify who was the true lender in national bank third-party relationships. By providing this clarity, these third-party entities were able to provide financial services in partnership with financial institutions with the protections of legal precedence.

Partnering with third parties like fintechs gives financial institutions the ability to increase access to credit, especially for low- and moderate-income consumers and small businesses.

Unfortunately, the bill before us is nothing more than a politically motivated attempt by Democrats to make it more expensive and difficult for banks to serve customers, and its passage will have long-term consequences.

According to the Congressional Review Act, if this legislation is passed, the OCC will not have the ability to issue a similar rule down the road. This will leave bank-fintech partnerships in limbo with a great deal of uncertainty regarding the loans they make and who is the true lender in the relationship.

Democrats are constantly putting their disdain for America's banks ahead of the needs of their constituents, and this bill is another prime example of this unfortunate practice.

I firmly oppose this bill and its prevention of widespread financial inclusion, especially for low- and moderate-income consumers.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GARCÍA), who is also the sponsor of the House companion to this legislation.

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of S.J. Res. 15, a resolution to repeal the OCC's so-called true lender rule.

Earlier this year, my State, Illinois, passed a law that protects our consumers from predatory, high-interest loans. Eighteen other States have done the same.

I introduced the House version of this resolution because the true lender rule undermines laws like ours, laws that keep working-class people out of cycles of debt they can't pay back.

The rule is a rubber stamp for rent-a-bank schemes, where a lender can dodge State law by having a bank's name on the loan paperwork. That is all. No skin in the game, no investment in our communities; just a name on the paperwork.

This rule doesn't encourage innovation. It encourages playing games. This isn't a partisan issue. As a matter of fact, last year, 82 percent of Nebraska voters joined States like Arkansas and South Dakota to protect their communities from unpayable debt, and this rule from the OCC provides bad actors with a new tool to ignore them.

So a broad coalition of over 400 organizations—rural, urban, suburban—have come together in support of this measure, and they include consumer advocates, labor advocates, veterans, credit unions, and many other actors, including evangelical congregations.

Madam Speaker, I urge this body to pass this resolution and empower working-class communities like mine that are targeted by predatory lenders, and voters across the country who support consumer protections.

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

Madam Speaker, I would reference my colleagues the Federal Code, the Federal Register, that actually has the contents of this rule.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the actual rule that we are debating here, and I would highlight one piece in particular.

"The OCC agrees that rent-a-charter schemes have no place in the Federal financial system but disagrees that this rule facilitates such schemes. As noted above, instead, this proposal would help solve the problem by (1) providing a clear and simple test for determining when a bank makes a loan and (2) emphasizing the robust supervisory framework that applies to any

loan made by a bank and to all third-party relationships to which banks are a party. As noted above, if a bank fails to satisfy its obligations under this supervisory framework, the OCC will use all the tools at its disposal, including its enforcement authority.”

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY  
Office of the Comptroller of the Currency  
12 CFR Part 7  
[Docket ID OCC-2020-0026]  
RIN 1557-AE97

National Banks and Federal Savings Associations as Lenders

AGENCY: Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Treasury.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) is issuing this final rule to determine when a national bank or Federal savings association (bank) makes a loan and is the “true lender,” including in the context of a partnership between a bank and a third party, such as a marketplace lender. Under this rule, a bank makes a loan if, as of the date of origination, it is named as the lender in the loan agreement or funds the loan.

DATES: The final rule is effective on December 29, 2020.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Background

Lending partnerships between national banks or Federal savings associations (banks) and third parties play a critical role in our financial system. These partnerships expand access to credit and provide an avenue for banks to remain competitive as the financial sector evolves. Through these partnerships, banks often leverage technology developed by innovative third parties that helps to reach a wider array of customers. However, there is often uncertainty about how to determine which entity is making the loans and, therefore, the laws that apply to these loans. This uncertainty may discourage banks from entering into lending partnerships, which, in turn, may limit competition, restrict access to affordable credit, and chill the innovation that can result from these relationships. Through this rulemaking, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) is providing the legal certainty necessary for banks to partner confidently with other market participants and meet the credit needs of their customers.

However, the OCC understands that there is concern that its rulemaking facilitates inappropriate “rent-a-charter” lending schemes—arrangements in which a bank receives a fee to “rent” its charter and unique legal status to a third party. These schemes are designed to enable the third party to evade state and local laws, including some state consumer protection laws, and to allow the bank to disclaim any compliance responsibility for the loans. These arrangements have absolutely no place in the federal banking system and are addressed by this rulemaking, which holds banks accountable for all loans they make, including those made in the context of marketplace lending partnerships or other loan sale arrangements.

On July 22, 2020, the OCC published a notice of proposed rulemaking (proposal or NPR) to determine when a bank makes a loan. Under the proposal, a bank made a loan if, as of the date of origination, it (1) was named as the lender in the loan agreement or (2) funded the loan.

As the proposal explained, federal law authorizes banks to enter into contracts, to make loans, and to subsequently transfer these loans and assign the loan contracts. The statutory framework, however, does not specifically address which entity makes a

loan when the loan is originated as part of a lending partnership involving a bank and a third party, nor has the OCC taken regulatory action to resolve this ambiguity. In the absence of regulatory action, a growing body of case law has introduced divergent standards for resolving this issue, as discussed below. As a result of this legal uncertainty, stakeholders cannot reliably determine the applicability of key laws, including the law governing the permissible interest that may be charged on the loan.

This final rule establishes a clear test for determining when a bank makes a loan, by interpreting the statutes that grant banks their authority to lend. Specifically, the final rule provides that a bank makes a loan when it, as of the date of origination, (1) is named as the lender in the loan agreement or (2) funds the loan.

##### II. Overview of Comments

The OCC received approximately 4,000 comments on the proposal, the vast majority of which were from individuals using a version of one of three short form letters to express opposition to the proposal. Other commenters included banks, nonbank lenders, industry trade associations, community groups, academics, state government representatives, and members of Congress.

Commenters supporting the proposal stated that the judicial true lender doctrine has led to divergent standards and uncertainty concerning the legitimacy of lending partnerships between banks and third parties. They also stated that, by removing the uncertainty, the OCC would help ensure that banks have the confidence to enter into these lending relationships, which provide affordable credit to consumers on more favorable terms than the alternatives, such as pawn shops or payday lenders, to which underserved communities often turn. Supporting commenters also observed that the proposal would enhance a bank’s safety and soundness by facilitating its ability to sell loans. These commenters also noted that the proposal (1) makes clear that the OCC will hold banks accountable for products with unfair, deceptive, abusive, or misleading features that are offered as part of a relationship and (2) is consistent with the OCC’s statutory mission to ensure that banks provide fair access to financial services.

Commenters opposing the proposal stated that it would facilitate so-called rent-a-charter schemes, which would result in increased predatory lending and disproportionately impact marginalized communities. Other opposing commenters stated that the proposal is an attempt by the OCC to improperly regulate nonbank lenders, a role they consider to be reserved exclusively to the states. Opposing commenters also asserted that the OCC did not have sufficient legal authority to issue the proposal and that the proposal violated the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) and 12 U.S.C. 25b.

Both supporting and opposing commenters recommended changes. These recommendations included (1) adopting a test that requires the true lender to have a predominant economic interest in the loan; (2) providing additional “safe harbor” requirements to enhance consumer protections (e.g., interest rate caps); (3) clarifying that certain traditional bank lending activities do not fall under the funding prong of the rule (e.g., indirect auto lending and mortgage warehouse lending); (4) providing additional details on how the OCC would supervise these relationships; and (5) stating that the rule will not displace certain federal consumer protection laws and regulations.

The comments are addressed in greater detail below.

##### III. Analysis

As noted in the prior section, commenters raised a variety of issues for the OCC’s consideration. These are discussed below.

##### A. OCC’s Authority To Issue the Rule

Some commenters argued the OCC lacks the legal authority to issue the rule because it would contravene the unambiguous meaning of 12 U.S.C. 85. These commenters believe that section 85 incorporates the common law of usury as of 1864, which they view as requiring courts to look to the substance rather than the form of a transaction. In a similar vein, commenters argued that section 85 incorporates all usury laws of a state, including its true lender jurisprudence. One commenter also argued that the proposal contradicts judicial and administrative precedent interpreting sections 85 and 86.

The OCC disagrees. The rule interprets statutes that authorize banks to lend—12 U.S.C. 24, 371, and 1464(c)—and clarifies how to determine when a bank exercises this lending authority. The OCC has clear authority to reasonably interpret these statutes, which do not specifically address when a bank makes a loan.

Banks do not obtain their lending authority from section 85 or 12 U.S.C. 1463(g). Nor are these statutes the authority the OCC is relying on to issue this rule. The proposal referenced sections 85 and 1463(g) in the regulatory text to ensure that interested parties understand the consequences of its interpretation of sections 24, 371, and 1464(c), including that this rulemaking operates together with the OCC’s recently finalized ‘Maddenfix’ rulemaking. When a bank makes a loan pursuant to the test established in this regulation, the bank may subsequently sell, assign, or otherwise transfer the loan without affecting the permissible interest term, which is determined by reference to state law.

Other commenters questioned the OCC’s authority on different grounds. Some asserted the OCC lacks authority to (1) exempt nonbanks from compliance with state law or (2) preempt state laws that determine whether a loan is made by a nonbank lender. One commenter also asserted that the proposal is an attempt by the OCC to interpret state law. A commenter further argued that the OCC’s statutory interpretation is not reasonable, including because the proposal (1) would allow nonbanks to enjoy the benefits of federal preemption without submitting to any regulatory oversight and (2) violates the presumption against preemption, especially in an area of historical state police powers like consumer protection.

This rulemaking does not assert authority over nonbanks, preempt state laws applicable to nonbank lenders, or interpret state law. It interprets federal banking law and has no direct applicability to any nonbank entity or activity. Rather, in identifying the true lender, the rule pinpoints key elements of the statutory, regulatory, and supervisory framework applicable to the loan in question. As noted in the proposal, if a nonbank partner is the true lender, the relevant state (and not OCC) would regulate the lending activity, and the OCC would assess the bank’s third-party risk management in connection with the relationship itself.

Furthermore, because commenters expressed concern that this rule would undermine state usury caps, it is also important to emphasize that sections 85 and 1463(g) provide a choice of law framework for determining which state’s law applies to bank loans and, in this way, incorporate, rather than eliminate, state law. These statutes require that a bank refer to, and comply with, the usury cap established by the laws of the state where the bank is located. Thus, disparities between the usury caps applicable to

particular bank loans result primarily from differences in the state laws that impose these caps, not from an interpretation that section 85 or 1463(g) preempt state law.

A commenter also asserted that the OCC's interpretation is not reasonable because it (1) does not solve the problem it claims to remedy, arguing that the proposal itself is unclear and requires banks to undertake a fact-specific analysis and (2) departs from federal cases holding that state true lender law applies to lending relationships between banks and nonbanks.

The OCC believes that this rule provides a simple, bright-line test to determine when a bank has made a loan and, therefore, is the true lender in a lending relationship. The only required factual analysis is whether the bank is named as the lender or funds the loan. The OCC has evaluated various standards established by courts and has determined that a clear, predictable, and easily administrable test is preferable. This test will provide legal certainty, and the OCC's robust supervisory framework effectively targets predatory lending, achieving the same goal as a more complex true lender test.

Several commenters also asserted that the proposal contravenes 12 U.S.C. 1, which charges the OCC with ensuring that banks treat customers fairly. One commenter also argued that the proposal is inconsistent with the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) because it encourages predatory lending. As the OCC explained in the proposal, the rule's purpose is to provide legal certainty to expand access to credit, a goal that is entirely consistent with the agency's statutory charge to ensure fair treatment of customers and banks' statutory obligation to serve the convenience and needs of their communities. B. 12 U.S.C. 25b

Several commenters asserted that the agency should have complied with 12 U.S.C. 25b, which applies when the OCC issues a regulation or order that preempts a state consumer financial law. Some of these commenters argued that the proposal fails to meet the preemption standard articulated in *Barnett Bank of Marion County, N.A. v. Nelson, Florida Insurance Commissioner, et al.* (Barnett), as incorporated into section 25b. Commenters also argued that (1) section 25b(f) does not exempt the OCC's proposal from the requirements of section 25b because the rule is not limited to banks charging interest and (2) the proposal undermines or contravenes section 25b(h) because it extends preemptive treatment to subsidiaries, affiliates, and agents of banks.

The OCC disagrees: The requirements of section 25b are inapplicable to this rulemaking. Section 25b applies when the Comptroller determines, on a case-by-case basis, that a state consumer financial law is preempted pursuant to the standard for conflict preemption established by the Supreme Court in *Barnett*, i.e., when the Comptroller makes a preemption determination. This rulemaking does not preempt a state consumer financial law but rather interprets a bank's federal authority to lend. Furthermore, commenters arguing that section 25b(f) (which addresses section 85) does not exempt this rulemaking from the procedures in section 25b and that sections 25b(b)(2), (e), and (h)(2) (which address bank subsidiaries, affiliates, and agents) preclude the agency from issuing this rule are mistaken; this rulemaking is not an interpretation of section 85, nor does it address the applicability of state law to bank subsidiaries, affiliates, or agents.

#### C. Administrative Procedure Act

Several commenters asserted that, for various reasons, the proposal is arbitrary and

capricious and, therefore, in violation of the APA. Some commenters argued that the proposal lacks an evidentiary basis, either entirely or with respect to certain assertions, such as the existence of legal uncertainty. The OCC disagrees. The APA's arbitrary and capricious standard requires an agency to make rational and informed decisions based on the information before it. Furthermore, the standard does not require the OCC to develop or cite empirical or other data to support its rule or wait for problems to materialize before acting. Instead, the OCC may rely on its expertise to address the problems that may arise.

The OCC has decided to issue this rule to resolve the effects of legal uncertainty on banks and their third-party relationships. In this case, the OCC's views are informed by courts' divergent true lender tests and the resulting lack of predictability faced by stakeholders. While the OCC understands its rule may not resolve all legal uncertainty for every loan, this is not a prerequisite for the agency to take this narrowly tailored action. Taking these considerations into account, the OCC has made a rational and informed decision to issue this rule.

Commenters also argued that the OCC's actions violate the APA because the agency has not given notice of its intention to reverse an existing policy or provided the factual, legal, and policy reasons for doing so. Specifically, these commenters referenced the OCC's longstanding policy prohibiting banks from entering into rent-a-charter schemes. This rulemaking does not reverse the OCC's position. The OCC's longstanding and unwavering opposition to predatory lending, including but not limited to predatory lending as part of a third-party relationship, remains intact and strong. In fact, this rulemaking would solve the rent-a-charter issues raised and ensure that banks do not participate in those arrangements. As noted in the proposal, the OCC's statutes and regulations, enforceable guidelines, guidance, and enforcement authority provide robust and effective safeguards against predatory lending when a bank exercises its lending authority. This rule does not alter this framework but rather reinforces its importance by clarifying that it applies to every loan a bank makes and by providing a simple test to identify precisely when a bank has made a loan. If a bank fails to satisfy its compliance obligations, the OCC will not hesitate to use its enforcement authority consistent with its longstanding policy and practice.

Furthermore, the final rule does not change the OCC's expectation that all banks establish and maintain prudent credit underwriting practices and comply with applicable law, even when they partner with third parties. These expectations were in place before the OCC issued its proposal and will remain in place after the final rule takes effect. For these reasons, the final rule does not represent a change in OCC policy.

#### D. Comments on the Proposed Regulatory Text

As noted previously, the OCC's proposed regulatory text set out a test for determining when a bank has made a loan for purposes of 12 U.S.C. 24, 85, 371, 1463(g), and 1464(c). Under this test, a bank made a loan if, as of the date of origination, it was named as the lender in the loan agreement or funded the loan.

Some commenters supported the rule without change, stating that the proposal provided the clarity needed to determine which entity is the true lender in a lending relationship. Other commenters supported the proposal as a general matter but suggested specific changes, including clarifying that

the funding prong does not include certain lending or financing arrangements such as warehouse lending, indirect auto lending (through bank purchases of retail installment contracts (RICs)), loan syndication, and other structured finance.

These commenters are correct that the funding prong of the proposal generally does not include these types of arrangements: They do not involve a bank funding a loan at the time of origination. For example, when a bank purchases a RIC from an auto dealer, as is often the case with indirect auto lending, the bank does not "fund" the loan. When a bank provides a warehouse loan to a third party that subsequently draws on that warehouse loan to lend to other borrowers, the bank is not funding the loans to these other borrowers. In contrast, and as noted in the proposal, the bank is the true lender in a table funding arrangement when the bank funds the loan at origination.

Another commenter recommended that the OCC consider the "safe harbor" established in the recent settlement between the Colorado Attorney General and several financial institutions and fintech lenders. While we are aware of this settlement, the OCC believes that our approach achieves the goal of legal certainty while providing the necessary safeguards.

One commenter requested that the OCC expressly state in the final rule that the rulemaking is not intended to displace or alter other regulatory regimes, including those that address consumer protection. Another commenter requested that the OCC clarify how account information in true lender arrangements should be reported to consumer reporting agencies under the Fair Credit Reporting Act. As the preamble to the proposal noted, the OCC's rule does not affect the application of any federal consumer financial laws, including, but not limited to, the meaning of the terms (1) "creditor" in the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) and Regulation Z (12 CFR part 1026) and (2) "lender" in Regulation X (12 CFR part 1024), which implements the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.). Similarly, the OCC's rule does not affect the applicability of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (12 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.), the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (15 U.S.C. 1691 et seq.), the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.), or their implementing regulations (Regulation C (12 CFR part 1003), Regulation B (12 CFR part 1002), and Regulation V (12 CFR part 1022)), respectively. The OCC recommends that commenters direct questions regarding these statutes and regulations to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

Some commenters stated that the two prongs in the proposal's test would produce contradictory and absurd results. For example, several commenters noted that, under the proposal, two banks could be the true lender (e.g., at origination, one bank is named as the lender on the loan agreement and another bank funds the loan). In response to this comment, we have amended the regulatory text to provide that where one bank is named as the lender in the loan agreement and another bank funds the loan, the bank named as the lender in the loan agreement makes the loan. This approach will provide additional clarity and allow stakeholders, including borrowers, to easily identify the bank that makes the loan. Otherwise, the OCC adopts the regulatory text as proposed.

#### E. Rent-a-Charter Concerns; Supervisory Expectations

The OCC received multiple comments expressing concern that the proposal would facilitate rent-a-charter relationships and

thereby enable nonbank lenders to engage in predatory or otherwise abusive lending practices. These commenters noted that nonbanks are generally not subject to the type of prudential supervision that applies to banks and that usury caps are the most effective method to curb predatory lending by nonbanks. They argued that the OCC's rule would effectively nullify these caps and facilitate the expansion of predatory lending.

As explained above, in a rent-a-charter arrangement, a lender receives a fee to rent out its charter and unique legal status to originate loans on behalf of a third party, enabling the third party to evade state and local laws, such as usury caps and other consumer protection laws. At the same time, the lender disclaims any responsibility for these loans. As a result of these arrangements, consumers can find themselves in debt to an unscrupulous nonbank lender that is subject to very little or no prudential supervision on a loan at an interest rate grossly in excess of the state usury cap.

The OCC agrees that rent-a-charter schemes have no place in the federal financial system but disagrees that this rule facilitates such schemes. As noted above, instead, this proposal would help solve the problem by (1) providing a clear and simple test for determining when a bank makes a loan and (2) emphasizing the robust supervisory framework that applies to any loan made by a bank and to all third-party relationships to which banks are a party. As noted above, if a bank fails to satisfy its obligations under this supervisory framework, the OCC will use all the tools at its disposal, including its enforcement authority.

Although the proposal discussed this supervisory framework in detail, it bears repeating because of its importance to this rulemaking. Every bank is responsible for establishing and maintaining prudent credit underwriting practices that: (1) Are commensurate with the types of loans the bank will make and consider the terms and conditions under which they will be made; (2) consider the nature of the markets in which the loans will be made; (3) provide for consideration, prior to credit commitment, of the borrower's overall financial condition and resources, the financial responsibility of any guarantor, the nature and value of any underlying collateral, and the borrower's character and willingness to repay as agreed; (4) establish a system of independent, ongoing credit review and appropriate communication to management and to the board of directors; (5) take adequate account of concentration of credit risk; and (6) are appropriate to the size of the institution and the nature and scope of its activities. Moreover, every bank is expected to have loan documentation practices that: (1) Enable the institution to make an informed lending decision and assess risk, as necessary, on an ongoing basis; (2) identify the purpose of a loan and the source of repayment and assess the ability of the borrower to repay the indebtedness in a timely manner; (3) ensure that any claim against a borrower is legally enforceable; (4) demonstrate appropriate administration and monitoring of a loan; and (5) take account of the size and complexity of a loan. Every bank should also have appropriate internal controls and information systems to assess and manage the risks associated with its lending activities, including those that provide for monitoring adherence to established policies and compliance with applicable laws and regulations, as well as internal audit systems.

In addition, a bank's lending must comply with all applicable laws and regulations, including federal consumer protection laws. For example, section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (FTC Act) provides that

"unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce" are unlawful. The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act also prohibits unfair, deceptive, or "abusive" acts or practices. The OCC has taken a number of public enforcement actions against banks for violating section 5 of the FTC Act and will continue to exercise its enforcement authority to address unlawful actions.

Banks also are subject to federal fair lending laws and may not engage in unlawful discrimination, such as "steering" a borrower to a higher cost loan on the basis of the borrower's race, national origin, age, or gender. If a bank engages in any unlawful discriminatory practices, the OCC will take appropriate action under the federal fair lending laws. Further, under the CRA regulations, CRA-related lending practices that violate federal fair lending laws, the FTC Act, or Home Ownership and Equity Protection Act, or that evidence other discriminatory or illegal credit practices, can adversely affect a bank's CRA performance rating.

The OCC has also taken significant steps to eliminate predatory, unfair, or deceptive practices in the federal banking system, recognizing that "[s]uch practices are inconsistent with important national objectives, including the goals of fair access to credit, community development, and stable homeownership by the broadest spectrum of America." To address these concerns, the OCC requires banks engaged in lending to take into account the borrower's ability to repay the loan according to its terms. In the OCC's experience, "a departure from fundamental principles of loan underwriting generally forms the basis of abusive lending: Lending without a determination that a borrower can reasonably be expected to repay the loan from resources other than the collateral securing the loan, and relying instead on the foreclosure value of the borrower's collateral to recover principal, interest, and fees."

Additionally, the OCC has cautioned banks about lending activities that may be considered predatory, unfair, or deceptive, noting that many such lending practices are unlawful under existing federal laws and regulations or otherwise present significant safety, soundness, or other risks. These practices include those that target prospective borrowers who cannot afford credit on the terms being offered, provide inadequate disclosures of the true costs and risks of transactions, involve loans with high fees and frequent renewals, or constitute loan "flipping" (frequent re-financings that result in little or no economic benefit to the borrower that are undertaken with the primary or sole objective of generating additional fees). Policies and procedures should also be designed to ensure clear and transparent disclosure of the terms of the loan, including relative costs, risks, and benefits of the loan transaction, which helps to mitigate the risk that a transaction could be unfair or deceptive. The NPR also highlighted specific questions that the OCC evaluates as part of its robust supervision of banks' lending relationships.

In addition to this framework targeted at banks' lending activities, the OCC has issued comprehensive guidance on third-party risk management. These standards apply to any relationship between a bank and a third party, including lending relationships, regardless of which entity is the true lender. Pursuant to this guidance, the OCC expects banks to institute appropriate safeguards to manage the risks associated with their third-party relationships.

Under the final rule, this robust supervisory framework will continue to apply to banks that are the true lender in a lending relationship with a third party. Rather than

allowing banks to enter into rent-a-charter schemes, the final rule will ensure that banks understand that the OCC will continue to hold banks accountable for their lending activities.

#### IV. Regulatory Analyses

**Paperwork Reduction Act.** In accordance with the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq., the OCC may not conduct or sponsor, and respondents are not required to respond to, an information collection unless it displays a currently valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number. The OCC has reviewed the final rule and determined that it will not introduce any new or revise any existing collection of information pursuant to the PRA. Therefore, no submission will be made to OMB for review.

**Regulatory Flexibility Act.** The Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), 5 U.S.C. 601 et seq., requires an agency, in connection with a final rule, to prepare a Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis describing the impact of the rule on small entities (defined by the Small Business Administration (SBA) for purposes of the RFA to include commercial banks and savings institutions with total assets of \$600 million or less and trust companies with total assets of \$41.5 million or less) or to certify that the final rule would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

The OCC currently supervises approximately 745 small entities. The OCC expects that all of these small entities would be impacted by the rule. While this final rule could affect how banks structure their current or future third-party relationships as well as the amount of loans originated by banks, the OCC believes the costs associated with any administrative changes in bank lending policies and procedures would be de minimis. Banks already have systems, policies, and procedures in place for issuing loans when third parties are involved. It takes significantly less time to amend existing policies than to create them, and the OCC does not expect any needed adjustments will involve an extraordinary demand on a bank's human resources. In addition, any costs would likely be absorbed as ongoing administrative expenses. Therefore, the OCC certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Accordingly, a Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis is not required.

**Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.** Consistent with the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA), 2 U.S.C. 1532, the OCC considers whether a final rule includes a federal mandate that may result in the expenditure by state, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100 million adjusted for inflation (currently \$157 million) in any one year. The final rule does not impose new mandates. Therefore, the OCC concludes that implementation of the final rule would not result in an expenditure of \$157 million or more annually by state, local, and tribal governments, or by the private sector.

**Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act.** Pursuant to section 302(a) of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 (RCDRIA), 12 U.S.C. 4802(a), in determining the effective date and administrative compliance requirements for new regulations that impose additional reporting, disclosure, or other requirements on insured depository institutions, the OCC must consider, consistent with principles of safety and soundness and the public interest, any administrative burdens that such regulations would place on depository institutions, including



small depository institutions, and customers of depository institutions, as well as the benefits of such regulations. In addition, section 302(b) of RCDRIA, 12 U.S.C. 4802(b), requires new regulations and amendments to regulations that impose additional reporting, disclosures, or other new requirements on insured depository institutions generally to take effect on the first day of a calendar quarter that begins on or after the date on which the regulations are published in final form. This final rule imposes no additional reporting, disclosure, or other requirements on insured depository institutions, and therefore, section 302 is not applicable to this rule.

Congressional Review Act. For purposes of the Congressional Review Act (CRA), 5 U.S.C. 801 et seq., the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) of the OMB determines whether a final rule is a "major rule," as that term is defined at 5 U.S.C. 804(2). OIRA has determined that this final rule is not a major rule. As required by the CRA, the OCC will submit the final rule and other appropriate reports to Congress and the Government Accountability Office for review.

Administrative Procedure Act. The APA, 5 U.S.C. 551 et seq., generally requires that a final rule be published in the Federal Register not less than 30 days before its effective date. This final rule will be effective 60 days after publication in the Federal Register, which meets the APA's effective date requirement.

#### List of Subjects in 12 CFR Part 7

Computer technology, Credit, Derivatives, Federal savings associations, Insurance, Investments, Metals, National banks, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Securities, Security bonds.

#### Office of the Comptroller of the Currency

For the reasons set out in the preamble, the OCC amends 12 CFR part 7 as follows.

#### PART 7—ACTIVITIES AND OPERATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 7 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 12 U.S.C. 1 et seq., 25b, 29, 71, 71a, 92, 92a, 93, 93a, 95(b)(1), 371, 371d, 481, 484, 1463, 1464, 1465, 1818, 1828(m) and 5412(b)(2)(B).

2. Add § 7.1031 to read as follows:

§ 7.1031 National banks and Federal savings associations as lenders.

(a) For purposes of this section, bank means a national bank or a Federal savings association.

(b) For purposes of sections 5136 and 5197 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 24 and 12 U.S.C. 85), section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371), and sections 4(g) and 5(c) of the Home Owners' Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1463(g) and 12 U.S.C. 1464(c)), a bank makes a loan when the bank, as of the date of origination:

(1) Is named as the lender in the loan agreement; or

(2) Funds the loan.

(c) If, as of the date of origination, one bank is named as the lender in the loan agreement for a loan and another bank funds that loan, the bank that is named as the lender in the loan agreement makes the loan.

Brian P. Brooks,

Acting Comptroller of the Currency.

[FR Doc. 2020-24134 Filed 10-29-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-33-P

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, additionally, I would highlight for you that the outline here and the arguments by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle really strikes at the nature of national banking.

So just repeal the National Banking Act rather than trying to undermine it

by taking away the legal principle by which a bank can make a loan. That is what this rule does, and that is the absurdity of this debate. That is why I oppose this attempt on the floor today.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), my colleague and friend.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from North Carolina for managing the opposition to this.

Look, it is simple. The reason we are here today is to debate the Democrats' latest episode in their anti-financial technology agenda, but also their rush to undo any policy of the previous administration, whether it was good or bad.

Now, here are the facts: More than 30 percent of adults are unbanked or underbanked, 40 percent do not have enough savings to cover a \$400 emergency expense, 42 percent have a subprime credit score and are rejected for bank loans at a rate four times higher than those with prime credit.

Now, fintech has been instrumental in expanding access to credit for consumers who have little or no credit history. Online lending has grown to \$90 billion a year.

So what do consumers typically use these loans to pay for?

Funerals, weddings, car repairs, and home improvement.

Fintech is particularly important for minorities. In fact, fintechs were the top PPP lenders to Black-owned businesses and Hispanic-owned businesses during the pandemic.

But there is an issue that has caused difficulty when banks and fintech companies partner to make loans, and that is the question of which entity is considered the true lender. Until recently, this question was attempted to be settled in a series of confusing and conflicting lawsuits. The courts are divided on it. But, last year, the OCC finalized a rule to provide much-needed certainty. It is no surprise that the organizations calling for the rule to be overturned are the so-called consumer groups that, for the most part, are funded by trial lawyers.

The Democrats are attempting to overturn this rule because some imaginary lenders could rent a bank charter to engage in predatory lending, but as the ranking member has just stated, that is clearly prohibited in the existing rule. This resolution is devastating to minority consumers and businesses, those with subprime credit, and the unbanked.

Instead of giving those people options, this resolution would direct them to payday lenders, or in States like Georgia where payday lending is illegal, they will have no access to credit.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to this disastrous resolution.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, we know it is expensive to be poor in our country; that we live in a country with a system that continues to put profit before our people, and it must stop.

In my home State of Michigan, communities that are more than a quarter Black and Latino have 50 percent more payday lenders than anywhere else in the State. These lenders target our communities, the most financially vulnerable communities. Payday lenders in Michigan are 62 percent more common in low-income Census tracts compared to statewide average.

That is what folks mean when they say that we need to abolish structural racism in our country.

You cannot justify loans of 100 percent APR or higher as providing access to credit when they trap borrowers in destructive cycles of debt and ruin their credit. World Business Lenders offered loans of upwards of 268 percent of APR, despite the fact that its rent-a-bank partner was regulated by the OCC. They found a way around the rules, and that is unacceptable.

OCC's rules leave States like our State of Michigan no ability to enforce their own State rate caps, giving predatory lenders free rein to exploit our neighbors with outrageous APRs.

Repealing the true lender rule is the first step toward protecting borrowers from predatory lenders, and I am proud to support it.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MOORE), a great new Member of the Congress.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to the CRA before us.

Innovation in our financial industry lifts Americans across all levels of the socioeconomic spectrum. A great example of this has been the emergence of the fintech industry, which has helped more Americans access secure, affordable credit.

Unfortunately, government regulation has stymied innovation as regulatory uncertainties have imposed artificial barriers to our creativity. Recent court rulings have only exacerbated this uncertainty by creating confusion about who the true lender of a loan is when a bank works with a third party.

In 2020, the Office of the Comptroller sought to clarify this uncertainty by finalizing the true lender rule. This rule allowed our local community and regional banks to provide expanded access to banking services and lower the cost of banking to consumers across the Nation. It is that simple.

Commonsense reforms that help banks and the fintech industry do business, in turn, make life easier for families, individuals, and businesses. Unfortunately, my Democrat colleagues are seeking to roll this rule back.

Nullifying the rule will decrease credit accessibility for underserved communities, hurt community banks' ability to utilize new technologies, and dissuade innovation in the financial services sector.



Madam Speaker, I oppose S.J. Res. 15, and I encourage my colleagues to vote “no.”

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), who is also the chair of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. And still I rise, Madam Speaker. Again, I thank the chairwoman for the time and the opportunity.

I would say to all, I recall the debate around the yield spread premium, wherein a loan originator could say to a person, “Here is a loan, you are lucky to get it for 10 percent” when the person qualified for a loan at 5 percent.

We eliminated the dastardly yield spread premium and the harm that it caused. We have a similar circumstance with the rent-a-bank scheme that steals the American Dream, such that people who qualify for better loans will likely get higher loans because they don’t always understand the scheme.

So I rise today, and I thank Mr. GARCIA for what he has done to bring this bill to fruition. I thank the Chairwoman, and I absolutely support the legislation.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), who is the ranking member on the Subcommittee on National Security, International Development, and Monetary Policy of the Financial Services Committee. He is also a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

□ 1400

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I rise today also in opposition to S.J. Resolution 15, the Congressional Review Act repeal of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency’s true lender rule.

The United States has the most vibrant and innovative financial system in the world. Recent advancements in technology have fostered products and partnerships that expand access to credit to large swaths of the population that previously couldn’t access basic financial services.

Many of these innovations faced challenges from regulatory red tape or confusing and often conflicting rules. The OCC’s true lender rule gave needed clarity to banks and their partners, fixing the disastrous Madden rule.

The OCC’s true lender rule gave that clarity, but unfortunately, the effort in the House today threatens to undermine the progress that we have made and compromise underbanked individuals’ and small businesses’ access to financial services.

I spoke with a local Kentucky bank that partners with a nonbank fintech lender to provide credit to consumers, including many underbanked populations. They told me that absent the true lender rule, they will once again be buried in compliance costs to keep track of the patchwork of cases that dictate the rules of the road.

Rather than embrace innovation to deliver cost savings to their customers, many of whom have trouble accessing traditional financial services to begin with, the bank will need to retain thousand-dollar-an-hour New York lawyers just to keep everything straight. And guess what? Those costs get passed on to the consumer through higher prices or reduced product availability.

This is yet another example of the Democrats sacrificing good policy for the sake of political points, all under the guise of consumer protection.

Contrary to some of the rhetoric from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, a vote for this CRA will actually harm the very people they purport to be helping.

Madam Speaker, one final point. I include in the RECORD an April 14, 2021, letter to the chair of the Financial Services Committee from the former OCC Acting Comptroller Blake Paulson.

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER  
OF THE CURRENCY,  
Washington, DC, April 14, 2021.

Hon. MAXINE WATERS,  
Chairwoman, Committee on Financial Services,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.  
Hon. PATRICK MCHENRY,  
Ranking Member, Committee on Financial Services,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN WATERS AND RANKING MEMBER MCHENRY: On March 26, 2021, H.J. Res. 35 was introduced, providing for Congressional disapproval under the Congressional Review Act of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency’s (OCC) final rule, entitled “National Banks and Federal Savings Associations as Lenders,” commonly referred to as the “True Lender” rule. As you and other members consider the resolution, I want you to be aware of the rule’s intended effect and the adverse impact of overturning the rule.

On October 27, 2020, the OCC issued its final true lender rule to provide legal and regulatory certainty to national banks’ and federal savings associations’ (banks) lending, including loans made in partnerships with third parties. The OCC’s rule specifies that a bank makes a loan and is considered to be the true lender of the loan if, as of the date of origination, it (1) is named as the lender in the loan agreement or (2) funds the loan. The rule clarifies that as the true lender of a loan, the bank retains the compliance obligations associated with making the loan, even if the loan is later sold, thus negating concerns regarding harmful rent-a-charter arrangements. Our rulemaking prevents potential arrangements in which a bank receives a fee to “rent” its charter and unique legal status to a third party with the intent of evading state and local laws, while disclaiming any compliance responsibility for the loan. These schemes have absolutely no place in the federal banking system, and this rule helps address them.

The rule makes clear banks’ responsibility and accountability for the loans they make and facilitates the OCC’s supervision of this core banking activity. Disapproval of the rule would return bank lending relationships to the previous state of legal and regulatory uncertainty, which, as nearly 50 preeminent economic and finance scholars explained in January 2021, adversely affects the function of secondary markets and restricts the availability of credit.

Legal and regulatory certainty facilitates access to responsible credit and clarifies responsibility and accountability in lending involving third-party partnerships. Bank third-party partnerships help banks better serve their communities by expanding access to affordable credit products from mainstream financial service providers. Such access is particularly important as individuals and small businesses across the country work to recover from effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. Banks seek partnerships with third parties for a variety of legitimate reasons, including reaching additional markets, benefiting from specific expertise or technology, and improving the efficiency and cost of their own operations. The OCC’s third-party risk management guidance and supplemental exam procedures make clear to banks that they retain the risks for activities conducted through relationships with third parties.

With the legal and regulatory certainty provided by the rule, lending by banks made in partnership with third parties can be assessed as part of the ongoing supervision of these banks, including as part of the OCC’s examinations to evaluate bank compliance with applicable laws and regulations that ensure consumer protection, Bank Secrecy Act and anti-money laundering compliance, required disclosures, and other obligations associated with making loans. The OCC clarified examiner responsibilities in assessing true lender activities in third-party relationships in 2021. This clarification addressed considerations related to assessing banks’ due diligence on the lending product or activity (e.g., terms and scope) and the third party; credit risk management, including underwriting practices; model risk management; compliance management systems; and ongoing monitoring of the lending activity and the third party’s performance.

If a bank fails to satisfy any of its compliance obligations, the OCC will not hesitate to use its supervisory and enforcement authorities to correct the deficiencies, protect consumers, and ensure the federal banking system operates in a safe, sound, and fair manner.

As you consider the Congressional Review Act resolution, you should be confident that the OCC issued this rule with the intent to enhance its ability to supervise bank lending. The rulemaking conformed to the Administrative Procedure Act, and the agency considered all stakeholder comments provided during the rulemaking process. The resulting rule is consistent with the authority granted to the agency by Congress.

It is also important to dispel misperceptions of the rule, many of which are repeated by opponents of the rule. To be clear, the rule does not change banks’ authority to export interest rates. That authority is granted by federal statute. Nor does the rule permit national banks to charge whatever rate they like; national banks and federal savings associations have the same authority as state banks regarding the exportation of interest rates. Both federal and state-chartered banks must conform to applicable interest rate limits. Disparities of interest rates from state to state result from differences in the state laws that impose these caps, not OCC rules or actions. States retain the authority to set interest rates, and rates vary from state-to-state.

The rule does not limit states’ ability to regulate the conduct of state-licensed and regulated nonbank lenders, which engage in the vast majority of predatory lending. States are the primary regulators of nonbank lenders, including payday lenders. Nonbank lenders are generally also subject to the rules and enforcement actions of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB).

It is also important to understand why demand exists for short-term, small-dollar credit products and why many consumers rely on nonbank sources of such credit, including payday lenders. Unfortunately, mainstream service providers, including commercial banks, largely abandoned short-term small-dollar lending over the past two decades. The resulting lack of choice and fewer options pushed up the cost of these products and forced consumers to seek services on less favorable terms. Because millions of U.S. consumers do not have sufficient savings or access to traditional credit, they borrow nearly \$90 billion each year in short-term small-dollar loans typically ranging from \$300 to \$5,000 to make ends meet and to address things like emergency car repairs and other unexpected expenses. That is why the OCC has remained vocal about encouraging banks to provide consumers with more safe and affordable options to meet these small-dollar needs. In providing these products, banks should consider the "Interagency Lending Principles for Offering Responsible Small-Dollar Loans," published in May 2020. Banks should also consider the full and actual cost of a credit product and its affordability. Fees associated with short-term loans may range from \$10 to \$30 per \$100 borrowed, and the imputed annual percentage rate (APR) of those loans can appear to exceed 100 percent or more. But often, the fees and total cost of these loans to the consumer can be less than that of loans made with a 36 percent APR, when such loans are available at all.

As you consider the Congressional Review Act resolution, please keep in mind what may be an unintended consequence of a Congressional Review Act disapproval. Disapproving the OCC's true lender rule will constrain future Comptroller ability to address the true lender issue and may limit the OCC's ability to take supervisory or enforcement actions against banks that would have been deemed to have "made" the loan under the true lender rule. Rather than vacate the rule, limit future Comptrollers from taking up similar rules or possibly hamstringing the OCC's enforcement authority, changes to the rule, if any, should be made through the agency's rulemaking process and in accordance with the Administrative Procedures Act.

Enclosed is a fact sheet that provides additional information for your awareness. If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me or Carrie Moore, Director, Congressional Relations.

Sincerely,

BLAKE J. PAULSON,  
*Acting Comptroller of the Currency.*

Mr. BARR. The point I want to highlight is that the former Acting Comptroller was making the point that disapproving the OCC's true lender rule will constrain a future Comptroller's ability to address the true lender issue and limit the OCC's ability to take supervisory or enforcement actions against banks that would have been deemed to have made the loan under the true lender rule; meaning that the way the CRA law operates, if the House passes this resolution, we will have a permanent problem in the credit markets that will deprive low- and moderate-income Americans of the financial products that they desperately need.

That is why I urge all my colleagues to reject this misguided proposal.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER).

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I express my gratitude to Chairwoman WATERS for allowing me to speak in support of invalidating the predatory true lender rule.

In our home State, the legislature passed an interest rate cap of 36 percent on loans of up to \$10,000 about 2 years ago.

Before California Governor Newsom had even signed this bill into law, predatory online lenders began plotting during their shareholder earnings calls to evade the new law through rent-a-bank arrangements. Companies like Speedy Cash and CashNetUSA went so far as to gloat about the California law creating a huge opportunity for them by driving out their competition, subprime title lenders based in California.

Since the founding of the United States, States have chosen to impose their own limits on interest rates that lenders may charge consumers. The Trump administration's true lender rule greenlit these rent-a-bank schemes and, in doing so, undermined the will of Californians who, through the democratic process, chose to prohibit abusive interest rates.

The true lender rule violates our federalist democracy, and it must be invalidated.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS), who has been a great new Member of Congress.

Mr. DONALDS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to allow me to speak on this matter.

It is important to understand, Madam Speaker, that having access to financial products is critical for not only the innovation of our markets but for the future expansion of our markets. It is time to take the pettiness out of politics and actually prioritize policy that puts Americans first and puts America first.

True lender is not being discussed in a way that considers people. If that were the case, we would be recognizing the incredible ways it has spurred innovation in our markets and has provided more access to credit and other financial products for Americans.

Instead of Congress working together to create financial equity in a sustainable way or ensuring that the United States remains a global leader, Democrats are working to undo anything accomplished under the Trump administration, even if it means sacrificing the good of the people.

I support assessing harmful financial policies of the past and working to undo some of the mistakes that have been made. In fact, we could benefit from assessing legislation like Dodd-Frank, which has put tremendous downward pressure on community banks being formed in the United States. But that is not what is being done here.

We are not having honest conversations. My peers across the aisle are undoing good policy without an objective view to determine how it helps or hurts Americans.

Fintech has played a significant role in transforming our markets, helping smaller banks become more competitive, and creating more products and access for Americans. The true lender rule has supported that because it clarifies the legal framework that allows these bank and nonbank partnerships to be successful for consumers.

We should be prioritizing fair access to financial services for Americans and work to protect and promote innovation in our markets so that consumers have as many pathways as possible to prosperity and achieving the American Dream.

If we scrap the true lender rule, we will disrupt our market, stifle innovation, and hinder access to accountable and affordable credit for consumers and small businesses. This is not the precedent we should set in this body. It is a gross abuse of power and a knife in the back of consumers.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The true lender rule specifies that when a bank makes a loan, the bank is the true lender. The rule clarifies what was uncertain and, therefore, made those loans more expensive.

This gives certainty to the marketplace. It is a good thing. The true lender rule is a good thing.

Under the true lender rule, we have fintechs that have been enabled to make loans in coordination with banks and regulated like the people that they work with, like the banks that they work with, which means the loans fall under Federal consumer protection laws, under Federal usury laws, under Federal laws.

One case in point, what the true lender rule enabled was one out of four African American-owned businesses accessing credit through fintechs.

I would ask Members to review a few pieces of evidence that I have here.

Madam Speaker, I would refer the Members to a study conducted by NYU highlighting the important role that fintechs play in supporting African American-owned small businesses.

I would also refer the Members to letters in opposition to S.J. Res. 15: a June 8 letter from the American Bankers Association, Consumer Bankers Association, Electronic Transactions Association, Independent Bankers of America, Midsize Bank Coalition of America, and National Bankers Association; an April 2, 2021, letter from FreedomWorks, Americans for Tax Reform, National Taxpayers Union, Center for a Free Economy, American Commitment, and Citizens Against Government Waste; a letter from the Structured Finance Association; a letter from the Independent Community Bankers of America; a May 11, 2021, letter from the American Bankers Association; a May 7, 2021, letter from the

Americans for Prosperity; and a June 22, 2021, letter from the Competitive Enterprise Institute, which consists of a number of additional signatories.

None of those people are payday lenders, by the way, which is the most spurious argument about the true lender rule. If you want to get at payday lending, go talk about valid when made. That would be the sound argument from there. At least it has some relationship tangentially to payday lending. True lender does not. These are different loans that are being described by my colleagues across the aisle.

Let's be clear. The National Banking Act enacted in 1864 established the principle by which and explicitly granted national banks the ability to transfer loans State-by-State. If you don't like that model, then repeal the 1864 National Banking Act instead of making these false arguments about the true lender rule, which simply provides clarity about the National Banking Act.

My colleagues across the aisle would have you believe that this is a complex scheme cooked up by the previous administration to get around consumer protection laws. That is not true. We are talking about 157 years of banking law here in the United States, and my colleagues across the aisle are arguing about that.

My Democratic colleagues also ignored this basic fact: They have made misleading statements about national banks versus State banks. They have implied falsehoods on State interest rates. They have cited protecting consumers when now they are just leaving them out to dry. That is not consumer protection.

I get it, Democrats are now so politically motivated that the facts and longstanding precedent no longer matter. I think facts matter. In fact, Democrats are so blinded by partisanship, some can't even seem to differentiate between that doctrine of valid when made versus what we are discussing today, which is true lender. I think we should be rooted in fact, and our policy debates should be rooted in fact.

Make no mistake, the true lender rule provides necessary consumer protections and supports affordable credit to more communities. The rule does nothing to change interest rates, plain and simple. States retain that authority.

The actions in 2020 to clarify true lender are very different than codifying and clarifying valid when made. Both were important clarifications, though.

The argument today is about true lender, not some massive shift away from congressional intent, not something new, something longstanding.

Regardless, the Democrats will push through whatever they can in the House today. But as former Acting Comptroller Brooks recently stated, nullifying the true lender rule does nothing to undo payday lending—nothing. And it seems to be what my colleagues across the aisle have a real problem with.

Deal with that. Don't create needless pain for consumers. Don't drive up the cost of credit and make it less available by repealing this true lender rule.

This is another moment where my colleagues are working against the national banks for politics rather than protecting consumers and creating a more vibrant, competitive, and innovative marketplace.

We should do what is good for consumers in the financial system. Technology and innovation facilitate financial inclusion, which should be our goal.

Let's not waste further time here. Let's vote this idea down that we are debating right now. Let's get back to actually driving a more competitive marketplace and doing what is right for our constituents, what is right for consumers, and what is right for families.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCCOLLUM). The gentlewoman has 18 minutes remaining.

□ 1415

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this resolution would take the necessary action to reverse the harmful Trump-era true lender rule that preys on small business owners and individuals when they need assistance the most. This rule is a back door for nonbanks to charge triple digit interest rates that trap consumers.

Last month, the Senate passed this resolution on a bipartisan vote with all Democrats voting in support. They were joined by Republican Senators LUMMIS, RUBIO, and COLLINS. This resolution is also supported by more than 400 consumer, civil rights, veterans, small businesses, and other organizations, including the American Civil Liberties Union, Americans for Financial Reform, the Center for Responsible Lending, Faith for Just Lending, the NAACP, National Association of Federally-Insured Credit Unions, the National Consumer Law Center, Conference of State Bank Supervisors, and 25 State attorneys general from both red and blue States, among many others.

Madam Speaker, and Members, small businesses and underbanked consumers do not benefit from the rule. Instead, the rule allows nonbank lenders to launder loans through banks in order to charge those with limited access to credit triple digit interest rates and trap these consumers in devastating cycles of debt. These predatory rent-a-bank schemes disproportionately prey on communities of color, draining wealth from these communities and, in turn, perpetuating the racial wealth gap.

A disproportionate share of payday borrowers come from communities of color even after controlling for income. Communities of color have historically been left out of the banking system. Black and Latinx consumers are much less likely to have a checking account than White consumers, which is typically a requirement for a payday loan. About 17 percent of Black and 14 percent of Latinx households are unbanked compared to 3 percent of White households.

Payday lenders target communities of color. The communities most affected by redlining are the same who are saturated by payday lenders today, which are more likely to locate in more affluent communities of color than in less affluent White communities.

One borrower, a single mother living below the poverty line from California, submitted a complaint to the CFPB about Elevate's RISE.

"I was misled by RISE Credit to believe that they were unlike other predatory loan companies. By the time," she says, "I understood what I had signed, I had paid them thousands of dollars in interest."

"I have recently become temporarily unemployed and called them to ask for help during my time of financial hardship. They refused any solution and my account is headed to collections now."

"The total paid is far over the amount initially borrowed from RISE. This is robbery, and all of the necessities I have for myself and my children are suffering because of it."

"How is it that they can do this? I am asking for help for not only my family, but for all of the families targeted by these predatory loans meant to target those living in poverty and struggling to live paycheck to paycheck."

The fake lender rule protects lenders that not only destroy small businesses but also threaten to take business owners' homes.

In New York, Jacob Adoni, a realtor, has been facing foreclosure threats on a \$90,000 loan with an interest rate of 138 percent APR.

In a court case—that is Adoni et al. v. World Business Lenders, LLC, Axos Bank and Circadian Funding filed in New York in October 2019—Adoni said he received threats that the lender would foreclose on his home after receiving a \$90,000 loan at 138 percent APR, secured by his personal residence.

"Adoni was contacted by Circadian Funding with an offer of a personal loan that would be funded by WLB and Axos Bank. He was told that the loan documents would be provided to him at 12 p.m. and he must execute them by 6 p.m. or the offer would no longer be valid."

"Adoni was told by Circadian that the loan was meant to be a personal loan to him, but it was necessary for the loan documents to make reference to his business."

He has received multiple threats to foreclose on his home and the mortgage.

Madam Speaker, let me just respond to some of what I have heard from the opposite side of the aisle. I am absolutely overcome by the great interest that my Republican colleagues have in helping minorities. I am so moved about the fact that all this is about helping minorities who have been put into trouble because they are subprime lenders. Now if they are, it is because they were the victim of predatory lenders who put them in a subprime position.

But I hardly think that this is all about taking care of minorities and these small businesses. This is about protecting the big banks. This is about protecting the national banks. You heard what the ranking member said. The big national banks have been in business for years, and we ought to let them operate the way that they have historically operated and not interfere with them.

I don't know where they get away with protecting these big national banks. And the constituents in their own district who are being misused because they happen to get money, money that was lent to them by a nonbank, and that nonbank partnered with a national bank, they are now having to pay the interest rates of another State, perhaps—like it was explained in California, why we have usury laws and there is a cap on those interest rates.

When they do this kind of partnering, it is all about getting to a State where they are made to pay whatever that big bank is allowed to collect from them.

Madam Speaker, this is a rip-off. This is about hurting the people who most need our help. This is about allowing this partnering to go on. And many of those people who are borrowing from these payday lenders and other nonbanks don't even know that they are going to be the victims of the big banks and the interest rates that they charge. This is absolutely ridiculous, and there is not a credible argument from the other side of the aisle about why they should disadvantage these minorities and small businesses that they claim that they are protecting. This is outrageous.

Madam Speaker, I am so pleased that the Senate passed this bill. And I am so pleased that the Republicans on the other side of the aisle—not on the other side of the aisle, on the other side of Congress—decided to join with the Democrats in order to do the right thing on behalf of our constituents.

Madam Speaker, when they talk about, Oh, this is just because they didn't like Trump and they want to undo whatever he has done, that is their talking point for the day. This is not about that.

This committee, the Committee on Financial Services, is a new and different kind of committee. We are not owned by the banks. We are not here to protect the big banks and the national banks. We are here because we are here to take care of what is right and what

is fair. And this committee is not going to be about the business of ripping off the least of these.

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

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

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

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

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

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

#### PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION RELATING TO "UPDATE OF COMMISSION'S CONCILIATION PROCEDURES"

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, pursuant to section 7 of House Resolution 486, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 13) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission relating to "Update of Commission's Conciliation Procedures", and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 486, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

#### S.J. RES. 13

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission relating to "Update of Commission's Conciliation Procedures" (86 Fed. Reg. 2974; published January 14, 2021), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials on S.J. Res. 13.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of S.J. Res. 13, a Congressional Review Act resolution disapproving the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, or EEOC, Conciliation Rule.

This resolution will help ensure fairness for those who bring forth charges of unlawful workplace discrimination.

When the EEOC has found that an employer likely violated the law, it is required under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to engage in conciliation before filing a lawsuit. This conciliation process is meant to be an informal and confidential opportunity for parties to settle a charge of discrimination in lieu of going to court.

Unfortunately, in the final weeks of the Trump administration, the EEOC issued a final rule that imposed onerous new requirements on the conciliation process.

Under the new rule, the EEOC must provide an employer with a written summary of the facts and the nonprivileged information the EEOC relied on to determine that the employer violated the law. Notably, the rule requires the EEOC to expose the identities of workers or groups of workers for whom relief is being sought unless they proactively request anonymity, and their witnesses.

This new rule will put a thumb on the scale in favor of employers in cases where the EEOC found that they likely violated workers' civil rights. Specifically, the rule incentivizes employers to focus litigation on whether the EEOC failed to satisfy the rule's new requirements instead of whether the employer engaged in unlawful discrimination.

In fact, on settlement—settlements had been more likely since the Supreme Court ruled that this conciliation process should be informal, unlike the rule that was promulgated late in the Trump administration. This will allow unscrupulous employers to drag out the conciliation process, possibly for years—and even avoid accountability altogether—by just litigating over whether the EEOC complied with the conciliation rule rather than correcting the discriminatory process.

The EEOC rule conflicts with the Supreme Court's 2015 decision in *Mach Mining v. EEOC*. It was a unanimous decision. It held that the EEOC must

have the discretion to use whatever informal means of settlement are appropriate in each individual case. However, under the new rule, a rigid conciliation process will apply across the board, one-size-fits-all, in every case of workplace discrimination.

This solution will likely lead to increased retaliation against victims of discrimination and witnesses, as well as needless delays in justice for workers. We know that justice delayed is justice denied. This is why civil rights leaders and worker advocates across the country have called on Congress to pass this Congressional Review Act resolution and restore fairness for victims of workplace discrimination.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Statement of Administrative Policy from the Biden administration in support of this resolution.

#### STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

S.J. RES. 13—A JOINT RESOLUTION FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION RELATING TO “UPDATE OF COMMISSION’S CONCILIATION PROCEDURES”—SEN. MURRAY, D-WA, AND NO CO-SPONSORS

The Administration supports Senate passage of Senate Joint Resolution 13 to nullify the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission’s (EEOC) recently promulgated “Update of Commission’s Conciliation Procedures,” which became effective on February 16, 2021, under the Congressional Review Act. The rule that S.J. Res. 13 would nullify imposed onerous and rigid new procedures on the EEOC’s obligation to conciliate or “settle” meritorious claims of employment discrimination, that risks unduly delaying and diverting limited resources from agency efforts to investigate and resolve meritorious claims of employment discrimination. The rule increases the risk of retaliation by making it easier for employers to demand the identities of those with information about unlawful discrimination, which will likely have a chilling effect on the willingness of victims and witnesses to come forward. S.J. Res. 13 would nullify the rule’s unnecessary and burdensome standards that would likely result in increased charge backlogs, and lengthier charge investigation, resolution and litigation times. The resolution will also ensure that EEOC has the flexibility to tailor settlements to the facts and circumstances of each case, thus increasing the likelihood of voluntary compliance. The resolution will furthermore ensure that justice for workers subject to discrimination is not delayed, or potentially denied, due to costly and time-consuming collateral litigation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to S.J. Res. 13, which negates a recent U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, EEOC, rule. I urge Members to reject this misguided resolution.

The rule in question, often referred to as the conciliation rule, is fair, increases transparency, reduces senseless litigation, and upholds a Federal statute.

There are dozens of pressing problems demanding Congress’ attention. Our southern border is being run over by drug dealers and human traffickers. America is vulnerable to cyberattacks from adversarial foreign nations, like China and Russia. Our children are months behind in their schoolwork because of Democrats’ insistence on putting teachers’ union leadership demands before students’ interests.

We could be addressing those problems, but Democrats are choosing to elevate the repeal of this commonsense rule before all those other immediate issues.

Let’s examine the facts of the matter. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires EEOC to engage in conciliation. Before the EEOC can pursue court proceedings against an employer for a discrimination claim, the agency must work with the business to resolve the dispute.

There are good reasons Congress established this requirement. Successful conciliations provide immediate relief to employees who suffered discrimination. Conciliations also save these employees time and money. Court cases are adversarial and can last years. Individuals who experience discrimination should not have to wait years for justice.

Nothing in the regulation prohibits the EEOC from using the court system if conciliation fails. For over four decades, EEOC’s conciliation process remained largely ineffectual and unaltered. Antiquated bureaucratic systems deserve scrutiny, and this opaque practice was long overdue for improvement.

Prior to the rule’s promulgation, a paltry 41 percent of the conciliations were successful. One out of every three employers declined to participate in this broken process.

In 2015, the Supreme Court reprimanded the EEOC for its inadequate conciliation process, which included failing to communicate basic information about the alleged discrimination to employers. The mounting evidence of a failed conciliation process grew harder and harder for the EEOC to ignore. That is why the conciliation rule was issued on January 14, after an extensive notice-and-comment rule-making.

Under the rule, the core tenets of conciliation remain unchanged. Conciliation stays voluntary, does not favor either the employer or the worker, and protects individuals’ privacy.

The rule requires the EEOC to provide employers with basic but important information in support of the agency’s findings, including simple underlying facts, the legal basis for the finding, an explanation of the monetary relief calculations, and whether the EEOC designated the case for a class of individuals.

The rule also does not increase costs to taxpayers. EEOC is on the record saying its operating budget will absorb any minor costs associated with implementing the rule.

In summary, S.J. Res. 13 harms the victims of discrimination; encourages the EEOC to pursue needless, combative, and expensive litigation; and turns the EEOC back into a politically driven, runaway bureaucracy.

Madam Speaker, I urge Members to vote “no” on S.J. Res. 13, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), the chair of the Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Human Services, and cosponsor of the House version of this resolution.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S.J. Res. 13, a resolution to repeal a harmful rule from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission that threatens to delay or potentially deny justice for individuals who face workplace discrimination.

As chair of the Education and Labor Committee’s Civil Rights and Human Services Subcommittee, I am pleased to co-lead the House companion to this resolution because far too many workers still experience workplace discrimination. The Civil Rights Act helps workers seek redress by directing the EEOC to engage in conciliation, which provides an opportunity for settlement before going to court.

But the EEOC’s new rule added burdensome requirements, and it gives employers unfair advantages in the conciliation process. Under the rule, the EEOC discloses confidential information, analysis, and even the identities of workers to employers, increasing the likelihood of retaliation.

By passing this resolution, we can direct the EEOC to revert to its prior practices, which were upheld by the Supreme Court.

Madam Speaker, I want to note that in the Mach Mining decision from the U.S. Supreme Court in 2015, the Court held that “Every aspect of the Title VII’s conciliation provision smacks of flexibility. To begin with, the EEOC need only to ‘endeavor’ to conciliate a claim, without having to devote a set amount of time or resources to that project.”

We can direct the EEOC to revert to those prior practices that were upheld and that better support the needs of workers.

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman SCOTT for his leadership, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Madam Speaker, Democrats have claimed that EEOC’s conciliation rule could subject employees to retaliation. This claim could not be further from the truth.

First, the rule explicitly states that employees may remain anonymous in the conciliation process if they so choose. In such cases, settlement discussions would proceed with the employee or employees making claims of discrimination remaining anonymous.

Second, the existing statutes to which the conciliation rule applies all make it illegal for an employer to retaliate against an employee for filing a charge with EEOC or participating in EEOC proceedings. An employer would be compounding its legal exposure if it unwisely tried to act against employees for making a complaint to the EEOC.

The claim that the conciliation rule will expose employees to retaliation is a red herring.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this misguided resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, just to state on the question of whether or not the individuals can be revealed, identifying the aggrieved individuals must take place, but not if the individual or individuals have requested anonymity. That means you have to know that you are about to be revealed. You have to proactively request anonymity. If you haven't gone through those steps, then you will be revealed.

That is an unnecessary step. It puts people in unnecessary jeopardy, and I hope they would not subject that. It is not necessary. The EEOC has an obligation to do conciliation, but they need to do it on an individualized case, best aimed at settlement and based on an individual case, and reveal the information that is best for that purpose, and no more.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, in 2015, the Supreme Court harshly criticized EEOC's conciliation process in the Mach Mining decision, which held that a court may review whether the EEOC satisfied its statutory obligation to engage in conciliation before filing a lawsuit.

The agency claimed that two "book-end letters" were all that was needed to satisfy the statutory conciliation requirement, one at the beginning of the process announcing a finding of discrimination, and one at the end stating that conciliation had failed.

The Supreme Court disagreed and ruled that the EEOC must disclose to the employer "what practice has harmed which person or class, and provide the employer an 'opportunity' to discuss the matter in an effort to achieve voluntary compliance."

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, S.J. Res. 13 is a partisan maneuver to overturn an eminently reasonable regulation. Before the rule, the EEOC's conciliation process was out of date, opaque, and inef-

fective. Individuals subject to workplace discrimination should not have to wait years for justice.

Employers are not asking too much when they request basic information about the EEOC's findings. The conciliation rule updates a broken system and is beneficial to both workers and employers.

S.J. Res. 13 delivers a partisan victory for the Democrats' technocrat base.

Madam Speaker, I reject S.J. Res. 13, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me.

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

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

Madam Speaker, it is our responsibility to reverse the EEOC's new conciliation rule. Before this harmful rule change, the EEOC's conciliation process was what it was meant to be, an informal, flexible, confidential opportunity to settle discrimination claims before going to court. That is what the Supreme Court ruled unanimously in 2015.

□ 1445

Now, the new conciliation rule is threatening to stack the process against workers by subjecting those who make discrimination claims to an increased risk of retaliation and allowing employers to hijack the process to focus on whether it failed to conciliate, not whether the employer violated the law.

Simply put, this is an unnecessary new regulation which will, at best, delay justice for victims of discrimination and, at worst, open the door for collateral litigation, adding potentially years to the process before ever reaching the merits of the discrimination claim.

That is why advocates of victims of discrimination support the resolution.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights signed by 24 civil rights groups in support of the resolution.

THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE  
ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS,  
Washington, DC, June 9, 2021.

Re Support S.J. Res. 13, a Congressional Review Act Resolution of Disapproval to Protect Workers from a Harmful EEOC Rule

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned 24 civil and workers' rights organizations urge you to vote for S.J. Res. 13, a Congressional Review Act (CRA) resolution of disapproval to undo a January 14, 2021, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) final rule that threatens to harm working people seeking relief from discrimination and to impede the work of the EEOC.

The EEOC final rule made several changes to conciliation, the process by which the EEOC tries to settle a charge of workplace discrimination. Instead of ensuring that discrimination charges are resolved fairly, the EEOC's final rule imposes several new obligations and disclosures that:

Significantly weight the conciliation process in favor of employers;

Delay justice and increase the likelihood of harm to working people;

Divert scarce EEOC staff time and resources away from investigating discrimination; and

Contravene controlling U.S. Supreme Court precedent.

The Senate passed S.J. Res. 13 on May 19, 2021. If the House now passes this resolution, Congress could undo this harmful rule and restore the status quo with respect to the EEOC's procedures. A resolution of disapproval is an appropriate exercise of Congress's power in this case, because the CRA is the most expeditious and effective option for addressing the negative impacts of the EEOC's final rule.

The EEOC must be able to conduct its work efficiently in order to be effective in its mission to prevent and remedy workplace discrimination. This mission is even more critical in the middle of a global pandemic that continues to have severe economic repercussions for women, people of color, and other marginalized communities, including a heightened risk of job loss, health and safety hazards, and discrimination based on sex, race, age, and disability.

Individuals who experience discrimination on the job already face significant hurdles to seeking redress, including retaliation, lack of information about their rights, and lack of access to legal assistance. When an individual does file a charge of discrimination against their employer with the EEOC, the agency collects information and conducts an investigation. If the EEOC finds "reasonable cause" to believe employment discrimination has occurred, the parties are invited to participate in the conciliation process, which seeks to settle or resolve the charges of discrimination informally and confidentially, in lieu of filing a lawsuit. Title VII requires the EEOC to attempt resolution of charges informally before considering or proceeding with litigation, and the EEOC may only pursue litigation if conciliation has failed.

The final rule will only deepen the barriers working people face coming forward to report discrimination and obtain justice. It requires the EEOC to grant the employer access to details of the victim and witnesses' identity and allegations, escalating the risk of retaliation for workers. Claims of retaliation made up more than half of all charges filed at the EEOC in FY 2020, and fear of retaliation prevents many victims of discrimination from coming forward and many witnesses from being forthright—something that may be especially true during an economic crisis. The rule also requires the EEOC to disclose critical information concerning the EEOC's legal analysis of the case to employers, and employers only. In other words, the EEOC would be required to automatically turn over its case files to employers whom the agency believes to have acted unlawfully, but not to the working people who are seeking a remedy for the discrimination they faced. This practice would exacerbate resource and information inequities between the parties to the benefit of employers only. Although the proposed rule would allow disclosures to the charging party upon request, many working people who file charges are unrepresented by counsel and will not know to make such a request. The EEOC, whose mission is to prevent and remedy discrimination, should not, in its own procedural rules, disadvantage the very party seeking to remedy discrimination.

By imposing inflexible rules on the conciliation process, the EEOC final rule also flouts congressional intent and is inconsistent with Supreme Court precedent. In its unanimous 2015 decision *Mach Mining, LLC v. EEOC*, the Supreme Court explained that



“every aspect of Title VII’s conciliation provision smacks of flexibility,” which allows the EEOC to tailor its approach to conciliation in the way most appropriate in each case. Without flexibility, the EEOC will be forced to divert resources away from investigating and remedying workplace discrimination and put them toward satisfying the final rule’s burdensome standards, resulting in increased delays at the expense of victims of discrimination.

In addition, the rules would saddle EEOC with wasteful collateral litigation attacking the conciliation process, prolonging harm to workers through increased delay. This tactic was prevalent before Mach Mining, and that case itself shows the potential impact: The workers in Mach Mining—women excluded from coal mining jobs due to sex discrimination—were forced to wait nine years after the first charge was filed for relief, in part because of unmeritorious employer challenges to the conciliation process.

By invoking the CRA and passing a resolution of disapproval, Congress could quickly restore the status quo with respect to the EEOC’s conciliation procedures, minimizing the harm to workers and eliminating the need for the EEOC to expend its scarce resources either undertaking rulemaking processes to rescind the conciliation rule or implementing the onerous new procedures in the final rule, and defending the sufficiency of the new conciliation process in collateral litigation by employers.

Importantly, application of the CRA to the final rule ensures that the EEOC would be prohibited from promulgating a “substantially” similar rule in the future that would hinder vigorous enforcement of federal workplace antidiscrimination laws. The final conciliation rule was both procedurally and substantively flawed, raising concerns about its integrity. As such, Congress’s exercise of the CRA would be warranted here.

Accordingly, we urge you to support and vote for S.J. Res. 13, the CRA resolution of disapproval of the EEOC’s final rule. Please contact Gaylynn Burroughs of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights at [burroughs@civilrights.org](mailto:burroughs@civilrights.org), or Maya Raghu of the National Women’s Law Center at [mrghu@nwl.org](mailto:mrghu@nwl.org), if you have any questions.

Thank you,  
The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, National Women’s Law Center, A Better Balance, AFL–CIO, American Association of University Women (AAUW), Anti-Defamation League, Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, AFL–CIO, Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, Center for American Progress, Equal Rights Advocates, Feminist Majority, Futures Without Violence, Institute for Women’s Policy Research, National Action Network, National Association of Councils on Developmental Disabilities, National Employment Law Project, National Organization for Women, National Partnership for Women & Families, National Workrights Institute, Public Citizen, Sikh Coalition, TIME’S UP Now, Women Employed, Workplace Fairness.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, we cannot allow employers to drag out the conciliation process rather than be held accountable for violating workers’ civil rights.

As I said at the beginning of this debate, justice delayed is justice denied. That is why I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this resolution and taking a critical step to ensuring that those who suffer workplace discrimination can get timely and fair justice.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for working with me on the House version of the resolution.

I ask for the support of the House to pass the resolution to overturn the EEOC regulation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, I rise in strong support of S.J. Res. 13, a Congressional Review Act (CRA) resolution of disapproval to undo an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) final rule issued January 14, 2021 that threatens to harm working people seeking relief from discrimination and to impede the work of the EEOC.

The EEOC final rule made several changes to conciliation, the process by which the EEOC tries to settle a charge of workplace discrimination, all of which harm employees.

Instead of ensuring that discrimination charges are resolved fairly, the EEOC’s final rule imposes several new obligations and disclosures that:

1. Significantly weight the conciliation process in favor of employers;
2. Delay justice and increase the likelihood of harm to working people;
3. Divert scarce EEOC staff time and resources away from investigating discrimination; and
4. Contravene controlling U.S. Supreme Court precedent.

The Senate passed S.J. Res. 13 on May 19, 2021, and by following suit, the House can ensure this harmful rule is rescinded and the status quo ante is restored with respect to the EEOC’s procedures.

The EEOC must be able to conduct its work efficiently in order to be effective in its mission to prevent and remedy workplace discrimination.

This mission is even more critical in the middle of a global pandemic that continues to have severe economic repercussions for women, people of color, and other marginalized communities, including a heightened risk of job loss, health and safety hazards, and discrimination based on sex, race, age, and disability.

Madam Speaker, individuals who experience discrimination on the job already face significant hurdles to seeking redress, including retaliation, lack of information about their rights, and lack of access to legal assistance.

When an individual does file a charge of discrimination against their employer with the EEOC, the agency collects information and conducts an investigation.

If the EEOC finds “reasonable cause” to believe employment discrimination has occurred, the parties are invited to participate in the conciliation process, which seeks to settle or resolve the charges of discrimination informally and confidentially, in lieu of filing a lawsuit.

Title VII requires the EEOC to attempt resolution of charges informally before considering or proceeding with litigation, and the EEOC may only pursue litigation if conciliation has failed.

The final rule will only deepen the barriers working people face coming forward to report discrimination and obtain justice by requiring the EEOC to grant the employer access to details of the victim and witnesses’ identity and allegations, escalating the risk of retaliation for workers.

Claims of retaliation made up more than half of all charges filed at the EEOC in FY 2020, and fear of retaliation prevents many victims of discrimination from coming forward and many witnesses from being forthright—something that may be especially true during an economic crisis.

The rule also requires the EEOC to disclose critical information concerning the EEOC’s legal analysis of the case to employers, and employers only.

In other words, the EEOC would be required to automatically turn over its case files to employers whom the agency believes to have acted unlawfully, but not to the working people who are seeking a remedy for the discrimination they faced.

This practice would exacerbate resource and information inequities between the parties to the benefit of employers only.

The EEOC, whose mission is to prevent and remedy discrimination, should not, in its own procedural rules, disadvantage the very party seeking to remedy discrimination.

By imposing inflexible rules on the conciliation process, the EEOC final rule also flouts congressional intent and is inconsistent with Supreme Court precedent.

In its unanimous 2015 decision *Mach Mining, LLC v. EEOC*, 575 U.S. \_\_\_, 135 S. Ct. 1645, No. 13–1019 (2015), the Supreme Court stated that “every aspect of Title VII’s conciliation provision smacks of flexibility,” which allows the EEOC to tailor its approach to conciliation in the way most appropriate in each case.

Without flexibility, the EEOC will be forced to divert resources away from investigating and remedying workplace discrimination and put them toward satisfying the final rule’s burdensome standards, resulting in increased delays at the expense of victims of discrimination.

By invoking the CRA and passing a resolution of disapproval, Congress could quickly restore the status quo with respect to the EEOC’s conciliation procedures, minimizing the harm to workers and eliminating the need for the EEOC to expend its scarce resources either undertaking rulemaking processes to rescind the conciliation rule or implementing the onerous new procedures in the final rule, and defending the sufficiency of the new conciliation process in collateral litigation by employers.

In addition, application of the CRA to the final rule ensures that the EEOC would be prohibited from promulgating a “substantially” similar rule in the future that would hinder vigorous enforcement of federal workplace antidiscrimination laws.

For all of these reasons, I strongly support S.J. Res. 13, the CRA resolution of disapproval of the EEOC’s final rule and urge all Members to join me in voting for its passage.

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

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.



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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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

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

### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1500

### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. MCCOLLUM) at 3 p.m.

### PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF CURRENCY RELATING TO "NATIONAL BANKS AND FEDERAL SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS AS LENDERS"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 15) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of Currency relating to "National Banks and Federal Savings Associations as Lenders", on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 208, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

#### YEAS—218

Adams	Carbajal	Crist
Aguilar	Cárdenas	Crow
Allred	Carson	Cuellar
Auchincloss	Carter (LA)	Davids (KS)
Axne	Cartwright	Davis, Danny K.
Barragán	Case	Dean
Bass	Casten	DeFazio
Beatty	Castor (FL)	DeGette
Bera	Castro (TX)	DeLauro
Beyer	Chu	DelBene
Bishop (GA)	Cicilline	Delgado
Blumenauer	Clark (MA)	Demings
Blunt Rochester	Clarke (NY)	DeSaulnier
Bonamici	Cleaver	Deutch
Bourdeaux	Clyburn	Dingell
Bowman	Cohen	Doggett
Boyle, Brendan	Connolly	Doyle, Michael
F.	Cooper	F.
Brown	Correa	Escobar
Brownley	Costa	Eshoo
Bustos	Courtney	Español
Butterfield	Craig	Evans

Fletcher	Lofgren	Ryan
Foster	Lowenthal	Sánchez
Frankel, Lois	Luria	Sarbanes
Gallego	Lynch	Scanlon
Garamendi	Malinowski	Schakowsky
Garcia (IL)	Maloney,	Schiff
Garcia (TX)	Carolyn B.	Schneider
Golden	Maloney, Sean	Schrader
Gomez	Manning	Schrier
Gonzalez,	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Vicente	McBath	Scott, David
Gottheimer	McCollum	Sewell
Green, Al (TX)	McEachin	Sherman
Grijalva	McGovern	Sherrill
Grothman	McNerney	Sires
Harder (CA)	Meeks	Slotkin
Hayes	Meng	Smith (WA)
Higgins (NY)	Mfume	Soto
Himes	Moore (WI)	Spanberger
Horsford	Morelle	Speier
Houlihan	Moulton	Stansbury
Hoyer	Mrvan	Stanton
Huffman	Murphy (FL)	Stevens
Jackson Lee	Nadler	Strickland
Jacobs (CA)	Napolitano	Suozzi
Jayapal	Neal	Swalwell
Jeffries	Neguse	Takano
Johnson (GA)	Newman	Thompson (CA)
Johnson (TX)	Norcross	Thompson (MS)
Jones	O'Halleran	Titus
Kahele	Ocasio-Cortez	Tlaib
Kaptur	Omar	Tonko
Keating	Pallone	Torres (CA)
Kelly (IL)	Panetta	Torres (NY)
Kildee	Pappas	Trahan
Kilmer	Pascarell	Trone
Kim (NJ)	Payne	Underwood
Kind	Perlmutter	Peters
Kirkpatrick	Phillips	Vargas
Krishnamoorthi	Pingree	Veasey
Kuster	Pocan	Vela
Lamb	Porter	Velázquez
Langevin	Pressley	Wasserman
Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)	Schultz
Larson (CT)	Quigley	Waters
Lawrence	Raskin	Watson Coleman
Lawson (FL)	Rice (NY)	Welch
Lee (CA)	Ross	Wexton
Lee (NV)	Roybal-Allard	Wild
Leger Fernandez	Ruiz	Williams (GA)
Levin (CA)	Ruppersberger	Wilson (FL)
Levin (MI)	Rush	Yarmuth
Lieu		

#### NAYS—208

Aderholt	Davis, Rodney	Herrell
Allen	DesJarlais	Herrera Beutler
Amodei	Diaz-Balart	Hice (GA)
Armstrong	Donalds	Higgins (LA)
Arrington	Duncan	Hill
Babin	Dunn	Hinson
Bacon	Emmer	Hollingsworth
Baird	Estes	Hudson
Balderson	Fallon	Huizenga
Banks	Feenstra	Issa
Barr	Ferguson	Jackson
Bentz	Fischbach	Jacobs (NY)
Bergman	Fitzgerald	Johnson (LA)
Bice (OK)	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (OH)
Biggs	Fleischmann	Johnson (SD)
Bilirakis	Portenberry	Jordan
Bishop (NC)	Foxx	Joyce (OH)
Boebert	Franklin, C.	Joyce (PA)
Bost	Scott	Katko
Brady	Gaetz	Keller
Brooks	Gallagher	Kelly (MS)
Buchanan	Garbarino	Kelly (PA)
Buck	Garcia (CA)	Kim (CA)
Bucshon	Gibbs	Kinzinger
Budd	Gimenez	Kustoff
Burchett	Gohmert	LaHood
Burgess	Gonzales, Tony	LaMalfa
Calvert	Gonzalez (OH)	Lamborn
Cammack	Good (VA)	Latta
Carl	Gooden (TX)	LaTurner
Carter (GA)	Gosar	Lesko
Carter (TX)	Granger	Letlow
Cawthorn	Graves (LA)	Long
Chabot	Graves (MO)	Loudermilk
Cheney	Green (TN)	Lucas
Cline	Greene (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Cloud	Griffith	Mace
Clyde	Guest	Malliotakis
Cole	Guthrie	Mann
Comer	Hagedorn	Massie
Crawford	Harris	Mast
Crenshaw	Harshbarger	McCarthy
Curtis	Hartzler	McCaul
Davidson	Hern	McClain

McClintock	Reschenthaler	Stewart
McHenry	Rice (SC)	Taylor
McKinley	Rodgers (WA)	Tenney
Meijer	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (PA)
Meuser	Rogers (KY)	Tiffany
Miller (IL)	Rose	Timmons
Miller (WV)	Rosendale	Turner
Miller-Meeks	Rouzer	Upton
Moolenaar	Roy	Valadao
Moore (AL)	Rutherford	Van Drew
Moore (UT)	Salazar	Van Dуйne
Mullin	Scalise	Wagner
Murphy (NC)	Schweikert	Walberg
Nehls	Scott, Austin	Walorski
Newhouse	Sessions	Waltz
Norman	Simpson	Weber (TX)
Nunes	Smith (MO)	Webster (FL)
Obernolte	Smith (NE)	Wenstrup
Owens	Smith (NJ)	Westerman
Palazzo	Smucker	Williams (TX)
Palmer	Spartz	Wilson (SC)
Pence	Stauber	Wittman
Perry	Steel	Womack
Pfleger	Stefanik	Young
Posey	Steil	Zeldin
Reed	Steube	

#### NOT VOTING—4

Bush	Khanna
Fulcher	Mooney

□ 1530

Messrs. GARCIA of California, DUNN, ROY, and HICE of Georgia changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. SÁNCHEZ changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the joint resolution was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. BUSH. Madam Speaker, due to being stuck in traffic, I was unable to make it in time to vote on rollcall No. 181. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 181.

Stated against:

Mr. MOONEY. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 181.

#### MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Aderholt	Johnson (TX)	Rush
(Moolenaar)	(Jeffries)	(Underwood)
Amodei	Kirkpatrick	Sewell (DelBene)
(Balderson)	(Stanton)	Soto (Deutch)
Beatty (Clark)	Lawson (FL)	Titus (Connolly)
(MA))	(Evans)	Van Drew
Buchanan	Lieu (Beyer)	(Reschenthaler)
(Walorski)	Lowenthal	Veasey
Burgess	(Beyer)	(Fletcher)
(Jackson)	Meng (Clark)	Vela (Gomez)
Castor (FL)	(MA))	Velázquez
(Demings)	Miller (WV)	(Jeffries)
Crist (Deutch)	(Walorski)	Wasserman
DeFazio (Davids)	Mullin (Cole)	Schultz
(KS))	Napolitano	(Deutch)
DeSaulnier	(Correa)	Waters (Takano)
(Matsui)	Pappas (Kuster)	Wilson (FL)
Grijalva (García)	Payne (Pallone)	(Hayes)
(IL))	Rice (NY)	Young (Joyce)
Hoyer (Brown)	(Peters)	(OH))
	Ruiz (Aguilar)	

### LGBTQ BUSINESS EQUAL CREDIT ENFORCEMENT AND INVESTMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 1443) to amend the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to require the collection of small business loan data related to LGBTQ-owned businesses, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 252, nays 176, not voting 2, as follows:

## [Roll No. 182]

## YEAS—252

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

## NAYS—176

Aderholt	Gohmert	Moolenaar
Allen	Good (VA)	Mooney
Amodei	Gooden (TX)	Moore (AL)
Armstrong	Gosar	Moore (UT)
Arrington	Granger	Mullin
Babin	Graves (LA)	Nehls
Bacon	Graves (MO)	Norman
Baird	Green (TN)	Nunes
Balderson	Greene (GA)	Owens
Banks	Griffith	Palazzo
Barr	Grothman	Palmer
Bentz	Guest	Pence
Bergman	Guthrie	Perry
Bice (OK)	Hagedorn	Pfleger
Biggs	Harris	Posey
Bilirakis	Harshbarger	Reschenthaler
Bishop (NC)	Hartzler	Rice (SC)
Boebert	Hern	Rodgers (WA)
Brady	Herrell	Rogers (AL)
Brooks	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Hice (GA)	Rose
Buck	Hill	Rosendale
Bucshon	Hollingsworth	Rouzer
Budd	Hudson	Roy
Burchett	Huizenga	Rutherford
Burgess	Issa	Scalise
Cammack	Jackson	Schweikert
Carl	Jacobs (NY)	Scott, Austin
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Sessions
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Simpson
Cawthorn	Johnson (SD)	Smith (MO)
Chabot	Jordan	Smith (NE)
Cheney	Joyce (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Cline	Keller	Smucker
Cloud	Kelly (MS)	Spartz
Clyde	Kelly (PA)	Staubert
Comer	Kustoff	Stefanik
Crawford	LaHood	Steil
Crenshaw	LaMalfa	Steube
Curtis	Lamborn	Stewart
Davidson	Latta	Taylor
DesJarlais	LaTurner	Tenney
Donalds	Lesko	Thompson (PA)
Duncan	Letlow	Tiffany
Dunn	Long	Timmons
Estes	Loudermilk	Turner
Fallon	Lucas	Van Duyne
Feenstra	Luetkemeyer	Wagner
Ferguson	Mann	Walberg
Fischbach	Massie	Walorski
Fitzgerald	Mast	Waltz
Fleischmann	McCarthy	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	McCaull	Webster (FL)
Fox	McClain	Wenstrup
Franklin, C.	McClintock	Westerman
Scott	McKinley	Williams (TX)
Gaetz	Meuser	Wilson (SC)
Gallagher	Miller (IL)	Witman
Gibbs	Miller (WV)	Womack

## NOT VOTING—2

□ 1552

Mr. MEUSER changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Aderholt	Johnson (TX)	Rush
(Moolenaar)	(Jeffries)	(Underwood)
Amodei	Kirkpatrick	Sewell (DelBene)
(Balderson)	(Stanton)	Soto (Deutch)
Beatty (Clark)	Lawson (FL)	Titus (Connolly)
(MA))	(Evans)	Van Drew
Buchanan	Lieu (Beyer)	(Reschenthaler)
(Walorski)	Lowenthal	Veasey
(Beyer)	Meng (Clark)	(Fletcher)
Burgess	(MA))	Vela (Gomez)
(Jackson)	Miller (WV)	Velázquez
Castor (FL)	(Walorski)	(Jeffries)
(Demings)	Mullin (Cole)	Wasserman
Crist (Deutch)	Napolitano	Schultz
DeFazio (Davids)	(Correa)	(Deutch)
(KS)	Pappas (Kuster)	Waters (Takano)
DeSaulnier	Payne (Pallone)	Wilson (FL)
(Matsui)	Rice (NY)	(Hayes)
Grijalva (Garcia)	(Peters)	Young (Joyce)
(IL))	Ruiz (Aguilar)	(OH)
Hoyer (Brown)		

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION RELATING TO “UPDATE OF COMMISSION’S CONCILIATION PROCEDURES”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 13) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission relating to “Update of Commission’s Conciliation Procedures”, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 210, not voting 1, as follows:

## [Roll No. 183]

## YEAS—219

Adams	Doyle, Michael	Luria
Aguilar	F.	Lynch
Allred	Escobar	Malinowski
Auchincloss	Eshoo	Maloney,
Axne	Españlat	Carolyn B.
Barragán	Evans	Maloney, Sean
Bass	Fletcher	Manning
Beatty	Foster	Matsui
Bera	Frankel, Lois	McBath
Beyer	Gallego	McCollum
Bishop (GA)	Garamendi	McEachin
Blumenauer	Garcia (IL)	McGovern
Blunt Rochester	Garcia (TX)	McNerney
Bonamici	Golden	Meeks
Bourdeaux	Gomez	Meng
Bowman	Gonzalez,	Mfume
Boyle, Brendan	Vicente	Moore (WI)
F.	Gottheimer	Morelle
Brown	Green, Al (TX)	Moulton
Brownley	Grijalva	Mrvan
Bush	Harder (CA)	Murphy (FL)
Bustos	Hayes	Nadler
Butterfield	Higgins (NY)	Napolitano
Carbajal	Himes	Neal
Cárdenas	Horsford	Neguse
Carson	Houlahan	Newman
Carter (LA)	Hoyer	Norcross
Cartwright	Huffman	O'Halleran
Case	Jackson Lee	Ocasio-Cortez
Casten	Jacobs (CA)	Omar
Castor (FL)	Jayapal	Pallone
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Panetta
Chu	Johnson (GA)	Pappas
Cicilline	Johnson (TX)	Pascarell
Clark (MA)	Jones	Payne
Clarke (NY)	Kahele	Perlmutter
Cleaver	Kaptur	Peters
Clyburn	Keating	Phillips
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Pingree
Connolly	Khanna	Pocan
Cooper	Kildee	Porter
Correa	Kilmer	Pressley
Costa	Kim (NJ)	Price (NC)
Courtney	Kind	Quigley
Craig	Kirkpatrick	Raskin
Crist	Krishnamoorthi	Rice (NY)
Crow	Kuster	Ross
Cuellar	Lamb	Roybal-Allard
Davids (KS)	Langevin	Ruiz
Davis, Danny K.	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
Dean	Larson (CT)	Rush
DeFazio	Lawrence	Ryan
DeGette	Lawson (FL)	Sánchez
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Sarbanes
DelBene	Lee (NV)	Scanlon
Delgado	Leger Fernandez	Schakowsky
Demings	Levin (CA)	Levin (MI)
DeSaulnier	Levin (MI)	Schneider
Deutch	Lieu	Schrier
Dingell	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
Doggett	Lowenthal	

Scott, David  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Speier  
Stansbury  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Strickland

Suoizzi  
Swalwell  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres (NY)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Vargas

## NAYS—210

Aderholt  
Allen  
Amodei  
Armstrong  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Baird  
Balderson  
Banks  
Barr  
Bentz  
Bergman  
Bice (OK)  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (NC)  
Boebert  
Bost  
Brady  
Brooks  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Calvert  
Cammack  
Carl  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Cawthorn  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Cline  
Cloud  
Clyde  
Cole  
Comer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Curtis  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donalds  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes  
Fallon  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franklin, C.  
Scott  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garbarino  
Garcia (CA)  
Gibbs  
Gimenez  
Gohmert  
Gonzales, Tony

Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wexton  
Wild  
Williams (GA)  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

Gonzalez (OH)  
Good (VA)  
Gooden (TX)  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Greene (GA)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Hagedorn  
Harris  
Harshbarger  
Hartzler  
Hern  
Herrell  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice (GA)  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Hinson  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Issa  
Jackson  
Jacobs (NY)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)  
Katko  
Keller  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kim (CA)  
Kinzinger  
Kustoff  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
LaTurner  
Lesko  
Letlow  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Mace  
Malliotakis  
Mann  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClain  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
Meijer  
Meuser  
Miller (IL)  
Miller (WV)  
Miller-Meeks  
Moolenaar

## NOT VOTING—1

Fulcher

□ 1615

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE  
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Aderholt  
(Moolenaar)  
Amodei  
(Balderson)  
Beatty (Clark  
(MA))  
Buchanan  
(Walorski)  
Burgess  
(Jackson)  
Castor (FL)  
(Demings)  
Crist (Deutch)  
DeFazio (Davids  
(KS))  
DeSaulnier  
(Matsui)  
Grijalva (García  
(IL))  
Hoyer (Brown)

Johnson (TX)  
(Jeffries)  
Kirkpatrick  
(Stanton)  
Lawson (FL)  
(Evans)  
Lieu (Beyer)  
Lowenthal  
(Beyer)  
Meng (Clark  
(MA))  
Miller (WV)  
(Walorski)  
Mullin (Cole)  
Napolitano  
(Correa)  
Pappas (Kuster)  
Payne (Pallone)  
Rice (NY)  
(Peters)  
Ruiz (Aguilar)

Rush  
(Underwood)  
Sewell (DelBene)  
Soto (Deutch)  
Titus (Connolly)  
Van Drew  
(Reschenthaler)  
Veasey  
(Fletcher)  
Vela (Gomez)  
Velázquez  
(Jeffries)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
(Deutch)  
Waters (Takano)  
Wilson (FL)  
(Hayes)  
Young (Joyce  
(OH))

Malinowski  
Malliotakis  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Manning  
Matsui  
McBath  
McCarthy  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Meuser  
Mfume  
Miller-Meeks  
Moore (WI)  
Morelle  
Moulton  
Mrvan  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neguse  
Newhouse  
Newman  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
Oberholte  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascrell

Payne  
Perlmutter  
Stanton  
Phillips  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Reed  
Rice (NY)  
Ross  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan  
Salazar  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Spanberger

Speier  
Stansbury  
Stanton  
Steel  
Stevens  
Strickland  
Suoizzi  
Swalwell  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres (NY)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Upton  
Van Drew  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wexton  
Wild  
Williams (GA)  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth  
Young

## NAYS—181

Gallagher  
Garbarino  
Garcia (CA)  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Good (VA)  
Gooden (TX)  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Greene (GA)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Hagedorn  
Harris  
Harshbarger  
Hartzler  
Hern  
Herrell  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice (GA)  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Hinson  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Issa  
Jackson  
Jacobs (NY)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (PA)  
Keller  
Comer  
Crawford  
Curtis  
Davidson  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donalds  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes  
Fallon  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Fleischmann  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franklin, C.  
Scott  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garbarino  
Garcia (CA)  
Gibbs  
Gimenez  
Gohmert  
Gonzales, Tony

EQUAL ACCESS TO CONTRACEP-  
TION FOR VETERANS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 239) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for limitations on copayments for contraception furnished by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 245, nays 181, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 184]

## YEAS—245

Adams  
Aguilar  
Alfred  
Auchincloss  
Axne  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Turner  
Bourdeaux  
Bowman  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brown  
Brownley  
Burgess  
Bush  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Cárbaal  
Cardenas  
Carson  
Carter (LA)  
Cartwright  
Case  
Casten  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney

Craig  
Crenshaw  
Crist  
Crow  
Cuellar  
Davids (KS)  
Davis, Danny K.  
Davis, Rodney  
Dean  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Delgado  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Escobar  
Eshoo  
Kim (CA)  
Kim (NJ)  
Kind  
Kinzinger  
Kirkpatrick  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster  
Lamb  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NV)  
Leger Fernandez  
Levin (CA)  
Levin (MI)  
Lieu  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Luria  
Hayes  
Higgins (NY)

Himes  
Hollingsworth  
Horsford  
Houlahan  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jacobs (CA)  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (TX)  
Jones  
Joyce (OH)  
Kahale  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Khanna  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kim (CA)  
Kim (NJ)  
Kind  
Kinzinger  
Kirkpatrick  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster  
Lamb  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NV)  
Leger Fernandez  
Levin (CA)  
Levin (MI)  
Lieu  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Luria  
Hayes  
Higgins (NY)

Allen  
Amodei  
Armstrong  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Baird  
Balderson  
Banks  
Barr  
Bentz  
Bergman  
Bice (OK)  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (NC)  
Boebert  
Brady  
Brooks  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burchett  
Calvert  
Cammack  
Carl  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Cawthorn  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Cline  
Cloud  
Clyde  
Cole  
Comer  
Crawford  
Curtis  
Davidson  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donalds  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes  
Fallon  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Fleischmann  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franklin, C.  
Scott  
Gaetz

McKinley  
Meijer  
Miller (IL)  
Miller (WV)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney  
Moore (AL)  
Moore (UT)  
Mullin  
Murphy (NC)  
Nehls  
Norman  
Nunes  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Pence  
Perry  
Pfluger  
Posey  
Reschenthaler  
Rice (SC)  
Rodgers (WA)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rose  
Rosendale  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Rutherford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sessions  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Spartz  
Staubert  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Steube  
Stewart  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiffany  
Timmons  
Turner  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walorski  
Waltz  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup

Westerman Wilson (SC) Womack  
Williams (TX) Wittman Zeldin

## NOT VOTING—4

Fulcher Smucker  
Johnson (LA) Van Duyne

□ 1637

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. VAN DUYN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 184.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE  
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Aderholt	Johnson (TX)	Rush
(Moolenaar)	(Jeffries)	(Underwood)
Amodei	Kirkpatrick	Sewell (DelBene)
(Balderson)	(Stanton)	Soto (Deutch)
Beatty (Clark)	Lawson (FL)	Titus (Connolly)
(MA)	(Evans)	Van Drew
Buchanan	Lieu (Beyer)	(Reschenthaler)
(Walorski)	Lowenthal	Veasey
Burgess	(Beyer)	(Fletcher)
(Jackson)	Meng (Clark)	Vela (Gomez)
Castor (FL)	(MA)	Velázquez
(Demings)	Miller (WV)	(Jeffries)
Crist (Deutch)	(Walorski)	Wasserman
DeFazio (Davids)	Mullin (Cole)	Schultz
(KS)	Napolitano	(Deutch)
DeSaulnier	Pappas (Kuster)	Waters (Takano)
(Matsui)	Payne (Pallone)	Wilson (FL)
Grijalva (Garcia)	Rice (NY)	(Hayes)
(IL)	(Peters)	Young (Joyce)
Hoyer (Brown)	Ruiz (Aguilar)	(OH)

COMMUNICATION FROM THE  
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 24, 2021.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 24, 2021, at 2:53 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1251.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON,  
Clerk.

## REDUCING CHILD POVERTY

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

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the child tax credit, which will start reaching families next month.

It is hard to overstate the tremendous good that the American Rescue Plan is doing for people all across Pennsylvania and, indeed, all across this country. Soon, we will see even more direct relief heading to families in Monroe, Northampton, and Lehigh Counties in my district.

Starting in July, nearly all families with children in my district will re-

ceive monthly payments of up to \$300 per child through the end of the year as part of the expanded and improved child tax credit. The expanded and improved child tax credit will be a lifeline for many struggling families, helping more than 133,000 children in my district.

I cannot overstate how meaningful this assistance is to families who have been hit so hard this past year. These are payments that will help families pay for the cost of childcare, healthcare, diapers, and clothing. For many, these payments will be the difference between food on the table or hunger.

I am proud to have fought for and passed the American Rescue Plan, and I am glad we were able to get important help like the child tax credit into the hands of families across Pennsylvania 7.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO  
TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABOR-  
TION ACT

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, the Hyde amendment is an essential protection for the conscience rights of Americans and has saved over 2 million innocent lives.

The prohibition on the use of taxpayer funds for abortion has been enacted annually on a bipartisan basis despite our country's divisions on the question of abortion itself. Yet, despite President Biden's decades of support for the Hyde amendment, his budget request bows to the radical left and fails to include these longstanding protections.

As ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, I am committed to protecting all existing pro-life protections and advancing the pro-life cause whenever possible.

I will strongly oppose the elimination of the Hyde amendment from annual appropriations bills. But to strengthen the Hyde amendment, we must make it permanent law. That is why I support H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOWMAN). Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

□ 1645

HONORING BSA TROOP 19 FROM  
SHORT HILLS, NEW JERSEY

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

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor BSA Troop 19 in Short Hills, New Jersey, and their historic first class of female Eagle Scouts.

Five members in the troop in my district earned this prestigious rank in the first year young women were able to obtain the status in the organization's 111-year history.

I first met Katelyn Cannon, Keira Lowden, Riya Tyagi, and Bridget and Morgan Lomax virtually in February and I was lucky enough to attend their Eagle ceremony earlier this month. Their pioneering leadership has paved the way for many more young women to follow.

From creating a nonprofit corporation, to leading conservation efforts for koalas; to preserving and digitizing hundreds of hours of music for the New Jersey Youth Symphony; to building and installing houses for bats in local open spaces, these Scouts have gone above and beyond.

The Scouting community is better with Katelyn, Keira, Riya, Bridget, and Morgan as Eagle Scouts.

Congratulations to these trailblazing young women, and thank you to their Scoutmaster, Daniel Cannon.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF  
WAYNE SEAY

(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 Wayne Seay of Pooler, Georgia, who peacefully passed away on June 21 at the age of 81.

A lifelong resident of Pooler, Wayne attended Chatham Junior High, graduated from Savannah High School and Georgia Southern College. He was then drafted into the United States Army where he proudly served in the 1st Infantry Division.

After completing his military service, he joined the faculty of Robert W. Groves High School where he taught history and social studies for 28 years.

Wayne was a devoted Pooler resident and was elected to the city council where he served as mayor pro tempore. I had the honor and privilege of serving on the Pooler City Council with Wayne Seay. He was an outstanding member.

I also had the honor and privilege of being a former student of Mr. Seay. I know everyone will remember his kind and gentle spirit. I am thankful for the immense impact Wayne Seay had on the Pooler community and on myself, and I know his legacy will remain.

My thoughts and prayers are with his family, friends, and all who knew him during this most difficult time.

## CHILD TAX CREDIT

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

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the expanded child tax credit. Thanks to the American Rescue Plan, working families across the country will receive a monthly child tax credit payment of up to \$300 per child, covering nearly 90 percent of all children and cutting child poverty in half.

In my district, the expanded child tax credit will improve the lives of families from Newton to Fall River, helping almost 60 percent of children and lifting 3,800 children out of poverty. As a father, I am committed to providing parents with the support needed to navigate the high cost of raising a child.

From affording their food bills to paying for childcare, this substantial tax relief will set our parents and children up for success. The expanded child tax credit is a necessary investment in our families so that we can build an economy that works for everyone. We must make the expansion permanent.

## RECOGNIZING HERITAGE HIGH TRACK TEAM

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Heritage High School girls track and field team in Lynchburg, Virginia, for winning their second consecutive Virginia Class 3 State championship. The Heritage Pioneers racked up 74 points at the title meet with only five girls.

Star student athlete junior, Alaysia Oakes said: "Our coach always calls us the SEAL team. We go into states with five people, and it was definitely a tough battle," she continued, "but everybody did what they needed to do. Still stayed strong. We knew it was going to be a battle, but we didn't back down, so I'm proud of us."

Oakes captured three events, and seniors Tya Blake, Kaelynn Hawkins, Graysen Arnold, and Jalasia Jones helped the Pioneer's pour on the points.

Oakes came away as the individual State champion in the triple jump, long jump, and 100-meter dash, while placing second in the 200-meter and 400-meter dash; all making for a tremendous showing from the junior phenom.

This team is a shining example of hard work paying off. Congratulations to the athletes and coaches on an incredible season. We look forward to seeing what the future has in store for this talented group.

## CHILD TAX CREDIT AND JUSTICE IN THE COURTS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the greatest wealth enhancer that I have seen in our immediate time in the United States Congress is the child tax credit, which should be made permanent. It will provide an opportunity for life and liberty and, yes, freedom for families in my community; hard-working mothers and fathers and children who look up into your eyes, some of them sometimes hungry.

It is important that this child tax credit be made permanent, and I stand here ready to move it as fast as possible. Thank you to our administration for what they are doing.

Now, I simply want to talk about justice in the courts, justice in a court system that sentences individuals, non-violent individuals to years in prison to rot, even individuals who have done reimbursement or compensation for their offense. Courts have to be, yes, a coequal branch of government, but they have to have justice.

What about an individual that I have no stake in who happens to be an entertainer under a horrible guardianship, forced to take medications, forced not to have children?

I am on the Judiciary Committee and there is a lot to be done. Yes, it is a coequal branch of government, but there has to be real justice. When you go into a courthouse you deserve justice.

## REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

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

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a voice for all Kansans, including those who have yet to be born.

Kansans have long valued life. From our entry into the Union as a free State before the Civil War to the Summer of Mercy in Wichita, the Sunflower State has been a beacon of hope and freedom for those without a voice.

In Congress, we should follow the lead of Kansans and recognize the intrinsic value of human life. Yet, the left continues to push radical and unscientific policies that end the lives of unborn babies.

What is worse, they want to pay for their abortion-on-demand policies with your tax dollars, a provision that has wide, bipartisan opposition. New polling shows that 58 percent of voters and 65 percent of Independents oppose taxpayer-funded abortion.

The No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act is a no-brainer. Simply put, we need to save the Hyde amendment. It saved nearly 2.5 million lives.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by suc-

cessive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

## IMPACT OF BIG TECH CENSORSHIP IN FIGHT AGAINST COVID

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

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, for far too long, the mainstream media and Big Tech companies like Twitter, Google, and Facebook have used their power to censor one type of speech while favoring and promoting other speech that they prefer in an attempt to manipulate public discourse.

There is even evidence that the mainstream media and Big Tech use their own judgment to suppress information related to the origins of coronavirus as well as available medication and treatment options.

In December 2020, shortly after medical professionals and infectious disease specialists testified before the United States Senate on the effectiveness of COVID-19 treatments, Google's YouTube removed the testimony from their online platform. The big takeaway is that these conglomerates have been complicit in limiting discussion of facts and evidence about the COVID-19 pandemic to the detriment of the American people.

We must rein in Big Tech and the mainstream media's abusive and monopolistic practices that have led to an abundance of censorship, views, and opinions deemed, in their own judgment, to be objectionable.

## HONORING THE LIFE OF MARK DOUMIT

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

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Southwest Washington and Cathlamet resident Mark Doumit.

Sadly, Mark passed away this week at the age of 59. For decades, Mark's life had been defined by a commitment to his home community. Mark served two terms as Wahkiakum County commissioner, then as a State house member representing the 19th legislative district for 10 years.

Though he left elected office, he never abandoned public service. He served as a steady leader of the Washington Forest Protection Association for the last 15 years until his passing.

A stalwart supporter of our forests, fish, water, and our economy, Mark was never hemmed in by Democrat versus Republican politics. He was a friend and an ally to me and anyone who cared about these priorities.

I want to extend my deepest sympathies to Mark's family, friends, and

colleagues as they grapple with this profound loss. He will be dearly missed.

#### REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, for more than 40 years American taxpayers have been protected from paying for abortions on demand with their tax dollars. Alarming, President Biden's budget proposal calls for the Hyde amendment to be removed. This radical, immoral policy makes it legal for taxpayer dollars to support and enable the abortion industry.

Nearly 60 percent of Americans agree that taxpayer dollars should not be used to fund abortion. This is not a partisan issue. One of the most basic ways we can protect innocent life is ensuring that taxpayer money is not being used to fund abortions.

As a defender of the unborn, I do not support the removal of the Hyde amendment. I oppose all efforts to mandate taxpayer funding for abortion.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

#### REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

(Mrs. HINSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HINSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on my colleagues to consider the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, legislation that would preserve the longstanding Hyde amendment.

For the first time in over 40 years, the administration's proposed budget does not include Hyde protections, protections that have long ensured taxpayer dollars are not used to fund abortions.

Mr. Speaker, Hyde protections have saved 2.4 million babies. Reversing this longstanding pro-life policy is wrong. The right to life is the most fundamental of all of our rights. We must defend those who cannot defend themselves.

I will always lend my voice to the voiceless and fight to ensure that Iowa taxpayers are never forced to fund abortions against their will.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy

and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, and I ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

#### REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

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

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. This bill codifies the Hyde amendment which ensures that taxpayer dollars aren't spent on abortions.

For over 40 years, both Democrats and Republicans have understood the value of this important protection which has saved more than 2.4 million lives. The right to life precedes all other rights and is fundamental to everything I believe.

I urge my colleagues across the aisle to embrace life and support H.R. 18. As President Biden said in 1994, "Those of us who are opposed to abortion should not be compelled to pay for them."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

□ 1700

#### CONGRATULATING AMBASSADOR DAVID FRIEDMAN

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

Mr. GARBARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in acknowledgment of Long Island's own David Friedman, former U.S. Ambassador to Israel.

In a few days, there will be a dedication ceremony to rename a local street in his honor, but I would be remiss if I did not state for the Record Ambassador Friedman's tremendous accomplishments in support of our ally, Israel, during his tenure.

Whether it be countering the anti-Semitic Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions campaign against Israel or recognizing Israel's sovereignty over the Golan Heights, he has been a leading example on how best to represent our Nation abroad.

Most notable, of course, was his leadership in advancing the Abraham Accords, the greatest development in normalized relations between Israel and its Arab neighbors in over 40 years, and

the movement of the U.S. embassy to its rightful and lawful place, Jerusalem.

I implore my colleagues to stand with me in a commitment to affirming and building upon the advancements that Ambassador Friedman made to strengthen U.S.-Israeli relations, and I congratulate him once again on his achievements.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION INDICATOR SPECIES

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, environmental protection of species revolves around the use of indicator species. But what has been lost in recent years is the impact also on humans and their needs.

The indicator, for example, for farmers in California is very grave in the great Central Valley and up at the Klamath Basin.

Up on the Klamath, you have one environmental management plan that says more water is needed for salmon, for example, under a biological opinion, and another management plan that says more water is needed to be stored in the lake for suckerfish. You can't do both at the same time, and the result is the salmon are not more plentiful and the suckerfish are not recovering as a species.

But the rural areas in Klamath and Siskiyou Counties are being cut off from their main economic driver. The farms up there are suffering badly because of water that has been taken by the Federal Government that does not belong to the Federal Government.

The stored water in that lake was created for agriculture solely, and yet it is being used as more or less a slush fund for Federal agencies that want to take this water and somehow try and make a difference in the river. This has got to come to a stop, because we need agriculture in California.

#### ECONOMIC RECOVERY AFTER THE PANDEMIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. CAWTHORN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAWTHORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CAWTHORN. Mr. Speaker, what is the American businessman to do

when the American worker will not come into work?

For the past nearly 7 months, this President has held America's small business owners hostage and declared a de facto strike on the American economy.

Following the end of this COVID pandemic, the Biden administration has been granted the political gift of a lifetime: take a staggering American economy, still reeling from the economic collapse, and simply let it return to normal. If the Biden administration had done nothing, zero, if they had sat on their hands and twiddled their thumbs, if Joe Biden had taken more naps, then experts say our economy would be in a much better place than where it is right now.

Instead, the Biden administration's efforts place the American economy in a financial choke hold that threatens to obliterate hundreds of small businesses in my district.

It was John Adams that said: "Facts are stubborn things; and whatever may be our wishes, our inclinations or the dictates of our passions, they cannot alter the state of facts and evidence."

Let's cast our eyes over the facts, shall we?

Back in April, economists predicted over 1 million new jobs to be added to our economy. Biden added just over 250,000. In May, economists adjusted their expectations, acknowledging this administration simply cannot deliver the type of job growth past administrations could.

Even with adjusted expectations, the Biden administration still fell short of the mark. There is no debate that the Biden administration of free handouts has dramatically undercut efforts to restart our economy. His massive increase of unemployment benefits has kept workers at home and left store owners scrambling to keep up with the growing consumer demand.

In my own district, business leaders in Asheville, Hendersonville, Franklin, and Macon County, have spoken with me about the difficulty in getting employees back to work. Who can blame them? Biden is literally paying American citizens to stay home instead of getting them back to work.

Who would fault an American husband or mother when they decide to stay home with their family and earn double their salary while doing it?

The Biden administration knows that their policy of handouts harms and is hurting business owners, but the game has always been about creating a welfare class, not empowering our economy. It is disgusting.

With those thoughts in mind, I now recognize one of my fellow North Carolina champions, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and my fellow North Carolinian, Mr. CAWTHORN, for having this Special Order.

My comments will echo his. Look, the pandemic is over. Thank goodness.

Our economy should be seeing robust growth. Instead, businesses cannot fill the record number of jobs available.

In fact, the number one issue that I hear, not only from business owners and managers, but from all constituents, is that folks will not come to work, businesses cannot find workers.

Last month, despite 9.3 million job openings, there were only 69,000 more new hires than in the month before. How is that possible with unemployment at 6 percent?

Simply put, President Biden and Democrats have insisted on continuing to pay people more to stay home than to work.

Despite consistent warnings from Republicans and economists, the so-called American Rescue Plan continued expanded unemployment benefit programs enacted in the heart of the pandemic.

In my home State, in North Carolina, these expanded benefits are worth \$650 a week. That is about \$50 more than the Progressives' preferred minimum wage of \$15 an hour. You don't have to be an economist to see why small businesses can't fill job openings, and it is beyond time that Congress fix this self-inflicted wound.

That is one reason that Representative JODEY ARRINGTON and I introduced the Jump-Start the Economy with Jobs Act. This bill, which ought to move promptly in this Congress, requires an individual who is currently receiving enhanced unemployment benefits to recertify that they do not have a job offer waiting for them in order to continue receiving enhanced benefits.

If their former employer would receive a communication, and if they say we are prepared to give an offer to that person to come back to work, then they can't continue to receive unemployment benefits. How appropriate. That would tailor the program to those people that continue to need it because of a job dislocation they cannot resolve. Enhanced unemployment benefits should continue for those who truly need them and not for those who have a job waiting for them.

The extended Federal unemployment benefits implemented during COVID-19 had their time, but they should not be the mainstay now. They are, instead, artificially reducing the workforce.

Across the country, let's all be thankful, communities are opening up their economies and getting back to normal.

It is past time for this government to stop holding back the recovery and to stand up for small businesses, job generators, by ceasing to pay people to stay home.

A good first step would be to enact the Jump-Start the Economy with Jobs Act.

Mr. CAWTHORN. Thank you very much, Congressman BISHOP, for those words. I echo the sentiments of both JODEY ARRINGTON and DAN BISHOP of wanting to jump-start this economy again.

With the fact that there are 9.3 million job openings in this country right now, we do need to change something to be able to actually fill the hire rate that has not increased at all. In fact, last quarter it only increased by 4.2 percent.

My friends, we will have artificial inflation if we do not do something to act quickly, and I believe the Jump-Start the Economy with Jobs Act is a great idea.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize another North Carolinian, a lion of our mountains, my dear friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD).

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague, Congressman CAWTHORN, for organizing this.

Last month, the NFIB, or the National Federation of Independent Businesses, reported that 48 percent of small businesses currently have unfilled job openings, and that is an all-time high. Right now—you have heard the number mentioned—9.3 million jobs remain unfilled nationwide.

This sluggish recovery is a direct result of the Federal Government paying people not to work. Essentially, the Federal enhanced unemployment benefit constitutes a "stay-at-home" bonus for millions of people.

Instead of following the lead of dozens of other States, North Carolina's Governor refuses to end this very backwards incentive.

That is why I introduced a solution that would help. It is called the Back to Work Bonus Act. First and foremost, my proposal would end the \$300 Federal unemployment bonus on day one.

Second, the bill would allow a new worker to receive a \$900 back-to-work bonus only if they get back in the workforce and stay on the job for at least 4 weeks.

Now, to be clear, someone would only receive these dollars if they not only accepted the job offer, but fully went back to work.

Third, I want to highlight that this legislation is a specific solution to what we hope is a temporary problem, using already appropriated funds that would expire on August 14.

Look, we simply can't continue to pay people to stay at home. For workers that stayed in the workforce throughout the pandemic, we need to cut their taxes, so they get to keep more of their hard-earned money.

We need to get the economy booming again, like it was during the Trump years. We need to stop the overspending in Washington that causes inflation to soar and eat away at a family's buying power.

But above all, our number one priority needs to be getting folks back to work as quickly as possible. There are just too many opportunities out there, 9.3 million of them, to be exact. So let's get America back to work.

Mr. CAWTHORN. Congressman, thank you for introducing that bill.



If you think about it, \$387 is the amount the average American receives from their home State in weekly unemployment benefits. You add to that the \$300 boost that the Federal Government is putting on, on top of that, and it is no wonder why people aren't going back to work. They get to stay at home with their families while making \$17.17 an hour. That sounds like a good deal to me.

But I genuinely hope that we can find some way out of this, because there is a real spiritual poverty created when you don't actually work for your living.

It is now time for me to recognize a dear friend of mine from a Carolina that is not as good as North Carolina, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for offering this Special Order. It couldn't come at a better time and a better place in history.

Mr. Speaker, Americans have been subjected to one of the most testing years we have ever seen. Just as they are starting to get back on their feet and the great economic engine that is the American economy is starting to turn over, this administration and my Democratic colleagues are proposing to shut down the engine that we had running so robustly for the last 4 years under President Trump.

Six trillion dollars in spending, with no offsets, is downright irresponsible and unfair to the American taxpayer. We are not going to get this economy on the right foot by expanding our Government even more.

Growing inflation concerns have already begun to hit our constituents where it hurts the most, at the gas pump—have you tried filling up your car lately? It has hit you in the grocery stores. It has hit you in the checkbooks.

This oncoming crisis is putting hard-working Americans on rocky footing, and this President is proposing to pull the rug out from underneath them. Another cash infusion will do nothing more than kick those Americans while they are down by driving prices up even more. Enough is enough.

Businesses are opening up, construction projects are expanding our neighborhoods and cities, and there is a light at the end of the tunnel and the light is a bright one. Don't shut the door on that light by throttling the demands of everyday items.

Ultimately, there are a variety of reasons for these rising prices, many of which are industry specific. However, it is important to remember that big government spending is only going to make this problem worse.

I was elected to Congress to take care of the American people. I was not elected to bankrupt this country. I was not elected to burden them even more. It is clear that the American economy wants to make a comeback. The only question is, will bureaucrats, will politicians, will government get out of the way.

□ 1715

Mr. CAWTHORN. Mr. Speaker, Congressman NORMAN was elected to take care of the American people, but right now the Democrats in Congress—although it is hard to call them Democrats because right now I believe that they have a socialist agenda, which is sabotaging America's jobs recovery with a crippling tax hike that targets our small businesses, the backbone of our economy.

Their plans raise small business taxes to the highest point in a generation, halt new projects and small business growth by doubling taxes on investments, and Democrats supercharge a second death tax, if you can believe that, where they want to tax you more. It would hit farms, machine shops, and other small businesses.

With all that in mind, I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER).

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest threats that emerged from this pandemic is an expanding government unwilling to relinquish control and restore Americans' God-given rights.

We see it all across our country. President Biden and liberal Governors tout the "follow the science" talking point while failing to follow the science themselves, keeping in place pandemic restrictions while knowing full well that our economy can fully reopen.

While the left virtue signals, pushing radical policies like vaccine passports and critical race theory, American families are still struggling to make ends meet. Tens of thousands of businesses have closed their doors for good, and our children have fallen behind because they are denied in-person learning.

Some Federal agencies are still not operating at pre-pandemic levels. We have American veterans who cannot access records they need for treatment and benefits they earned because of career bureaucrats who can't be bothered to go back to work. This is wrong and completely avoidable.

Here, in Congress, we see the hypocrisy of the left on display. Speaker PELOSI lifts the mask mandate for the House floor, but keeps the people's House closed to the public. We have Members of this body not showing up and voting in person. The people that we represent go to work every day, and they expect us to do the same. Americans have never been and never will be a nation ruled by fear and control.

Reopen the Capitol Building, reopen our country, and restore freedom and power to the American people.

Mr. CAWTHORN. Mr. Speaker, I can see why Pennsylvania loves their Congressman so much.

When I think about what is going on in Congress and I see that Democrats are prioritizing wasteful spending over hardworking Americans' paychecks, I realize that the Democrats' socialist agenda won't produce long-term

growth or greater economic security for American families.

A majority of Americans say they fear for an impending crash following the injection of Federal stimulus money during the pandemic. This is an unsettling thought for those who are trying to deal with dining room politics.

With all those thoughts in mind, I am very pleased to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEHLS), my dear friend and America's sheriff, who represents Texas' 22nd District.

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Speaker, it is time to get the American people back to work. The vaccine has been available for all Americans for weeks. Cases across the country are drastically decreased, and businesses are opening back up. Thank God.

Why, then, is the Federal Government still paying people not to work?

Why, then, are we still considering multitrillion-dollar proposals when there is billions upon billions of previously appropriated COVID relief money that hasn't been touched?

Inflation is higher than at any point in over a decade. Americans are paying more for goods they need to survive. Businesses that are open and want to expand their workforce can't find the employees willing to come to work because the government is paying them to stay home.

And amidst all of this, the Biden administration is proposing tax increases on job creators. It doesn't take an economics Ph.D. to conclude that raising taxes on job creators amid record levels of inflation and this underperforming economy will lead to economic disaster.

Small business owners in this country are trying to rebuild and get people back to work. Raising taxes on them will only hurt them and the Americans they want to hire.

The Biden tax-and-spend model is failing our country. We need to get back to the free-market approach that we had under President Trump: Slashing regulation, reducing taxes, and increasing economic freedom.

That is the light at the end of the Biden economic crisis tunnel. But to get there, we need Democrats to stop playing politics with the future of our country and work with the Republicans.

Mr. CAWTHORN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES), a dear friend of mine who represents the Fourth District.

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, we should be experiencing one of the greatest economic booms in our history as we emerge from COVID, yet prices are climbing, consumer sentiment is plunging, and there are more than nine million open jobs without workers to fill them. That is the most ever.

In my State of Kansas, we have 3.6 jobs available for every job seeker. Subsidizing people not to work and spending without restraint is stalling out this recovery and causing inflation.

In May, core inflation rose at its fastest pace since 1992. That is because Democrats' untargeted spending has acted like kindling for inflation. There is too much money chasing too few goods. Recent surveys show that 70 percent of Americans are concerned that President Biden's spending plans could lead to inflation. But if you have filled up your gas tank recently or entered a grocery store, you know that it is already there.

Instead of working to quickly reopen and prioritize getting America back to work, upon entering office, President Biden took his eyes off the ball and squandered the recovery that President Trump had handed to him. In the first five months of 2021, the current administration has added 500,000 fewer jobs than the last 5 months of 2020. President Biden should be concerned about his economic crisis.

Biden's slow-growth agenda calls for \$6 trillion in government spending with \$3 trillion in new taxes. That would crush small and midsized companies, resulting in far fewer jobs down the road.

One of the most antigrowth policies in President Biden's agenda is his plan to revert America's business tax rate to one of the worst in the world again at 28 percent, a move that would return us to the old tax code that incentivized jobs to be shipped overseas.

Biden's budget even acknowledges that a real recovery isn't their priority. It only forecasts a meager 2 percent GDP growth by 2023, with it dropping even lower until 2029.

The American people should contrast Biden's tax-and-spend agenda with what Republicans have done and are fighting to do. In 2017, we put the American people first by passing a progrowth tax code while removing massive amounts of government regulation. That created an economic atmosphere that enabled wages to grow for historically disadvantaged workers, brought the unemployment rate down to the lowest in 50 years, and allowed more people to find jobs in America than at any point in our history. The income gap was even shrinking as lower income wages were increasing faster.

We need to get back to that. It is not hard to see the impact that common-sense, progrowth policies can make. Our focus should be on filling available jobs and rebuilding our economy, not to line the pockets of progressive special interest groups with millions in Federal spending, as Biden's agenda would do. It is hard to ignore that, across the country today, the six States with the lowest unemployment rates all have Republican leadership.

Mr. Speaker, President Biden and Speaker PELOSI need to prioritize economic recovery, not unrestrained government spending.

Mr. CAWTHORN. Mr. Speaker, I think Congressman ESTES touches on a great point. Under Republican leadership, under the last administration,

business applications were at record levels. The TCJA encouraged business creation, as the amount of business applications reached its highest level ever, of over 880,000.

Now, you contrast that with what is going on in America today. There are many people who own restaurants in my own district, who are having to literally pay people \$50 just to turn an application in, and then they never show up for the interview or even for work.

Because of how bleak things are looking, I am very happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MCCLAIN), the most loved and the most feared woman in all of Congress.

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, for more than 40 years, Joe Biden has been a staunch supporter of the Hyde amendment. So have the American people. Just this past January, polling found that nearly 6 in 10 Americans oppose using tax dollars to terminate innocent lives. That number includes a majority of Independents and nearly one-third of Democrats.

For decades, congressional Democrats joined Republicans in a truly bipartisan effort to ensure tax dollars of hardworking Americans do not pay for abortions. Unfortunately, President Biden is trying to shatter years of congressional bipartisanship with a radical budget that has no Hyde amendment protections.

The President ran on unity, yet his first budget proposal immediately divides. This Congress must take back its congressional responsibility and craft spending bills which protect the lives of the unborn, just as past Congresses have done since 1976.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 37 minutes remaining.

Mr. CAWTHORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, over the past year, it really has felt like our small businesses, our middle class, our communities have really taken one punch after another.

First, we were handed mandatory shutdowns of our restaurants, our small businesses, and our churches, while Walmart and Lowe's and other big box retail stores were allowed to remain open. In some places around the country, we were not even allowed to leave our homes unless it was for a purpose that the government deemed essential.

Like all Americans, I am extremely excited and pleased to see that most of

the economy in our communities have reopened. But we can't help but observe that it seems like the reopening is occurring because of the independence and resilience of the American people, despite the best efforts by some to keep us shuttered indefinitely.

It is baffling that during this time when our neighbors have the opportunity to finally get back to work, Democrats are pushing policies to hurt them.

Oh, you are trying to find employees for your diner so you can reopen?

Well, they are paying those employees more to sit at home.

You have a corner store in central South Dakota?

Sorry, but President Biden canceled the Keystone XL pipeline and instantly caused your customers to lose their jobs.

You want to go back to work, but have two children at home?

Well, unbelievably, the Biden education plan included zero requirement that your son's or daughter's school reopens.

You were excited for your hotel to be busy this spring?

Well, the CDC was still advising Americans not to travel, even if they were vaccinated.

Your bait shop along the Canadian border has been struggling since the border closure?

Too bad President Biden and Justin Trudeau decided that couldn't be solved at the G7 last week.

You need gas to get to work, to get to your job site?

Well, it costs you \$50 more this year than it did last year.

Mr. Speaker, this is a staggering laundry list of policies that individually would be an enormous impediment to our success, but together it is a brick wall. Without urgent changes to these antijobs, anti-small business policies, our communities will continue to struggle to reopen completely, and more families will feel the negative impacts of the Biden-Pelosi economy.

As a small business owner myself, I know what these men and women are going through. I know that they were the ones who built their business, not the government. And despite opposing efforts, they won't let the government take it away from them either.

Mr. CAWTHORN. Mr. Speaker, I believe we are created to work, and I believe we are created to work hard, and the right to work and the determination to build with one's hands is as foundational to the American ethos as it can be.

We were not set in this universal orchard to stand still as trees. There is no substitute under the heavens for productive labor. It has been said that a firm work ethic is the process by which dreams become realities. It is the process by which idle visions become dynamic achievements.

This administration seeks, though, to strip employment from the men and

women of America, to replace work with welfare and service with subservience. I reject that notion.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), my dear friend.

□ 1730

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the most important issue facing our country today: the reopening of the U.S. economy.

For 16 long months, the U.S. economy has been held hostage by government, both elected and unelected. What started as a 15-day shutdown to allow hospitals to brace for the coming wave of COVID cases has ballooned into over a year of shifting goalposts, evolving science, and political power grabs.

Since the pandemic began, over 200,000 small businesses, which the President once claimed were the backbone of the U.S. economy, have been shuttered for good. This has left their owners jobless and futures uncertain.

Those whose businesses did survive the long lockdowns still face harsh restrictions. For too long and in too many cases, we have seen restrictions on controlling how many customers they can serve, how their employees can conduct business, and, by default, how much revenue they can bring in.

Worse, the reopening of our economy has been prolonged even further by the misguided attempts from the political left to provide relief.

The example I hear the most from constituents and businesses back in George's First Congressional District is the increased unemployment benefits. Under these expanded benefits, many Americans have been able to receive more money not working than they did actually working. This is a poor incentive to get people back into jobs, especially as our economy continues to see record-high job openings.

Businesses coming out of their long hibernation will continue to struggle to find employees as long as this benefit is in place.

There are not enough taxpayer dollars in the world to give these businesses the relief they need, but we can remove the Federal Government as an obstacle to returning to normalcy.

We need policies that incentivize Americans to find jobs and allow businesses to stand on their own. Ultimately, we need to put an end to all COVID business restrictions nationwide.

It is hard to say what the long-term impact of prolonged shutdowns will be, but it does not take a Harvard economist to know that losing 200,000 jobs in small businesses alone does not spell good fortune.

The sooner we get Americans back to work and our economy back to full capacity, the sooner we can return to normal or, at the very least, stop the damage from continuing.

To borrow a quote from President Trump, we built the greatest economy

in the world, and we will do it a second time.

Mr. CAWTHORN. Mr. Speaker, when we started looking at the American Families Plan, we realized the tax hikes it would increase would raise capital gains and dividends tax from 20 to 39.6 percent, almost two times the normal price. It would impose capital gains taxes at death, which creates a second death tax, although I can't believe that we would ever need to tax anyone more than we do now. It would expand the 3.8 percent Obamacare surtax to hit even more small businesses' income than it already does.

Lastly, it would increase the IRS' auditing power, including monitoring bank accounts, because the very first thing that we need to reopen our economy at a better pace is to give more power to three-letter agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD), my good friend.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as a Nation founded on a history of rugged individualism, the American people are resilient and self-reliant. They will flourish and prosper absent the intrusion and heavy-handed weight of the government.

Apart from national defense, safety, and security, the less our government does, the better, especially here at the Federal level.

In fact, our country would be far better off if we had just paid this President and his administration to stay home, and they did nothing over these past 5½ months. It is sadly true that the less this government does to us while pretending to do things for us, the better off we will all be.

Incredibly, this administration's disastrous economic policies have produced fewer jobs in their first 5 months of the year than the Trump administration produced in the last 5 months of 2020 when the government restrictions and lockdowns in the name of the China virus were far more widely and strenuously enforced.

Unfortunately, at present time, we have employers, businesses, and job creators literally competing with their own government for employees because of the enhanced \$300 a week Federal unemployment benefit.

Every business owner that I talk with in my district tells me that this is a major, ongoing problem. Every business has up signs saying: "Help Wanted," "Employees Needed."

We even have this problem in my home district in the city of Charlottesville, in Albemarle County, with the Postal Service. They can't get people to come to work for the starting wage of \$18 an hour for a mail carrier because they are getting paid \$17 an hour to stay home and not work.

However, the tone-deaf, economically illiterate Democrats, especially those I serve with on the Education and Labor Committee, they tell businesses they simply need to raise their wages so far above what the Federal Government is

paying folks not to work—again, \$17 an hour in my home State of Virginia—that folks will finally refuse the free income not to work and return for a higher paycheck—this as businesses are struggling to recover from the government shutting them down for a year, again, in the name of the China virus.

We need to fully reopen our economy, end all restrictions, open our schools so parents can go back to work, and stop sending confusing and harmful messages, like requiring masks on public transportation.

In this very House, it was only a couple of weeks ago that we were pretending that even in a Special Order, speaking to an empty Chamber with no one near you—within how many feet?—you needed to wear a mask to keep us safe because we wanted to appear to the American people back home that we were doing something, the theater of wearing masks just a few weeks ago.

That is continuing now on public transportation. What kind of a myth and harmful message does that send to folks?

We need to stop paying folks not to work, reopen our economy, and turn the American people loose.

Mr. CAWTHORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this important issue. I think it is something that America needs to talk about, and I am glad we are talking about it on the floor of the people's House.

During the COVID shutdowns, more than 600,000 businesses shut their doors. This is 200,000 more businesses than typically close in a year due to natural market influences.

Unsurprisingly, many of these most severe lockdowns across the country were implemented by liberal Governors who caved to fearmongering and hostility to former President Trump.

To be clear, I recognize the dangers posed by this virus. However, reactionary and overreaching shutdowns significantly worsened the impacts of COVID on our Nation.

One of the most glaring examples of these negative impacts has been on our children who missed a year or more of in-person education because their schools were closed.

The resilience and creativity of many teachers to adjust to these tragic circumstances are admirable. However, the reality is that these closures resulted in deteriorating mental health among students and less effective educational environments for children across America.

Importantly, these shutdowns disproportionately affected children with disabilities, minority students, and students facing economic hardships.

America is beyond ready to reopen. Today, more than half of Americans have been vaccinated, and broad mask

mandates are clearly no longer necessary for most communities. The science overwhelmingly demands that the restrictions continuing to burden our communities be lifted, and efforts by liberal politicians to extend these mandates only serve to reveal their ideological motivations.

I urge our national, State, and local officials to follow the science, unshackle our economy from these burdensome and unnecessary restrictions, and reopen our country.

Mr. CAWTHORN. Mr. Speaker, when we start thinking about what is going on here in our country with unemployment, in the week ending May 1, 2021, about 16 million people collected unemployment. Now, that is a staggering statistic when you realize that over 6.6 million of those people would not have been eligible to receive unemployment benefits in a traditional environment. But because of the trumped-up and boosted-up unemployment benefits the Federal Government is sending out, we are basically incentivizing people by giving them \$34,000 a year to not go to work, thus creating more and more inflation. There is no production so, therefore, there are too many dollars chasing too few goods.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I certainly appreciate his leadership on this and giving us an opportunity to speak about small business issues in our country.

Mr. Speaker, as restrictive government mandates on Americans have relaxed, our economy has begun recovering from the worst of the pandemic. Many businesses have reopened their doors, and there are now millions of new returning jobs and available jobs across the Nation.

Unfortunately, I hear from businesses large and small across my district that Big Government is getting in the way of the return of our booming prepandemic economy.

It is a bizarre paradox, but under the Biden administration, we are simultaneously facing an intense labor shortage and widespread unemployment at the same time, when our economy should be thriving back to prepandemic levels. Sadly, this is a common story in every corner of our country.

It is clear that the primary driver of this problem is federally subsidized unemployment benefits. In many regions, particularly in rural areas, would-be job seekers make more staying at home than reporting to work.

Recently, I was speaking to a friend of mine, and he called an unemployed driver that he was going to hire. The unemployed driver's response was this: I am going ride this mule until it drops.

Basically, what he was saying was: I am going to take this free money until it goes away.

Many small businesses are facing that very same issue. Some businesses

have even offered cash bonuses to interviewees, but small businesses cannot afford this.

There are plenty of examples back home in my district. For example, in Houston County, there are 124 unemployment claims and over 2,000 job openings as we speak. In Coffee County, there are 57 unemployment claims and 570 job openings, with many more coming. In Dale County, there are 47 unemployment claims yet 350 job postings.

It is very simple. Small business cannot compete with government handouts. I am glad that many red States, including my great State of Alabama, have ended all federally funded pandemic unemployment benefits. I hope our numbers will improve as a result.

Removing these payments that were meant to be short-term is necessary to advance our economic recovery. But this is a real problem that betrays the Biden administration and congressional Democrats' fundamental misunderstanding of what powers an economy.

Mr. Speaker, the best welfare program in the world is a job, not government. I know that many of my Democratic colleagues agree with me.

Let's get Americans back to work by empowering workers and removing incentives to stay home. Only then can we truly reopen this economy.

Mr. CAWTHORN. Mr. Speaker, I am disheartened to know that with this Federal unemployment stimulus that we are sending out around the country, although it might solve some short-term financial woes, it is creating a spiritual poverty in the hearts of men and women across this country that I believe cannot be described.

When you start to think about how devastating it would be to one's morale and one's own honor and one's own self-esteem to think that you don't actually create anything, you don't actually build anything, you are not truly benefiting society, it makes me shudder to think about how I would feel about that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN).

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for hosting this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce you to the newest resident of western and central Kansas. She greets every store's patrons at the business front door and every farmer at the farm gate. She is in the newspaper, on the radio, and all over social media. She goes by Help Wanted, and you have probably met her, too, as she has made herself quite popular under President Biden's policies.

It has been more than a year since the pandemic shut down the country. America is finally getting back to normal. Businesses across the country are ready to reopen and welcome back customers. Unfortunately, President Biden's bonus, the monthly unemployment checks being distributed on top

of the already existing unemployment checks, is paying a premium for potential workers to remain at home rather than finding work.

The data doesn't lie. There are nearly 8 million job openings in America right now, a new record. Businesses in the Big First of Kansas—agriculture, hospitality, food service, manufacturing, construction, and healthcare—cannot find workers, leading to reduced hours or closures to accommodate the staffing shortages.

□ 1745

Help is wanted at the North Central Kansas Hospital, short 50 employees and regularly turning away patients as the hospital is unable to properly staff and serve them.

Help is wanted in McDonald's in that same north central Kansas town, closing early each night.

Christina, the owner of hair salons in Garden City, Hays, and Dodge City, Kansas, wants help as she temporarily shuts down one location, only opens another for a few days a week, and shortens hours at all three.

Help is wanted at the ethanol by-products plants in south central Kansas, unable to find workers even after offering a salary of a \$35,000 plus health and retirement benefits.

And PureField Ingredients, a food ingredient manufacturer in Russell, Kansas, wants help as they are staffed at only 30 percent of their normal levels.

Mr. Speaker, hear me say this: If you can get to work, you should. Do it for our local businesses and our State's economy. Do it for your family. Most of all, do it for yourself.

I recently joined fellow Kansas Republicans in urging the Kansas governor to opt out of the enhanced unemployment benefits. Additionally, I cosponsored the Help Wanted Act, which addresses the severe labor shortages caused by the Federal unemployment policy and the Get Americans Back to Work Act, which would shorten the extension of the pandemic unemployment checks.

It is time to take off the masks, get our kids back to school, get our businesses open, get people back to work, and get the country back on track.

Mr. CAWTHORN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. CAWTHORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am so excited for Congressman CAWTHORN's leadership on this issue tonight. I thank him for making time to address the American people.

Mr. Speaker, there are three people who come to mind when I think of people who cannot even give their money away:

ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ, do you remember when her donations were returned to her by Members of Congress

because they didn't want to be associated with her?

Harvey Weinstein. And Joe Biden.

Those three cannot even give money away. In fact, by July 3, 25 States across America will have rejected President Biden's Federal unemployment benefit bonuses.

I meet with organizations every day that request funds for worthwhile endeavors. Sadly, America is \$28 trillion in debt and can't afford to spend the money on many of these worthy causes. But leave it to Joe Biden to try to spend money in a way that actually hurts our economy and is rejected by Republican and Democrat governors across our entire country. That is a special level of basement incompetency.

We have got 9.3 million unfilled jobs. And I hear it back home, businesses can't get people back to work because they are making more to sit at home on the couch. They would rather watch Dave Portnoy eat a slice of pizza. But then, again, maybe that is not his viewers. Maybe it is more of the folks sitting back, watching Joy Behar and "The View" cackle and demonize our country and all of our worthwhile efforts to restore dignity in this Nation.

The Biden regime is literally incentivizing laziness. But then again, they set that example on a regular basis, calling it quits in the middle of the day. When is the last time the President hasn't called a "lid" before his afternoon snack?

In my home State of Colorado, many corporations are offering bonuses that small businesses can't afford. We are seeing massive signing bonuses, from \$10,000 to \$30,000 for utility and HVAC workers, and that is simply unsustainable.

According to the Colorado Restaurant Association, more than 90 percent of restaurants are having issues finding workers. I am one of them. I have had employees say, "I cannot work more than 2 days a week. I cannot exceed 12 hours of work because it will cut into my benefits." That is un-American.

Joe Biden is quickly becoming the greatest threat to small businesses since Fauci's fraud. While small businesses across my district and across America are struggling to find workers, struggling to stay open, Joe Biden is struggling to stay awake.

I am calling on this administration to end these excessive Federal COVID payouts and stop disincentivizing work.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MADISON CAWTHORN for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. CAWTHORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her always incredibly accurate and fierce comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), another similarly fierce Congressman.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate my friend, Congress-

man CAWTHORN, holding this because it is important.

You know, to some people, it is just about, "Well, it is the economy. It is an inconvenience." Well, that is for rich people, like the billionaires that donated to the current President's campaign. They sure didn't help the former President.

Well, what are we talking about? We are talking about a President that is so out of touch. As he has said, "I keep forgetting I am President." It is very unfortunate.

But if you go back to his days as Vice President, you find what this President, the current President, was doing in the previous administration, and these policies are now coming back.

It ran up the price of oil and gas—natural gas, propane. It ran up the price of gasoline. And unfortunately, for the working people in America, for those that haven't been in Washington for 50 years or so—like the current President—they are getting strangled with debt. They are getting strangled with increasing prices because it just so happens, we don't have a lot of electric 18-wheelers. We don't have a lot of massive electric engines that are pulling countless numbers of cars down the train tracks.

That means every time this President takes another step to raise the price of oil—which raises the price of gasoline—he is economically crippling people that are working, people that are on Social Security, people that have fixed incomes. They are getting hammered. Yeah, it is an inconvenience to the mega wealthy that donated to the President, or people like here in Congress that are millionaires, but it is devastating.

And I go back to when President Biden was Vice President, and a lady from Panola County told me, she said, "I am 80 years old, and my gas is getting so expensive, I am afraid I am going to end up in a home like I was born in, where the only energy we had was a wood-burning stove."

And I said, Oh, ma'am, I am so sorry to be the bearer of bad news, but if Biden and Obama have their way, you are not going to be able to even have that wood-burning stove you had when you were born. You are going to be at home without any kind of energy. And that is where this President is now wanting to go back to.

We enjoyed the days of cheaper gasoline, cheaper energy. America was vibrant; and people spent and they went out to eat and they bought clothes, and it generated jobs. And this President is killing those. And he is devastating the people on fixed incomes. The people that are working and poor, he is devastating them—the people that he is supposed to care about.

Well, it is time for this administration to think about somebody besides themselves and their mega-billionaire donors. It is time to think about the American people and the damage that this administration is doing to them.

Mr. CAWTHORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Congressman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, as I continue to consider that the Democrats' plan must be to destroy our economy by incentivizing laziness, by incentivizing people not going to work, I shake my head and say, No, that can't be true. That is just one mistake that they made.

But then when I start to look through all the points that I have outlined—of the ridiculous tax increases on dividends, the tax increases on capital gains, the tax increases on small businesses, the tax increases which will increase the cost of living for the middle class, I am sure that they are trying to destroy our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the most powerful and the most humble man in Congress.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman CAWTHORN for his leadership on behalf of working families, small business—of which he is one—for getting this economy going again. I thank him for allowing me to be part of this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, when President Biden promised to focus on climate change, I didn't realize he meant changing the climate of the U.S. economy by cooling off the jobs recovery. The President inherited a strong recovery, life-saving vaccines, a reopening economy, and trillions of dollars in COVID stimulus.

Yet, in his first 5 months of this year, America is nearly 550,000 fewer jobs than in the last 5 months of 2020 under President Trump—550,000 fewer jobs. Inflation is running twice as high as wage growth. In fact, for Americans, their pocketbook, their paycheck has actually declined in buying power since President Biden took office.

America's jobs recovery ought to be surging, but instead, April/May reports were just disastrous. Main Street businesses, Congressman CAWTHORN, as you said, they are struggling to find workers.

Labor force participation is back in the 1970s. Inflation has hit a 13-year high, and a lot of Americans are fearful about the impact of rising prices and slow growth economy when the sugar high from all this COVID stimulus goes away, which is exactly what President Biden's budget admits will do.

This President is sabotaging America's jobs recovery, with crippling tax increases and antibusiness policies that hurt working families and Main Street businesses and drive U.S. jobs overseas.

Treasury Secretary Yellen, the other day, conceded that just as you heard tonight, these lavish Federal employment bonuses really are hurting Main Street and hurting hiring. Thankfully, half of American States, including one blue State, have opted out of these benefits to help reconnect workers and help our economy survive.

A recent analysis of the Ways and Means' staff shows that Congress has

already approved, for an average family of four, where both parents are out of work, we have already approved over \$109,000 in stimulus checks, unemployment checks, and child checks.

We were incredibly generous during COVID to help people get back on their feet, defeat this virus, and move back. But the time for emergency spending is over; the time for endless government checks is over. We cannot become the Olive Garden of never-ending government checks. It won't help people rebuild their lives. It won't help us rebuild the economy.

Unfortunately, because of these Federal bonuses on unemployment, we are seeing a record 9.3 million unfilled jobs. It is hurting Main Street businesses; they are struggling. And frankly, it will hurt families who are not going to be able to reconnect again when all these checks run out. And our job creators shouldn't have to compete with the Federal Government.

Instead of helping America get back to work, the Biden administration is pushing crippling tax hikes that will cost us millions of new jobs. I am proud to have led, on behalf of President Trump in a Republican Congress, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act that reduced tax cuts across the board, or reduced taxes across the board, redesigned our Tax Code so American businesses could compete and win anywhere in the world.

It made America the most competitive economy on the planet, lifted millions of Americans out of poverty, and stopped U.S. businesses from moving overseas. But now, we face a big risk. President Biden's insistence on repealing the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will cost 6 million U.S. jobs. For that family of four, middle class, making maybe \$73,000 a year, it will rob their family budget of over \$20,000 over time.

The attack on American energy will cut jobs by 1.5 million U.S. jobs and repealing stepped-up basis on family farms will cost us another 1 million jobs over 12 years.

Congressman CAWTHORN's efforts to lead commonsense proposals, stop these crippling tax increases, and get the economy back on task is exactly what our country needs today.

Mr. Speaker, I thank him for letting me join him.

□ 1800

Mr. CAWTHORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman BRADY for his leadership on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I think with everything that has been said from all of these Representatives from all over the country, each of them representing nearly 730,000 people, I believe it is overly and abundantly clear that it is time to end the emergency spending. It is time to end the trumped-up unemployment checks, which are incentivizing laziness. It is time to end government-mandated joblessness in America.

There is a labor shortage in this country, and if we don't end it, we will

see inflation, the likes of which our country has never seen before, and I don't know if we will be able to recover from that.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

#### VIRTUE SIGNALING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, this evening, I am going to try to do something that is a little bit different, and parts of it are going to be incredibly annoying. I am going to hurt some feelings, but my theme is actually very simple.

There are general solutions to so many of the things we consider problems, but we are going to have to deal with something, and it is a true problem around this place. And that is, I am going to use the word "virtue signaling" and sort of folklore.

We sometimes know what we know, but the fact of the matter is that technology, science, all of what we were told was wrong, yet we can't get it out of our heads, or, as a society, we care more about the symbolism than actually curing the problem. And I really do believe if we could embrace that thing called a calculator, math, thinking, science, there are some amazingly good things we could do.

But, first, we got to step up and admit that we have been making up a lot of crap. And that is me being slightly on the vulgar side. But it is a frustration I have where often I see our speeches behind these microphones, and we are virtue signaling because that is often what is expected from our voters. At least we think that is what is expected, but I bet you our voters would be elated if we would actually give them the truth and then show them the math.

I am going to show a couple of things to first set up my argument, and then walk through a couple things that I think are incredibly optimistic for our future as a country, but maybe even the entire world.

So, first off, let's just use this. I have done versions of this before, but it is important as a thought experiment.

Do you care about plastic in the ocean?

I think everyone in America cares about plastic in the ocean. Except we have a small problem. We do this virtue signaling of let's ban plastic straws. But the fact of the matter is, the data says that straws that come from North America don't end up in the ocean. We do actually an amazingly good job grabbing our waste and putting it in the landfills or incinerating or taking care of it. But if you

actually look at the real math, 90 percent of the plastic in the world's oceans comes from 10 rivers: 8 in Asia, 2 in Africa.

If you actually gave a darn about plastic in the ocean, what would you do?

You would actually go to those 10 rivers—8 in Asia, 2 in Africa—and either add value, use our technical assistance, use our foreign aid, and go and deal with the plastic in the ocean.

But, instead, we give speeches here, we award, we allot cities like D.C. that ban plastic straws. That is pure virtue signaling. It doesn't actually do anything, yet we parade around like we did something.

Instead, this body could actually have an incredible impact on plastic in the ocean. Go to the 10 rivers that are 90 percent of the plastic, and actually get our foreign aid, our technical aid, even some economic incentives to capture that plastic and stop sticking it into rivers that flow into the ocean. It is a simple example of the virtue signaling that actually warps real environmental policy.

Here is one that is going to drive some people crazy.

What would happen if I came to you and said the entire environmental impact of that cloth cotton bag you carry to the grocery store, you have to use 7,100 times to basically equal the plastic bags that are produced out of natural gas?

Yet we walk around with our little plastic bags when we walk into the Trader Joe's and those things, you know, proudly showing, hey, I care about the environment. But the math—that is not the science.

If we are going to make public policy, how does this body, and not only Congress, but our city councils, our county governments, our State legislatures, how do we stop making public policy that is virtue signaling, and the math is the math?

We have this incredible report, detailed. It came out of, I think, Demark. It was looking at the environmental impact. It turns out those crappy little plastic bags that are banned in so many of our cities were less environmentally impactful than the cotton bags we are walking around with, because those cotton ones you have to use 7,100 times to actually have the same environmental impact.

Another one that is going on around the country right now is let's ban natural gas for cook stoves and heating in homes. Except if you actually do the math of burning natural gas to make steam, to turn the turbine, to make electricity, it actually is environmentally substantially better to use natural gas in your home. And there are lots of really good studies and data on this.

But, once again, it is sort of this urban folklore, it is virtue signaling to say my city council is going to ban natural gas from people being able to cook with. Aren't I doing something wonderful for the environment?



But it turns out, no, you are not. We have got to stop doing this.

So there is actually some other really interesting ones.

So how many out there did we watch on the cable news shows after the function of the canceling of the Keystone pipeline?

Now, as Republicans, we all talked about the jobs lost. On the left, they are talking about the environmental benefit of stopping that pipeline.

Well, first, let's deal with the reality. Those hydrocarbons are going somewhere. They are going to be cracked somewhere, turned into distillates or fuels. And they are refined in southeast Asia or refined in Louisiana or Texas. They are going to be refined. So let's just do the math on the transportation.

It turns out the Keystone pipeline has dramatically less carbon impact than sticking it in the rail, sticking it into the rail pipeline attachment, or sticking it in rail or pipeline and putting it on the coast and shipping it out to southeast Asia. Just the shipping part.

If you actually cared about the actual math of the environmental impact of the Keystone pipeline, you would have supported the pipeline, but that wasn't the virtue signaling that came from the environmental community. And being someone who genuinely cares a lot about the actual math, you know, as those of us who try to do the math of what is the actual impacts in global warming, and what is actually the folklore, what is make-believe, what is real, we got to stop doing this.

And I know we love the political wedges, saying, well, they supported this and we supported the union workers.

How do you get some people around the table to use a calculator, and say, well, it turns out, whether you like hydrocarbons or not, the pipeline turns out to have a less environmental load than canceling it does because now we are going to stick it in railcars, now we are going to ship it to other parts of the world?

And I haven't even done the math on other refineries from other parts of world that have dramatically less environmental standards when cracking carbon chains.

So here is another one. This one actually is both hopeful, but we are going to have to start to think a little more creatively. So here is my setup. Half of the noncarbon-emitting electricity in the United States—actually, I think it is slightly more than half—comes from baseload nuclear.

We have a massive amount of our baseload nuclear that is coming off line. If you actually do the math of the amount of nuclear that is coming off line, our renewable baseload cannot keep close to keeping up. So there are a lot of charts. And I have done this on the floor before, showing that as all this nuclear comes off line, carbon emissions in the United States on electrical generation is going up.

Even though we have all this renewable, this wind, this photovoltaic, these things, geothermal hitting the market, it doesn't produce enough power to keep up with the nuclear coming off. And the argument for much of the nuclear is, well, think, they have to do uranium mines, think of this, think of that.

Well, what if I came to you and said, baseload nuclear is absolutely critical to the reliability of the grid and all of those other things, and it is noncarbon-emitting, and we have the technology today?

I have done a whole presentation on this in detail. Basically, we can extract uranium from sea water now. We do this. We have the technology.

But it is even better than that. We have a Nobel Prize physicist who has been writing papers, articles, saying that, within a decade, they believe high-pulse lasers—and, look, I have done my best to read the scientific articles a couple times. Some of it is beyond even—you know, when you are having to read an article and have a dictionary close by to look up some of the technical. But his premise is we can use high-pulse lasers to break up and make inert spent nuclear fuels.

So his theme is, say, in 30 minutes I could take something that would have lasted a million years, and in 30 minutes I can make it inert. If this is true, it is the virtuous cycle on nuclear energy. And you all know, because this place has actually helped fund it, the new compact nuclear reactor design that is dramatically safer, dramatically less intrusive, and much more efficient.

So think of that. I can extract my uranium from rain water, the new nuclear reactor design, and now we have a way of instead of sticking it in Yucca Mountain, we can actually break up that spent nuclear fuel.

This should be exciting. There should be people on the left and the right going, it is worth sticking some money into this type of technology. But it doesn't fit our political folklore around here of, well, we can't have nuclear because of this.

But we claim we give a darn about science and technology, when we have some of our smartest people in our society saying, we think we have a solution.

Why don't we actually invest in those solutions instead of investing in the things that we keep doing around here, where we are investing in technology that is already decades out of date?

So part of my fixation is—the reason I bring this chart is there was a Member, I think, just last week that was on the floor, and she alluded—someone from the left—that the economic growth basically led to more greenhouse gases, more environmental impact. But that is not actually the math.

We are still working on some of the data for 2019, but if you look at 2018

and what we are preliminarily seeing in 2019, you know, greenhouse gases, the environmental impact, went down, even though GDP went up dramatically.

□ 1815

Why? Because what we did in the tax reform created this huge incentive to invest in the latest technology.

Mr. Speaker, you can go buy that new technology, and you could 100 percent expense it. It turned out we were able to create a moment where economic growth took off, jobs took off, and the working poor got dramatically less poor.

It was the first couple of years in modern economic times when income inequality shrank, and it shrank because there was opportunity. People's labor became valuable. And, oh, guess what? Our environment got cleaner while growing the economy. We have the proof. We have the data.

Isn't this the Holy Grail that both the left and the right claim they care about? Except the difference is it didn't require a command-and-control economy. It just required really good technology and the incentive to invest in that technology, and it made a difference.

The other argument we come to the microphone and talk about is that there are incredible technology disruptions on the cusp. If we could get our heads around them, then we could make some amazing things happen. If we don't get our heads around them, then it is going to create economic disruptions. It is going to hurt a lot of people. We need to understand these.

Over the last couple of years, I have done some presentations on something called synthetic biology. The reality is it is incredibly hopeful for humanity. It also has some really scary stuff. Mark my words, we will know in about a decade whether I am right. I believe this piece of technology here will be the single most disruptive technology of our lifetimes.

Here is one: What if I came to you tomorrow and said that we can take plants and make them from the mid-20s to 52 percent more efficient in their growth by tweaking?

Now, I am not a plant biologist, but I have gone out of my way to read every article of the University of Illinois and those who are producing.

Mr. Speaker, you remember your high school biology class? Let's see if I can get this right. You had a plant cell, and it really, really, really wants a carbon molecule to turn it into a sugar to grow. But a quirk of nature, it grabs an oxygen molecule. It now has to spend all this energy to purge that and then turn around and grab the carbon so it can grow.

What happens if every time it grabs the right molecule to maximize its growth?

Okay, it looks like we would now know how to tweak commodity crops and other crops to always grab that carbon molecule and grow.

Now, I need the thought experiment. I need the people around here who all believe we are geniuses to think this through.

What happens tomorrow to the value of farmland? What happens to our trade relationships with the world where it is our agriculture muscle as a country when other countries are now able to grow 40 percent more soybeans on the same land, same water, same fertilizer?

Think about the value of agricultural land. What is the value of agricultural debt?

This is coming. This technology is here.

Are we preparing, thinking what it means? What type of opportunity does this mean? Because the world already produces more food than it needs. Our real problem is distribution.

What happens if tomorrow much of the agriculture in the world could produce 40 percent more on the same piece of land?

There is also a quirky piece of math to think about, and that is world agriculture is estimated to produce about 2.2 times more greenhouse gases than every car on Earth. Mr. Speaker, if you were an optimistic utopian, then this technology is functionally equal to removing every car off the face of the Earth. Yes, that is the positive. But you also have to be ready to deal with the disruption it means economically. And it is coming.

But yet have we ever had a hearing? Have we ever had a discussion? Have we ever invited the scientists to think about and talk us through and have us start to plan economically about what it means?

Or are we just going to do what this place does, which is to avoid difficult discussions until it kicks us in the head?

Let's talk about healthcare a bit. Obviously, that is my fixation. I come here every week and try to talk about ways we can change.

Before we do this, here is a simple thought experiment. Well, it is not a thought experiment. It is the facts. ObamaCare, the ACA, was a financing bill. It is who gets subsidized, who gets to pay. Our Republican alternative is a financing bill. It is who has to pay, who gets subsidized. Medicare for All is a financing bill. They don't actually change what the underlying cost of delivering healthcare is. They just shift around who gets to pay.

This debate here has to become what we pay. What technology and what models are we going to adopt that change the cost of delivering healthcare?

What happens if I come to you, Mr. Speaker, and say that 5 percent of our brothers and sisters have preexisting conditions, that they are suffering, and that they are also over half of the healthcare costs of this Nation?

Wouldn't it be much smarter, much more caring, much more empathetic, and much more compassionate to fix-

ate on that 5 percent who are suffering and say that we are going to do everything we can to push technologies, to push the caring, and to push disruption in biologics to cure or minimize the suffering of the 5 percent? We are living examples of this.

Do you remember, Mr. Speaker, only a few years ago the cost curve we were all looking at in regard to hepatitis C? Do you remember, hep C, you carry the virus in you for sometimes decades and decades and decades, Mr. Speaker. Then, all of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, you need a liver transplant.

We were looking at numbers that were going to essentially bankrupt the VA with all the liver transplant costs. Then what happened? A cure was delivered. It was really expensive at the beginning, but it was dramatically less expensive than somebody having a failed liver.

We are living in the time of disruptions, and we should promote those as a Congress and help many of us who are panicked over the debt but also really care about eliminating suffering.

It is one of the reasons I have an absolute fixation. If you really wanted to help people of color, Mr. Speaker, and my Tribal communities—I represent some of the populations with the highest diabetes in the world, some of my Native Americans—how about an Operation Warp Speed on diabetes?

Remember, Mr. Speaker, in the next 30 years, in today's dollars, inflation-adjusted dollars, we have \$121 trillion of debt coming at us. Sixty-seven percent of that is just Medicare.

The single biggest thing you could actually do, Mr. Speaker, the single thing, the biggest thing to deal with future debt that buries and destroys the future for my 5-year-old daughter, believe it or not, is a cure for diabetes because 31 percent of the Medicare future is just diabetes.

One of the most loving and compassionate things we could do as conservatives and liberals is say that we are going to do—call it whatever you want, Mr. Speaker. I want to call it operation warp speed because we are close to the cusp of major revolutionary treatments for type 1, the ability to do stem cells to the pancreas. There are some incredible journal articles out just in the last 6 weeks on that.

Some of that can also be used for type 2. Type 2 is more complicated because it is both the autoimmune but also lifestyle and having a discussion of, as a people, as a society, are we going to continue to fund really unhealthy foods? Are we going to continue to do farm supports in a way where we grow only a handful of crops instead of being able to have a wide variety of different things?

These are really disruptive concepts, and they would be really compassionate and loving for everyone if we took really, really, really seriously what diabetes means to this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, if you really want to deal with the reality, don't come to

these microphones and give a speech about how COVID affected certain populations much more dramatically and then, in the next breath, not talk about the fact that the curve is absolutely sympathetic with those same populations having diabetes. The math is the math.

Mr. Speaker, if you really give a darn about people, let's solve that because it is the single biggest thing you and I could do to take on future sovereign debt.

The other one that drives me insane, because this is the one you and I could have the most impact on in the shortest period of time, Mr. Speaker, 16 percent of U.S. healthcare costs, so about \$528 billion every single year, is people not taking their pharmaceuticals properly.

I forget to take my hypertension medicine, and I have a stroke. I don't take my statin for my cholesterol, and all of a sudden, I have to get a stent. Someone doesn't maintain use of technology and stay on their insulin properly.

We have lots of data now. This is a really well-vetted number. Sixteen percent of U.S. healthcare is our not taking or taking improperly our pharmaceuticals.

Well, it turns out there is a technology solution to that: the little pill cap that talks to you.

How about for grandma, who has to take some pills in the morning and then in the evening, we have the technology that drops the pills and talks to her. It turns out this technology could save not \$100 billion but a few hundred billion dollars every year.

Mr. Speaker, you talk about wanting to have an impact on healthcare and make people healthier and deal with those 5 percent of our brothers and sisters who have chronic conditions that are 50-plus percent of our healthcare. There are things you could do tomorrow that would have an impact on society before the year is over.

We made a proposal last year or just before the pandemic of super-high-value pharmaceuticals. Why don't we put them in sterile blister-pack-type containers and make them recyclable?

I had a number of Members here, particularly one who is my friend on the left, who came to me and said: Oh, that is yucky.

But I remember 10 years ago, when my mother was in hospice care, and one of the nurses there—she was a family friend—took me in the back. We were talking, and she showed me this barrel. She said: You know, there is probably \$10,000 to \$20,000 of pharmaceuticals in there that I am throwing away from our patients who have passed away in the last few weeks.

That got me thinking: Is this rational?

Besides the fact that the small molecules end up in your water supply, Mr. Speaker, the biologics, but is that rational?

These are just little, incremental, creative things. We know we have technology now—the thing you can blow

into, Mr. Speaker, that instantly tells you that you have the flu that could bounce off your phone with its medical records and say that you are not allergic to this antiviral and instantly order that antiviral, and you would be healthier.

But that process is illegal under the laws that we passed here. The Social Security Act says you are going to need a doctor, Mr. Speaker, the reimbursement from HHS, our State licensing rules.

Are we ready to stop living in virtue signaling, stop living in folklore, and start looking at the actual math?

Yes, we are going to get lobbied like crazy from groups that we are disrupting their business model. But wouldn't it be neat to say: This isn't Republican, and it is not Democrat. It is technology.

Let's make a difference. It is doable, and it is here.

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

#### INFLATION THREATENS FUTURE OF AMERICA'S ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to discuss the threat of inflation on the future of America's economy.

In other places around the Capitol at this time, people are discussing a new infrastructure bill. They are talking about a new 2022 budget. People talk about the importance of not raising taxes on the poor. Earlier this year, they rejected a possible gas tax hike because it would have fallen disproportionately on the poor. But there is no surer way to penalize the poor of this country than to inflate the currency.

□ 1830

Look at where we already are on other commodities: aluminum, lumber, soybeans.

How are our young people going to buy that first house?

The cost of food, and even prepared food, is going up.

Why is that?

Take a look at the charts showing the amount of currency in banks. M1 currency, which is up by a factor of 5 times; not 5 percent, not 50 percent, but a factor of 5 times in the last year.

Look at M2, up 30 percent in the last year. Of course, the cost of commodities is spiraling through the roof.

America is a wealthy country because our dollar has been the envy of the world. But this Congress has not been acting like a Congress with the world's reserve currency. This Congress is acting like the Congress of a country such as Zimbabwe, and we all saw on TV what happened there.

It is time for the people who are not only negotiating the infrastructure

bill, but negotiating the 2022 budget, to take into account what they are doing to the poor of this country or the middle class of this country as they inevitably stoke inflation.

Think of the people on almost fixed incomes, on Social Security. Think of all of the people on pensions, who are locked in at \$15,000 a year, \$20,000 a year, and think how their purchasing power will go down if we continue along this path, including the bloated budget proposed by President Biden himself.

We must rein in our spending. The poor and the middle class are the ones paying the price. I beg the negotiators to stand up to the people who think that printing hundreds of millions of dollars more in the infrastructure bill or passing this bill with an excessively high spending increase in the regular 2022 budget will not affect the average guy. It is going to affect the average guy. It is going to erode their savings. It will shrink the values of their pension or Social Security. It will be a true disaster for middle class and poor America.

QUESTIONS FOR VICE PRESIDENT HARRIS ON HER TRIP TO THE SOUTHERN BORDER

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to, first of all, applaud the fact that Vice President HARRIS is going to the southern border. I don't know whether she has done this on her own accord or with prodding from President Biden, but, either way, I am glad she is going down there.

I have been to the border several times this year. I think it is very difficult to learn all you should learn in one day. There are nine sectors to the southern border, and what you learn in El Paso is very different from what you learn in Yuma. It is very different from what you learn in San Diego. It is very different from what you learn in McAllen.

Nevertheless, I am glad she is going down there, and I would like to make some suggestions for her, which we will forward to her as questions she should be asking or things she should learn about the southern border.

First of all, Madam Vice President, the Migrant Protection Protocols caused the Mexican Government to hold asylum seekers on the south side of the border. President Biden has since walked away from the protocol. What effect did the nullification of this agreement with the Mexican Government have on the number of people crossing the border? And what effect will it have on the number of people from around the world who will come here in the future?

Secondly, we also had Asylum Cooperative Agreements with Central American countries that held people south not only of the Mexican border, but south of Mexico. What effect did President Biden's ending the Asylum Cooperative Agreements with Central American countries have on the number of people entering southern Mex-

ico? And what effect will this have on people coming through Mexico from around the world?

Third, I want the Vice President to find out what type of drugs are coming across the border. Has there been a change in the fraction of marijuana versus fentanyl coming across the southern border? How lethal is fentanyl?

Fourth, I hear horrific stories from the border guards as far as women and girls being sexually assaulted on their journey through Mexico. What percentage of women and girls are sexually assaulted as they travel to enter the U.S. illegally?

Fifth, you will find when you get down there, Madam Vice President, that families consist of adults and children, find out how many times a family supposedly shows up and the Border Patrol suspects that the children are not part of the family, and what happens when DNA tests are given to children and the adults they are entering with?

Six, how much does it cost for the migrants to enter our country? And by that, I mean how much are they having to pay the drug cartels? I think you will find different numbers for the cost of a Mexican, a Central American, a Brazilian, and Asian. But you should ask these questions when you are on the southern border.

Seventh, got-aways are when people come in this country and have no contact with the Border Patrol. As the Border Patrol must spend time doing paperwork with the huge increase of unaccompanied children coming here, has the number of got-aways, increased from this time last year to now?

Eighth, I think you should look at some demonstrations with some dogs. How effective are dogs in looking for fentanyl and other drugs, and should we be purchasing more dogs in this budget?

Next, I ask you to look at the border wall which you will find is 30-feet high and 8 feet underground. Talk to the Border Patrol, talk to ICE, talk to local law enforcement, and see what they think of that wall and whether it would be worth expanding it or whether your administration was right to just cut it off with equipment just sitting in the open sun.

Next, Madam Vice President, you said you want to focus on the root causes from countries whose citizens are coming here. I ask you to find out what countries are sending its citizens here and which countries have sent a significant amount of people. I think you are going to be surprised that it is not just a matter of people coming here from Mexico or Honduras. They are coming from around the world, but you should report back on the number of countries you would have to improve to prevent the demand from going up further to come here.

Next, in the opinion of the Border Patrol, have you and the President's public comments during your campaign

and after the campaign had an impact on the number of people coming to this country? I would ask members of the Border Patrol.

The twelfth question is: Have your comments, as well as the fact that you have decided to take 13 weeks before you decided to go to the border, had an effect on the morale of the Border Patrol? You and the President have not visited the border, which I think is the biggest crisis facing your administration since you were both sworn in. What do they think about that, and what can you do to make up any dispiriting of these brave people due to your inaction to this point?

Thirteen, and one of the scary things that I don't think we have talked about: Ask the Border Patrol if they keep track of how many people drown in the Rio Grande trying to come here every year, and how many people dehydrate in the Arizona or New Mexico or Texas deserts as they try to come here.

And, finally, look for what policies we can implement from Washington to make your job of securing the border easier.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct remarks to the Chair and not a perceived audience.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

ALLOCATIONS AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2022  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, June 24, 2021.

MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to sections 1 and 3 of House Resolution 467 (117th Congress) and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: (1) allocations for fiscal year 2022 for the House Committee on Appropriations, and (2) a list of discretionary accounts identified for advance appropriations in fiscal year 2022 appropriations bills.

This filing is made for technical purposes as required by House Resolution 467, and the budgetary material published herein is for the purposes of enforcing titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and other budgetary enforcement provisions. If there are any questions, please contact Jennifer Wheelock or Sam Wice of the Budget Committee staff.

JOHN YARMUTH.

TABLE 1.—ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS  
(Unified amounts in millions of dollars)

	2022
Base Discretionary Action:	
BA .....	1,506,027
OT .....	1,672,503
Current Law Mandatory:	
BA .....	1,356,059
OT .....	1,355,730

TABLE 2.—ACCOUNTS IDENTIFIED FOR ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS

Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations For Fiscal Year 2023
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education
Employment and Training Administration
Education for the Disadvantaged

TABLE 2.—ACCOUNTS IDENTIFIED FOR ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS—Continued
School Improvement Programs
Career, Technical, and Adult Education
Special Education
Transportation, Housing and Urban Development
Tenant-based Rental Assistance
Project-based Rental Assistance
For Fiscal Year 2024
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education
Corporation for Public Broadcasting
Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations
For Fiscal Year 2023
Military Construction, Veterans Affairs
Veterans Medical Services
Veterans Medical Support and Compliance
Veterans Medical Facilities
Veterans Medical Community Care

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported that on June 17, 2021, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills and joint resolution:

H.R. 49. To designate the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue, Orlando, Florida, 32806, and for other purposes.

H.R. 711. To amend the West Los Angeles Leasing Act of 2016 to authorize the use of certain funds received pursuant to leases entered into under such Act, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 27. Providing for the appointment of Barbara Barrett as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 25, 2021, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-1467. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Appropriations, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Report to Congress from the Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies June 2021, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 262r(a); Public Law 95-118, Sec. 1701(a) (as amended by Public Law 105-277, Sec. 583); (112 Stat. 2681-202); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-1468. A letter from the Chairman, Appraisal Subcommittee, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting the Council's 2020 Annual Report, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 3332(a)(5); Public Law 101-73, Sec. 1103 (as amended by Public Law 111-203, Sec. 1473(b)); (124 Stat. 2190); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-1469. A letter from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's interpretive rule — Examinations for Risks to Active-Duty Servicemembers and Their Covered Dependents received June 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law

104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-1470. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73-622(i), Post Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Augusta, Georgia) [MB Docket No.: 21-49] (RM-11874) received June 23, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1471. A letter from the Chair, Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, transmitting the Commission's June 2021 Report to Congress on Medicaid and CHIP, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1396(b)(1)(C); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XIX, Sec. 1900 (as amended by Public Law 111-148, Sec. 2801(a)(1)(A)(iv)); (123 Stat. 91); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1472. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's Major final rule — Revision of Fee Schedules; Fee Recovery for Fiscal Year 2021 [NRC-2018-0292] (RIN: 3150-AK24) received June 17, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1473. A letter from the Acting Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Annual Performance Report for Fiscal Years 2020-2022, including the Annual Performance Plan, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1115(b); Public Law 111-352, Sec. 3; (124 Stat. 3867); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-1474. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's Semiannual Report of the Office of Inspector General for the 6-month period of October 31, 2020 through March 31, 2021; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-1475. A letter from the Acting Director, Selective Service, transmitting the Service's fiscal year 2022 Congressional Budget Justification, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231f(f); Aug. 29, 1935, ch. 812, Sec. 7(f) (as amended by Public Law 93-445, Sec. 416); (97 Stat. 436); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-1476. A letter from the Acting Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the final map and perimeter boundary description for the Sturgeon Wild and Scenic River, in Michigan, added to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System by Public Law 102-249, March 3, 1992, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1274(b); Public Law 90-542, Sec. 3(b) (as amended by Public Law 100-534, Sec. 501); (102 Stat. 2708); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1477. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the COPS Office Annual Report to Congress, FY 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1478. A letter from the Acting Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Returning the Urban Sea to Abundance: A five-year review of the 2015 Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan report, pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 1269(f)(1); June 30, 1948, ch. 758, title I, Sec. 119 (as amended by Public Law 115-270, Sec. 4104(a)); (132 Stat. 3873); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1479. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Modification of 2021 Cost-of-Living Adjustments to the Internal Revenue Code Due Statutory Changes Contained in the American Rescue Plan of 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-1480. A letter from the Chair, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting the Commission's June 2021 Report to the Congress: Medicare and the Health Care Delivery System, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395b-6(b)(1)(D); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XVIII, Sec. 1805(b)(1)(D) (as amended by Public Law 111-148, Sec. 2801(b)(2)); (124 Stat. 332); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

EC-1481. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the final report on the national emergency with respect to the International Criminal Court that was declared in Executive Order 13928 of June 11, 2020, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and the Judiciary.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 4112. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to establish clear Federal oversight of the development of credit scoring models by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 4113. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to fix the consumer report dispute process, to ban misleading and unfair consumer reporting practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 4114. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide equal coverage of in vitro specific IgE tests and percutaneous tests for allergies under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes; 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 Ms. TLAIB:

H.R. 4115. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to restore the impaired credit of victims of predatory activities and unfair consumer reporting practices, to expand access to tools to protect vulnerable consumers from identity theft, fraud, or a related crime, and protect victims from further harm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TRONE (for himself and Mr. PALMER):

H.R. 4116. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Appalachian development highway system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BACON (for himself, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. MACE):

H.R. 4117. A bill to establish the National Commission on Domestic Terrorist Attacks on the United States by Antifa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORSFORD (for himself, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr.

JEFFRIES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SOTO, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. DEAN):

H.R. 4118. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to build safer, thriving communities, and save lives, by investing in effective community-based violence reduction initiatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 4119. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to remove adverse information for certain defaulted or delinquent private education loan borrowers who demonstrate a history of loan repayment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 4120. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to provide comprehensive reforms to the consumer credit reporting laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ARRINGTON:

H.R. 4121. A bill to codify a final rule issued by the Secretary of Health and Human Services relating to fraud and abuse and the removal of safe harbor protection for certain drug rebates, and for other purposes; 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. BABIN (for himself and Ms. HOULAHAN):

H.R. 4122. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for interest-free deferment on student loans for borrowers serving in a medical or dental internship or residency program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BUDD, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. PERRY, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. CAWTHORN, and Ms. HERRELL):

H.R. 4123. A bill to codify certain rules related to health reimbursement arrangements and other account-based group health plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, 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 Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 4124. A bill to establish the "Biomedical Innovation Fund", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and 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. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. HICE of Georgia):

H.R. 4125. A bill to authorize Inspectors General to continue operations during a lapse in appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. DAVIDSON (for himself, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ESTES, and Mr. HERN):

H.R. 4126. A bill to prohibit the Federal Government from issuing vaccine passports, to prohibit businesses from discriminating against patrons and customers by requiring documentation certifying COVID-19 vaccination, or post-transmission recovery, as a condition on the provision of products or services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H.R. 4127. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to encourage the development and use of DISARM antimicrobial drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. BUCHSHON):

H.R. 4128. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the regulation of in vitro clinical tests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 4129. A bill to promote the United States-Greece defense partnership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. BASS, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, and Ms. CHU):

H.R. 4130. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide fair treatment of radio stations and artists for the use of sound recordings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 4131. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to expand access to home and community-based services (HCBS) under Medicaid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DONALDS (for himself, Mr. NORMAN, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. MANN, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. HERN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ROY, and Mr. GOOD of Virginia):

H.R. 4132. A bill to consolidate or repeal unnecessary agency major rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. SIREs):

H.R. 4133. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Caribbean Basin Security Initiative, enhance the United States-Caribbean security partnership, prioritize disaster resilience, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida (for herself, Mr. WALTZ, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. KIM of California, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BASS, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. RUTHERFORD):

H.R. 4134. A bill to support empowerment, economic security, and educational opportunities for adolescent girls around the world, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself and Mrs. LURIA):

H.R. 4135. A bill to require an independent assessment with respect to the Arctic region and establishment of the Arctic Security Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOLDEN (for himself and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 4136. A bill to establish competitive grant programs to incentivize the safe and responsible storage of firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. NEWMAN, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CARSON, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK):

H.R. 4137. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a veterans visa program to permit veterans who have been removed from the United States to return as immigrants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. KATKO, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. GUEST, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 4138. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) identification of staffing needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 4139. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect more victims of domestic violence by preventing their abusers from possessing or receiving firearms, to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to establish a grant program relating to the removal of firearms from adjudicated domestic violence offenders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. MANN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. FEENSTRA, and Mr. LUCAS):

H.R. 4140. A bill to make improvements with respect to the pricing of cattle in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 4141. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Small Business, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KINZINGER (for himself, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MELJER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. PORTER, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Ms. SALAZAR):

H.R. 4142. A bill to require the Secretary of State to establish an investor visa denials database, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 4143. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify the mailing requirement relating to social security account statements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 4144. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to ban the use of credit information for most employment decisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. LEE of Nevada (for herself and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 4145. A bill to establish a matched savings program for low-income students; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LIEU (for himself, Mr. KILMER,

Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WELCH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CHU, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. DEAN, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SULTZ, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. MENG, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. BASS, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. KAHELE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. MANNING, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. SOTO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SIREs, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Ms. TLAB):

H.R. 4146. A bill to prohibit commercial sexual orientation conversion therapy, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. CHU, Mr. SOTO, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, and Mr. CORREA):

H.R. 4147. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Billie Jean King, in recognition of her contribution to the Nation and her courageous and groundbreaking leadership advancing equal rights for women and the LGBTQ community in athletics, education, and our society; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MALINOWSKI (for himself, Mr. SIREs, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 4148. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide an option for first responders age 50 to 64 who are separated from service due to retirement or disability to buy into Medicare; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 4149. A bill to extend the authorization of the Maurice D. Hinchey Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. WILD, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. SLOTKIN):

H.R. 4150. A bill to establish a grant program for shuttered minor league baseball clubs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 4151. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and extend the Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders Prevention and Services program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 4152. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to establish an Appalachian regional energy hub initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 4153. A bill to advance clean power technology development and use through innovation and clean energy standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Science, Space, and Technology, Transportation and Infrastructure, Oversight and Reform, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 4154. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for direct-pay



credit bonds in the case of certain bonds the proceeds of which are used for the replacement of lead drinking water service lines; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. PERLMUTTER (for himself, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. MORELLE):

H.R. 4155. A bill to encourage energy efficiency, conservation, and development of renewable energy sources for housing, and to create sustainable communities; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PHILLIPS (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CASE, and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 4156. A bill to establish the Compassionate Capitalist Award to recognize organizations that substantially benefit the well-being of their employees, stakeholders, and communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 4157. A bill to amend section 1977 of the Revised Statutes to protect equal rights under law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SCHKOWSKY, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SIREN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TLAI, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 4158. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to eliminate cost sharing with respect to coverage of insulin as a covered part D drug under the Medicare program or as a covered outpatient drug under the Medicaid program; 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 Ms. SCANLON (for herself and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS):

H.R. 4159. A bill to develop best practice guidelines for the use of dogs in Federal courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. MEUSER):

H.R. 4160. A bill to establish a Global Autism Assistance Program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. STEEL, Ms. MENG, and Mr. SUOZZI):

H.R. 4161. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to allow additional funds to be provided under the airport improvement program for certain noise mitigation projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SPANBERGER (for herself and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 4162. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to improve the Rural Energy for America Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. TITUS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. KEATING, Ms. BASS, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. ROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 4163. A bill to amend the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act to provide pay equity for amateur athletes and other personnel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4164. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to limit the charitable deduction for certain qualified conservation contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. VAN DUYNE (for herself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MAST, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. DONALDS):

H.R. 4165. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitation on qualified first-time homebuyer distributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. BUSH, Mr. CARSON, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MENG, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. POCAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SIREN, Mr. SOTO, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. TLAI, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 4166. A bill to direct the Secretary Housing and Urban Development to establish a grant program for planting of qualifying trees in eligible areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 4167. A resolution to establish the Northern Neck National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself and Mrs. KIM of California):

H. Res. 497. A resolution condemning the murder of Alireza Fazeli Monfared and the practice of so-called "honor killings" in Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. KINZINGER):

H. Res. 498. A resolution honoring the lives and legacies of the "Radium Girls"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

ML-36. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 47, urging the United States Congress and President of the United States to enact the Protecting the Right to Organize Act of 2021 as expeditiously as possible; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ML-37. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 45, urging the United States Congress to grant additional authority to the Federal Communications Commission to stop unwanted and illegal robocalls; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ML-38. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 25, urging the United States Congress and the President of the United States to oppose H.R. 1 and similar harmful election policy measures; to the Committee on House Administration.

ML-39. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 81, urging the United States Congress, Federal Aviation Administration, and Hawaii Department of Transportation to take every action necessary to address rapidly increasing safety risks and community disruption from insufficient regulation of tour helicopter and small aircraft operations throughout Hawaii skies; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ML-40. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 7, memorializing the United States Congress to support H.R. 82 of the 117th Congress, the Social Security Fairness Act of 2021, and all other similar legislation and to take such actions as are necessary to review and eliminate all provisions of federal law which reduce Social Security benefits for those receiving pension benefits from federal, state, or local government retirement or pension systems, plans, or funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ML-41. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, relative to House Concurrent Memorial 2001, urging the Congress of the United States to appropriate monies to eradicate Salt Cedars from Arizona's waterway; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Natural Resources.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 4112.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 4113.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 4114.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8  
By Ms. TLAIIB:  
H.R. 4115.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section VIII, Clause XVIII  
By Mr. TRONE:  
H.R. 4116.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.  
By Mr. BACON:  
H.R. 4117.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8  
[Page H2357]  
By Mr. HORSFORD:  
H.R. 4118.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States  
By Ms. PRESSLEY:  
H.R. 4119.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution  
By Ms. PRESSLEY:  
H.R. 4120.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution  
By Mr. ARRINGTON:  
H.R. 4121.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.  
By Mr. BABIN:  
H.R. 4122.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution: "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."  
By Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina:  
H.R. 4123.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8  
By Ms. CLARKE of New York:  
H.R. 4124.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8  
By Mr. CONNOLLY:  
H.R. 4125.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.  
By Mr. DAVIDSON:  
H.R. 4126.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1. The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;  
Under 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 any Department or Officer thereof"  
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, to regulate commerce with for-

eign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian.  
By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:  
H.R. 4127.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.  
By Ms. DEGETTE:  
H.R. 4128.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3  
By Mr. DEUTCH:  
H.R. 4129.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.  
By Mr. DEUTCH:  
H.R. 4130.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8 of the United States Constitution; and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.  
By Mrs. DINGELL:  
H.R. 4131.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
The Constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.  
By Mr. DONALDS:  
H.R. 4132.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8  
By Mr. ESPAILLAT:  
H.R. 4133.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I Section 8:  
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. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida:  
H.R. 4134.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.  
By Mr. GALLAGHER:  
H.R. 4135.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18  
By Mr. GOLDEN:  
H.R. 4136.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution  
By Mr. GRIJALVA:  
H.R. 4137.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.  
By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:  
H.R. 4138.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
U.S.C. Article I Section 8  
By Mr. HIMES:  
H.R. 4139.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8  
By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:  
H.R. 4140.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3  
By Mr. KIND:  
H.R. 4141.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1  
By Mr. KINZINGER:  
H.R. 4142.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution  
By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:  
H.R. 4143.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.  
By Mr. LAWSON of Florida:  
H.R. 4144.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
"Article 1, Section 8: 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 Mrs. LEE of Nevada:  
H.R. 4145.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, clause 1 provides Congress with the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises" in order to "provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States."  
By Mr. LIEU:  
H.R. 4146.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
U.S. Const., Art. I, Sec. 8  
By Mr. LOWENTHAL:  
H.R. 4147.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution  
By Mr. MALINOWSKI:  
H.R. 4148.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, Clause 18 of the Constitution.  
By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:  
H.R. 4149.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8  
By Ms. MATSUI:  
H.R. 4150.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution  
By Ms. MCCOLLUM:  
H.R. 4151.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution  
By Mr. MCKINLEY:  
H.R. 4152.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
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. MCKINLEY:  
H.R. 4153.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8—Powers of Congress. 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. PASCRELL:

H.R. 4154.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:

H.R. 4155.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H.R. 4156.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18—Congress shall have the 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. RASKIN:

H.R. 4157.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 4158.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. SCANLON:

H.R. 4159.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 4160.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the US Constitution

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 4161.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution: The Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Ms. SPANBERGER:

H.R. 4162.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4163.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 4164.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Ms. VAN DUYNE:

H.R. 4165.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 4166.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1. Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 4167.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States of America Constitution:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 18: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. KIM of California, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 65: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 82: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 112: Mr. CARL.

H.R. 228: Ms. BROWNLEY and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 234: Ms. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 304: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 310: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

H.R. 392: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 532: Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. BRADY, and Mr. LATURNER.

H.R. 554: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ESTES, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 555: Mr. ESTES.

H.R. 556: Mr. DOGGETT and Ms. SEWELL.

H.R. 604: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 735: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 852: Ms. LETLOW.

H.R. 869: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 890: Ms. SÁNCHEZ and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 899: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 914: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1025: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 1095: Mr. GARCÍA of California.

H.R. 1140: Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 1179: Mr. CARSON, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1201: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HIMES, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CORREA, Ms. MENG, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ.

H.R. 1284: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH and Mr. HUIZENGA.

H.R. 1304: Mrs. LAWRENCE and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1309: Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. WILD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1348: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. OMAR, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. MFUME, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1355: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1379: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 1394: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1408: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 1417: Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 1453: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.

H.R. 1456: Mr. LIEU.

H.R. 1471: Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 1522: Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ.

H.R. 1534: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. GOODEN of Texas.

H.R. 1551: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 1596: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1625: Mrs. FISCHBACH.

H.R. 1626: Mr. CLOUD.

H.R. 1630: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 1656: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1661: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1670: Mr. STANTON.

H.R. 1684: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 1733: Ms. MATSUI and Ms. NEWMAN.

H.R. 1734: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1745: Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ESTES, Mr. SMUCKER, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1794: Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 1800: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1801: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.

H.R. 1842: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. CARSON, Mr. BROWN, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. MAST.

H.R. 1916: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina.

H.R. 1957: Mr. LIEU.

H.R. 1961: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 1983: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1986: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mr. LIEU.

H.R. 2028: Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2050: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2079: Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 2096: Mr. KEATING, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 2122: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.

H.R. 2126: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 2223: Mr. CLYDE.

H.R. 2278: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 2294: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2325: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. FLETCHER, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2347: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 2361: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 2373: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 2400: Mrs. HAYES and Mr. KUSTOFF.

H.R. 2472: Mr. RYAN and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2499: Ms. SCHRIER and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 2573: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. BACON, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2586: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LIEU, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 2607: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2721: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2727: Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 2767: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2782: Mr. CLYDE.

H.R. 2795: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 2810: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2816: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2840: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2849: Mr. CLYDE.

H.R. 2859: Mr. TORRES of New York and Mr. ALLRED.

H.R. 2886: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 2920: Ms. NORTON, Ms. ROSS, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, and Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 2924: Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 2928: Ms. SPANBERGER and Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 2931: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 2974: Ms. WILD.

H.R. 2998: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 3031: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 3046: Mr. WALTZ.

H.R. 3076: Mr. NADLER, Mr. MAST, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BOST, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 3083: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 3104: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 3105: Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 3126: Mr. YARMUTH.  
 H.R. 3131: Mr. GIBBS.  
 H.R. 3180: Ms. STRICKLAND.  
 H.R. 3187: Ms. KUSTER.  
 H.R. 3254: Mr. MOONEY, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. MAST, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.  
 H.R. 3281: Mr. ROSENDALE and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.  
 H.R. 3288: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 3289: Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Ms. CHU, Mr. JONES, Mr. SIRE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. POCAN, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 3291: Mr. HORSFORD.  
 H.R. 3293: Mr. HORSFORD.  
 H.R. 3321: Ms. SALAZAR and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
 H.R. 3341: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.  
 H.R. 3378: Ms. STRICKLAND.  
 H.R. 3385: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MANNING, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. BOURDEAUX, Ms. TLAIB, and Ms. HOULAHAN.  
 H.R. 3408: Mrs. MCCLAIN and Mr. CARSON.  
 H.R. 3434: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.  
 H.R. 3440: Mr. PASCRELL.  
 H.R. 3482: Mr. TIMMONS.  
 H.R. 3515: Mrs. LESKO.  
 H.R. 3537: Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. FEENSTRA, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. ALLRED, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3542: Mr. CLYDE.  
 H.R. 3548: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. CROW.  
 H.R. 3554: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi and Mr. LATURNER.  
 H.R. 3584: Ms. BOURDEAUX.  
 H.R. 3625: Mr. PAYNE.  
 H.R. 3630: Mr. PETERS and Mr. KIM of New Jersey.  
 H.R. 3650: Mr. BOST, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. LAMB, and Mr. KUSTOFF.  
 H.R. 3780: Mr. KILMER.  
 H.R. 3790: Mr. TIMMONS.  
 H.R. 3796: Mrs. BOEBERT.  
 H.R. 3807: Ms. BASS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Ms. UNDERWOOD.  
 H.R. 3818: Mrs. BUSTOS.  
 H.R. 3821: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.  
 H.R. 3860: Mr. NORMAN.  
 H.R. 3867: Mr. CASE.  
 H.R. 3880: Ms. WILD.  
 H.R. 3913: Mr. HUDSON.  
 H.R. 3926: Mr. FERGUSON.  
 H.R. 3942: Mr. TAKANO.  
 H.R. 3962: Mr. CROW.  
 H.R. 3985: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MANNING, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. RYAN, Mr. STEWART, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CASE, Ms. BOURDEAUX, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Ms. STEFANIK.  
 H.R. 3988: Mr. NEAL.  
 H.R. 3992: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.  
 H.R. 3999: Mr. TRONE, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BUCSHON, and Ms. LETLOW.  
 H.R. 4025: Mr. RUSH.  
 H.R. 4041: Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 4056: Mr. DUNN.  
 H.R. 4079: Mr. NADLER, Ms. WILD, Mr. MORELLE, and Mr. SCHIFF.  
 H.R. 4086: Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Ms. SCANLON.  
 H.R. 4104: Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. KAHELE, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. DEAN, Mr. HARDER of California, and Mr. KILMER.  
 H.J. Res. 35: Ms. OMAR, Mr. CARSON, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.  
 H.J. Res. 51: Mr. CALVERT.  
 H.J. Res. 53: Mr. JONES and Ms. SPANBERGER.  
 H. Con. Res. 33: Ms. MACE, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. BARR, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. HERN, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.  
 H. Res. 47: Mrs. FLETCHER and Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida.  
 H. Res. 117: Mrs. KIM of California.  
 H. Res. 131: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Ms. DEAN.  
 H. Res. 259: Mr. CASTEN.  
 H. Res. 338: Mr. SUOZZI.  
 H. Res. 361: Mr. WELCH and Mr. CASE.  
 H. Res. 413: Mr. TURNER.  
 H. Res. 459: Mrs. HAYES and Mr. MCGOVERN.  
 H. Res. 471: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.  
 H. Res. 483: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. MRVAN.  
 H. Res. 484: Mr. JACKSON.  
 H. Res. 489: Mr. CASE, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. CARBAJAL.