United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2021 *No. 186*

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, October 25, 2021, at 3 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2021

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 22, 2021.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LAUREN UNDERWOOD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

God, You have asked of us, above all things, to love our neighbor. Help us to live into that difficult yet simple commandment.

The other half of that command is not easy either, that we are to love them as we love ourselves. Holy God, for a variety of reasons, loving ourselves is often difficult.

Remind us that You first loved us. Your love has forgiven us all our faults, excused our shortcomings. May we bask in that redemption with gratitude for Your mercy.

Then, as we turn to our neighbors—those we find in our communities, in our country, in this Chamber—enable us to understand that what we do to them should be a reflection of what You have so mercifully done for us.

If in response to Your willingness to love us—allowing us to discover our worth, our value—then we will be willing to love them, and our neighbors will be encouraged and strengthened and our relationship with them transformed.

God of love, we pray that this day, we would remain faithful to Your Golden Rule and live as examples of Your merciful and gracious love.

In Your redemptive 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 Carlina (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 five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

REMEMBERING DR. TIMUEL BLACK

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

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, last week, Chicago and the Nation lost a great champion for justice and civil rights, Dr. Timuel Black.

As a World War II veteran and a leader in the Black community that came to Chicago during the great migration, Tim always challenged the inequities he witnessed in the United States and abroad.

In his 102 years, Tim was a historian, educator, author, and civil rights activist. He inspired generations to fight for racial and social justice.

He fought alongside Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and helped organize the march on Washington. He registered voters and raised funds to elect Harold Washington, the first Black mayor of Chicago, in 1983. He mentored the first Black President of the United States, Barack Obama.

On a personal note, I will always be grateful for Tim's support during my mayoral campaign in 2015. He said he supported me as someone who was able to communicate with everyone and transcend racial lines.

Tim profoundly shaped the struggle for civil rights in Chicago and across the country. I will seek to honor him by following his example and fighting for the voiceless in our city.

Rest in power, Tim Black.

Printed on recycled paper.

REMEMBERING OFFICER DAVID HORTON

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to remember and honor Darien Police Officer David Horton of Ludowici, Georgia, who sadly passed away at the age of 45. David was a respected and honored member of his community.

After graduating from law enforcement training in 2014, he began his career with the Long County Sheriff's Office.

David had a heart for service and was awarded numerous accolades during his time in law enforcement. As an agency DUI Hero award winner, David was the definition of protect and serve.

He was not only a dedicated law enforcement officer but also a devoted father and citizen who was loved and respected by many.

I am thankful for David's lifetime of service and commitment to his community. I know his legacy will be forever treasured.

My thoughts and prayers are with his family, friends, and all who knew him during this most difficult time.

PRESIDENT GEORGE W. BUSH'S REMARKS ON THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF 9/11

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, and Members of the House, last month, on the 10th anniversary of 9/11, former President George W. Bush delivered remarks commemorating the heroism of the crew and passengers of United Flight 93 in Pennsylvania.

The former President's words were a welcome reminder, Madam Speaker, of what it looks like for an American leader to call us together in unity. His words were compassionate, inspiring, and patriotic.

Madam Speaker, he and I have had many differences over the years when it comes to policy. During his Presidency, I opposed much of his governing agenda. He did the same, opposing many of Democrats' plans when we came into the majority in 2007.

We respected one another, we were able to work together with one another, and we both had at the center of our philosophy the best interests of the United States of America and its people. We always approached each other with civility, with seriousness, and with a shared respect for each other's patriotism.

We never questioned each other's love of our country or that we were doing what we thought was best for the safety and security of the American people.

I hope that President Bush's message will inspire my friends on the other side of the aisle, from the former President's own party and, indeed, all Americans and all of us, to remember what that kind of leadership looks like after 4 years of a President who did not call us to unity, who did not encourage civility or common cause, and who furthered our divides instead of bridged them.

I hope as well that we in this House can strive to heal the divisions in our country and embrace the kind of leadership that President Bush displayed last month and that together, as Democrats and Republicans, we can work toward a better tomorrow for all of our fellow Americans.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD President Bush's full remarks.

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT GEORGE W. BUSH AT FLIGHT 93 NATIONAL MEMORIAL IN COMMEMORATION OF THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF 9/11 ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2021

''Thank you very much. Laura and I are honored to be with you. Madam Vice President, Vice President Cheney. Governor Wolf, Secretary Haaland, and distinguished guests:

''Twenty years ago, we all found—in different ways, in different places, but all at the same moment—that our lives would be changed forever. The world was loud with carnage and sirens, and then quiet with missing voices that would never be heard again. These lives remain precious to our country, and infinitely precious to many of you. Today we remember your loss, we share your sorrow, and we honor the men and women you have loved so long and so well.

''For those too young to recall that clear September day, it is hard to describe the mix of feelings we experienced. There was horror at the scale of destruction, and awe at the bravery and kindness that rose to meet it. There was shock at the audacity of evil, and gratitude for the heroism and decency that opposed it. In the sacrifice of the first responders, in the mutual aid of strangers, in the solidarity of grief and grace, the actions of an enemy revealed the spirit of a people. And we were proud of our wounded nation.

''In these memories, the passengers and crew of Flight 93 must always have an honored place. Here the intended targets became the instruments of rescue. And many who are now alive owe a vast, unconscious debt to the defiance displayed in the skies above this field.

''It would be a mistake to idealize the experience of those terrible events. All that many people could initially see was the brute randomness of death. All that many could feel was unearned suffering. All that many could hear was God's terrible silence. There are many who still struggle with a lonely pain that cuts deep within.

''In those fateful hours, we learned other lessons as well. We saw that Americans were vulnerable, but not fragile—that they possess a core of strength that survives the worst that life can bring. We learned that bravery is more common than we imagined, emerging with sudden splendor in the face of death. We vividly felt how every hour with our loved ones is a temporary and holy gift. And we found that even the longest days end.

''Many of us have tried to make spiritual sense of these events. There is no simple explanation for the mix of Providence and human will that sets the direction of our lives. But comfort can come from a different sort of knowledge. After wandering long and lost in the dark, many have found they were actually walking, step by step, toward grace.

''As a nation, our adjustments have been profound. Many Americans struggled to understand why an enemy would hate us with such zeal. The security measures incorporated into our lives are both sources of comfort and reminders of our vulnerability. And we have seen growing evidence that the dangers to our country can come not only across borders, but from violence that gathers within. There is little cultural overlap between violent extremists abroad and violent extremists at home. But in their disdain for pluralism, in their disregard for human life, in their determination to defile national symbols, they are children of the same foul spirit. And it is our continuing duty to confront them.

''After 9/11, millions of brave Americans stepped forward and volunteered to serve in the Armed Forces. The military measures taken over the last 20 years to pursue dangers at their source have led to debate. But one thing is certain: We owe an assurance to all who have fought our nation's most recent battles. Let me speak directly to veterans and people in uniform: The cause you pursued at the call of duty is the noblest America has to offer. You have shielded your fellow citizens from danger. You have defended the beliefs of your country and advanced the rights of the downtrodden. You have been the face of hope and mercy in dark places. You have been a force for good in the world. Nothing that has followed—nothing—can tarnish your honor or diminish your accomplishments. To you, and to the honored dead, our country is forever grateful.

''In the weeks and months following the 9/11 attacks, I was proud to lead an amazing, resilient, united people. When it comes to the unity of America, those days seems distant from our own. A malign force seems at work in our common life that turns every disagreement into an argument, and every argument into a clash of cultures. So much of our politics has become a naked appeal to anger, fear, and resentment. That leaves us worried about our nation and our future together.

''I come without explanations or solutions. I can only tell you what I have seen.

''On America's day of trial and grief, I saw millions of people instinctively grab for a neighbor's hand and rally to the cause of one another. That is the America I know.

''At a time when religious bigotry might have flowed freely, I saw Americans reject prejudice and embrace people of Muslim faith. That is the nation I know.

''At a time when nativism could have stirred hatred and violence against people perceived as outsiders, I saw Americans reaffirm their welcome of immigrants and refugees. That is the nation I know.

''At a time when some viewed the rising generation as individualistic and decadent, I saw young people embrace an ethic of service and rise to selfless action. That is the nation I know.

''This is not mere nostalgia; it is the truest version of ourselves. It is what we have been—and what we can be again.

''Twenty years ago, terrorists chose a random group of Americans, on a routine flight, to be collateral damage in a spectacular act of terror. The 33 passengers and 7 crew of Flight 93 could have been any group of citizens selected by fate. In that sense, they stood in for us all.

''The terrorists soon discovered that a random group of Americans is an exceptional group of people. Facing an impossible circumstance, they comforted their loved ones by phone, braced each other for action, and defeated the designs of evil.

''These Americans were brave, strong, and united in ways that shocked the terrorists—but should not surprise any of us. This is the nation we know. And whenever we need hope and inspiration, we can look to the skies and remember.

God bless.

AMERICA IS EXPERIENCING AN ENERGY CRISIS

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

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, America is experiencing an energy crisis. The price of oil, a gallon of gas, electricity, and natural gas are all topping 7-year highs. But what does that really mean for the American people?

It means less money to buy groceries and more money at the gas pump; it means less money to take care of your kids and more money to heat your home; and it means less money for your healthcare and more money for overhead to run your business. That is a terrible tradeoff for every American working hard to support their families.

It is only happening because the Biden administration is intent on implementing policies that make it harder for American energy producers to develop cleaner, more affordable energy right here at home.

President Biden must wake up and see that there is only one way to reverse this course: Embrace American energy.

RECOGNIZING THE OBERLIN VILLAGE COMMUNITY

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

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the history and the legacy of the Oberlin Village community.

Founded in 1866, Oberlin Village is one of the last surviving antebellum settlements founded by free Black people in North Carolina.

After Reconstruction, the community became a welcoming refuge for newly freed former slaves from the nearby Cameron plantation.

It became much more than a town. The thriving municipality was home to rows of single-family houses, two churches, and a public school. It became a symbol of land ownership for freedmen.

The local post office, now located in a building owned by the Oberlin Baptist Church, is still named after the plantation rather than this historic community. I urge the Postal Service to change the name to reflect the post office's new location and to commemorate the Oberlin Village community and its legacy.

BIDEN'S CRISIS CREATION

(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, Tim Murtaugh, a visiting fellow at The Heritage Foundation, correctly wrote: ''President Joe Biden is drowning in a sea of crises of his own creation, and Americans are the ones who are paying the price.

''There's an ongoing humanitarian and national security calamity at the southern border.

''Thirteen U.S. servicemembers are dead, and an unknown number of our citizens remain stranded in Afghanistan following Biden's disastrous withdrawal.

''Americans are not taking the millions of jobs available . . . as many have chosen the option of being paid by the government to stay home instead of working.

''And energy prices continue to rise, helping to drive mounting inflation . . .

''Such a callous dismissal of real-world issues . . . simply feeds the prevailing belief that Biden simply is bad at his job.''

In conclusion, God bless our troops, who successfully protected America for 20 years, as the global war on terrorism continues moving from Afghanistan to America.

Our thoughts and prayers are with South Carolina Senate Finance Chairman Hugh Leatherman for a speedy recovery.

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE DELAYS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the significant mail backlogs we are experiencing in northern Ohio, across the whole region, Cleveland to Toledo, impacting the timely and reliable delivery of mail.

Postal employees do remarkable work every day to execute their mission.

To the tens of thousands of military veterans who work for the Postal Service, we owe you an enormous debt of gratitude for your continued loyal service to our Nation.

However, the decision by the U.S. Postal Service Board of Directors and management to implement disastrous policies to consolidate processing centers and ship local mail hundreds of miles away to be sorted elsewhere is truly illogical.

While we are finally seeing incremental progress being made, our region is still in desperate need for constructive solutions to the backups and slow processing people are enduring on the ground.

I will continue working with my colleagues from across our country and across the aisle until we bring about new Postal Service leadership and fully restore the service our people and communities richly deserve and expect.

CRISIS AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, last night on television, I listened as Jen Psaki—I don't know whether it was from yesterday or a replay from something a month ago—wondered why President Biden should go to the border. Having been down there, I want to educate her as to why.

First of all, she would find we have a shortage of Border Patrol. Well over 10,000 unaccompanied minors a month are coming across the border, and because they have to deal with them, they are not able to guard the border. Rather than giving free college for illegals, you could get some more Border Patrol agents.

Secondly, he would get to know that the Border Patrol agents are wonderful people, so that in the future, when agents on horses are charging a group of Haitians who are assaulting some woman, our hate-filled President does not attack the Border Patrol.

Third, she can find out that immigrants are right now routinely throwing away identification cards so that we can't do background checks on them.

Fourth, I always knew immigrants who tested positive for COVID are being let in. I was not aware that Border Patrol has a policy that we can never even force immigrants to take the tests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

□ 0915

REMEMBERING VICTORIA BACA

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Moreno Valley City Councilwoman, and true public servant, Victoria Baca.

As the first Latina elected to the city council, Victoria broke barriers and paved the way for so many others to follow in her footsteps.

I knew Victoria during her time on the city council and remember her as someone who was fiercely loyal to her community.

Victoria also served on the board of the Moreno Valley Unified School District, where she was a strong advocate for special education services in the Inland Empire and dedicated her time in office to protecting and uplifting students.

She genuinely cared about others and worked tirelessly to make a lasting difference. Her legacy with respect to education, diversity, and economic growth in Moreno Valley will always be admired.

Victoria's death has left a void in the community and in the lives of the people closest to her. I am honored to have known her and to have witnessed the positive change she pioneered.

To the Baca family and all those who knew, loved, and respected her, I offer my deepest condolences.

BIDEN PILES UP RED TAPE

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, it appears that the Biden administration is going to do everything it possibly can to destroy our economy and hurt working-class people.

Headline in today's Washington Times: ''Biden piles up red tape after Trump's trims: Long arm of regulation reaches businesses for vague objectives.''

''President Biden accelerated the regulatory state on his first day in office by ordering agencies to consider aspirational but vaguely defined goals and benefits when imposing new rules on businesses large and small.

''The order greenlighting regulations even when the benefits 'are difficult or impossible to quantify' sent shudders down the spines of CEOs. They fear business growth will be smothered in pursuit of vague objectives such as 'human dignity' and 'the interests of future generations.'

'' 'It is the most aggressive thing I have ever seen by an administration,' said Doug Holtz-Eakin. 'It is one thing to put out a bunch of regulations, but this changes the way regulation is done. It allows you to jam through any regulation you want regardless of the impact [on] the private sector.' ''

We know we are having historic increased inflation and historic debt levels and now regulations. It is a disaster coming.

PROVIDING URGENT MATERNAL PROTECTIONS FOR NURSING MOTHERS ACT

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 716, I call up the bill (H.R. 3110) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to expand access to breastfeeding accommodations in the workplace, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 716, an amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part C of House Report 117–137, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 3110

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 ''Providing Urgent Maternal Protections for Nursing Mothers Act'' or the ''PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act''.

SEC. 2. BREASTFEEDING ACCOMMODATIONS IN THE WORKPLACE.

(a) EXPANDING EMPLOYEE ACCESS TO BREAK TIME AND PLACE.—The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 7, by striking subsection (r);

(2) in section 15(a)—

(A) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting ''; and''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) to violate any of the provisions of section 18D.'';

(3) in section 16(b) by striking ''7(r) or 15(a)(3)'' each place the term appears and inserting ''15(a)(3) or 18D''; and

(4) by inserting after section 18C the following:

''SEC. 18D. BREASTFEEDING ACCOMMODATIONS IN THE WORKPLACE.

''(a) An employer shall provide—

''(1) a reasonable break time for an employee to express breast milk each time such employee has need to express breast milk for the 2-year period beginning on the date on which the circumstances related to such need arise; and

''(2) a place, other than a bathroom, that is shielded from view and free from intrusion from coworkers and the public, which may be used by an employee to express breast milk.

''(b)(1) Subject to paragraph (2), an employer shall not be required to compensate an employee receiving break time under subsection (a)(1) for any time spent during the workday for such purpose unless otherwise required by Federal or State law or municipal ordinance.

''(2) Break time provided under subsection (a)(1) shall be considered hours worked if the employee is not completely relieved from duty during the entirety of such break.

''(c) An employer that employs fewer than 50 employees shall not be subject to the requirements of this section, if such requirements would impose an undue hardship by causing the employer significant difficulty or expense when considered in relation to the size, financial resources, nature, or structure of the employer's business.

''(d) No provision of this section or of any order thereunder shall excuse noncompliance with any Federal or State law or municipal ordinance that provides greater protections to employees than the protections provided for under this section.

''(e)(1) Subject to paragraph (2), before an employee commences an action to recover liability under section 16(b) for a violation of paragraph (a)(2), the employee shall inform the employer of the failure to provide adequate place and provide the employer with 10 calendar days after such notice is provided to come into compliance with subsection (a)(2) with respect to such employee.

''(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply in the case that—

''(A) the employee has been discharged because the employee has made a request for break time or place under this section or has opposed any employer conduct related to this section; or

''(B) the employer has indicated that the employer has no intention of complying with subsection (a)(2).

''(f) The circumstances described in subsection (a)(1) arise if an employee—

''(1) begins providing breast milk for a nursing child; or

''(2) gives birth, including to—

''(A) a stillborn child; or

''(B) a child over whom the employee does not retain legal custody.

''(g)(1) This action shall apply to an air carrier, as defined in section 40102 of title 49, United States Code, subject to the following requirements:

''(A) In providing a break described in subsection (a)(1) to a crewmember, an employer shall not be required to—

''(i) completely relieve such crewmember from duty during break time taken during flight time; or

''(ii) provide such a break during critical phases of flight.

''(B) Nothing in this subsection shall require an employer to incur significant expense, when considered in relation to the size, financial resources, nature, or structure of the employer's business, to retrofit an aircraft.

(2) In this subsection—

(A) the terms 'flight time' and 'crewmember' have the meaning given such terms in section 1.1 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(B) the term 'critical phases of flight' has the meaning given the term in 121.542 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations.''.

(b) CLARIFYING REMEDIES.—Section 16(b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 216(b)) is amended by striking ''15(a)(3)'' each place the term appears and inserting ''7(r) or 15(a)(3)''.

(c) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall issue guidance with respect to employer compliance with section 18D of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended by this Act, which shall be similar, with respect to specific examples of compliance, to the guidance relating to ''Supporting Nursing Moms at Work'' published on the website of the Office on Women's Health of the Department of Health and Human Services as of such date of enactment.

(d) CONFORMING COVERAGE OF CERTAIN OTHER EMPLOYEES.—Section 203(a)(1) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1313(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and section 12(c)'' and inserting ''section 12(c), and section 18D''; and

(2) by inserting '', 218D'' after ''212(c)''.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) EXPANDING ACCESS.—Except as provided in subsection (c), the amendments made under sections 2(a) and 2(d) shall take effect on the date that is 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) REMEDIES AND CLARIFICATION.—The amendments made under section 2(b) shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) APPLICATION OF LAW.—Section 18D of the Fair Labor Relations Act of 1938 (as added by section 2) shall not apply to crewmembers of an air carrier, as defined in section 40102 of title 49, United States Code, until the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. REGULATIONS REQUIRED.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, shall propose regulations, as appropriate, to—

(1) identify appropriate means for air carriers, as defined in section 40102 of title 49, United States Code, to comply with subsection (b)(1) of section 18D of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 during flight time; and

(2) update title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, to ensure that expressing breast milk is considered a physiological need.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, is 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 may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 3110, the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act.

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, today the House has an opportunity to pass H.R. 3110, the Providing Urgent Maternal Protections for Nursing Mothers Act, or the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act, a bipartisan bill that would strengthen workplace protections for nursing mothers.

Nursing mothers should have a clear right to break time and a clean, private space to pump breast milk at work. As we have heard from health experts and worker advocates across the country, these basic accommodations ensure that nursing mothers can balance their work, their health, and the health of their babies.

Regrettably, many nursing mothers still do not have these protections. Under current law, millions of workers—including farmworkers, transportation workers, and teachers—are currently excluded from Federal protections for nursing employees.

The nursing mothers who are covered by existing law have limited recourse when their rights are violated.

To close these gaps, the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act expands existing protections for nursing mothers for nearly 9 million employees who are currently left out. It provides nursing workers with access to meaningful remedies when employers fail to provide appropriate time and pumping space.

Importantly, this bill includes an amendment to clarify that congressional employees are covered by these protections and to address safety concerns by including airline crew members break time to pump during a flight.

No working American should be forced to choose between going to work and staying healthy, so we must take this urgent step to support nursing workers and strengthen our economy.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy in support of H.R. 3110.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 3110—PUMP FOR NURSING MOTHERS ACT—REP. MALONEY, D–NY, AND 8 COSPONSORS

The Administration strongly supports House passage of H.R. 3110, the Providing Urgent Maternal Protections (PUMP) for Nursing Mothers Act. No new mother should face unfair treatment in the workplace because their employer refuses to provide them with reasonable break time and private, clean space needed to adequately express breast milk while at work, forcing them to choose between their health and the health of her child, and earning a paycheck. Yet millions of new working mothers, disproportionately working mothers of color, face this challenge every day.

Congress recognized the importance of ensuring that workers are able to have the time and space they need to express breast milk by passing section 4207 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, also known as the 2010 Break Time for Nursing Mothers Act. The PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act would ensure that millions of working mothers previously excluded from the 2010 Break Time law are protected. By closing this gap, the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act will ensure millions of nursing mothers have a clear right to pump at work. Without these protections, nursing mothers face serious health consequences, including risk of painful illness and infection, diminished milk supply, or inability to continue breastfeeding.

H.R. 3110 is a bipartisan bill that would also require employers to pay an hourly employee for any time spent pumping if the employee is also working. The legislation would ensure that nursing mothers have access to remedies available for other violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Finally, the PUMP Act also gives employers flexibility to identify solutions that work for their specific business environment. For example, the bill requires employees to inform their employers about inadequate space to express breast milk 10 days before filing suit for violating the requirement.

The Administration encourages the House to pass this bipartisan, commonsense legislation and looks forward to working with the Congress to fill the gaps in the law so that all new mothers who choose to breastfeed are guaranteed the workplace protections they deserve.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I urge support of the legislation 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 H.R. 3110.

This act puts overly burdensome, one-size-fits-all requirements on businesses.

While I believe empowering women in the workplace is important, we must not saddle businesses with rigid policies that will open them up to legal action. We, instead, must support flexible policies that allow women to thrive in the workplace.

This bill's flawed scheme and expansive mandate do more harm than good and will further bog down businesses that are already struggling to recover from the pandemic. During this difficult time, the last thing small businesses need is more sweeping mandates.

More than 2 million women left the labor force in 2020. Now more than ever, we need to advocate for flexible workplace policies that improve conditions for, and empower, working mothers.

I fully support women who wish to enter and return to the workforce, and I understand the challenges that can come with this, especially for nursing mothers. Yet, I don't believe one-size-fits-all mandates are beneficial, not for women and not for employers.

Workplaces are as varied as the people they employ. Putting every workplace under the same standard, despite a job creator's needs or ability to meet that standard, will ultimately be bad for the American worker.

Airlines are just one example of an industry that will be negatively impacted if this bill is signed into law. Under this bill's rigid requirements, airlines may have to rethink plane designs or modify aircraft to provide a private space, other than a bathroom, for nursing mothers to pump, as required under the bill.

The rigid break requirements in the bill are also inappropriate for airlines because flight crews have varying responsibilities in preparation for and throughout flights, which ensure the safety and security of passengers.

Exposing airlines and other businesses to such inflexible requirements will hurt struggling businesses.

Further, not all nursing mothers have the same needs. Pretending that they do might be convenient, but it also demonstrates ignorance about the diverse circumstances that mothers are in.

I wholeheartedly believe that it is possible to provide women with a healthy environment in which to work and simultaneously to allow businesses flexibility in providing accommodations.

When I first entered the workforce, nursing-accommodation requirements for women in the workplace were not even on the horizon. Countless workplaces now provide such accommodations, and rightly so. Current law provides accommodations for hourly workers.

Creating a healthy place for women to thrive is important to us all, but there is a right way to go about this and a wrong way. H.R. 3110 is the wrong way.

Most employers have their employees' best interests at heart, but H.R. 3110 treats our job creators as if they are out to harm the very women they depend on to keep their businesses running.

Again, this is the wrong way to go about empowering women in the workplace.

This bill's excessive penalties, expansive mandate, and lack of clarity will create a perfect storm for frivolous lawsuits. Unfounded lawsuits cost businesses billions every year in the United States. We should do all we can to prevent opening businesses up to harmful legal action.

I would like to remind my colleagues that Representative MILLER-MEEKS submitted her bill, the Supporting Working Mothers Act, to the Rules Committee as an amendment to provide a commonsense alternative to the PUMP Act.

That is a sensible amendment that meets the actual needs of nursing mothers without forcing overly burdensome regulations on our job creators.

That amendment, unlike the PUMP Act, expands access to nursing accommodations in the workplace without

relying on punitive mandates that expose businessowners to costly litigation.

The Supporting Working Mothers Act adds nursing-accommodation coverage for white collar executive, administrative, or professional employees, ensuring that over 80 percent of currently exempt women are covered.

That amendment also includes a fair and workable process to ensure accommodations are provided for nursing mothers by encouraging collaboration between workers and employers to identify and make improvements when accommodations are insufficient.

Representative MILLER-MEEKS' commonsense amendment serves nursing mothers in the workforce without sacrificing the well-being of our job creators. This is the right way to empower women.

I am extremely disappointed that the Democrat majority refused to make the amendment in order. Democrats chose to stifle debate on this commonsense approach to nursing accommodations in favor of a flawed mandate.

Because the bill is impractical and overly punitive, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.R. 3110.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), chair of the Oversight and Reform Committee and the lead Democratic sponsor of the bill.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his incredible leadership in this body.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3110, the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act, a bipartisan bill I authored with Representative HERRERA BEUTLER. Our bill has also been introduced in the Senate by Senators MERKLEY and MURKOWSKI.

When I first came to Congress, working mothers would come to me, often in tears, and advocate for a place to safely pump breast milk. Often, they were fired, ridiculed, forbidden, or forced to pump milk in bathrooms.

Since those years, I have worked for on-site lactation rooms, here in government and really everywhere in our country.

In 1998, I passed a provision allowing State WIC agencies to purchase breast pumps for new mothers, making it easier for low-income moms to choose breastfeeding.

In 1999, Congress passed my bill to guarantee the right to breastfeed on Federal property.

Most recently, Senator MERKLEY and I passed the Break Time for Nursing Mothers as part of the Affordable Care Act. This act provides employees with critical protections to provide break time for nursing mothers and a private place to pump milk.

The PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act we are considering today builds on the Break Time Act by protecting the nearly 9 million employees who were not originally included in these protections. Those covered by the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act now include teachers, nurses, farmworkers, and software engineers, to name a few.

The PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act would also ensure that nursing mothers have remedies if their employers fire them or violate these breastfeeding protections. In addition, if an employee is fired for taking a break, the PUMP Act ensures that workers can seek reinstatement.

It also extends breastfeeding protections for 2 years, in line with recommendations from the World Health Organization.

Over 150 organizations have endorsed this important legislation. I include in the RECORD letters of support from some of those organizations, including the Center for WorkLife Law, and MomsRising, to name a few.

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF THE CENTER FOR WORKLIFE LAW BEFORE THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—SEPTEMBER 24, 2021

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI, MINORITY LEADER MCCARTHY, MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The Center for WorkLife Law submits this letter to the U.S. House of Representatives in full support of the Providing Urgent Maternal Protections (PUMP) for Nursing Mothers Act (H.R. 3110).

The Center for WorkLife Law is a research and advocacy organization that seeks to advance gender, racial, and class equity in employment and education. We collaborate with employees, employers, attorneys, and government officials to identify practical and legal solutions to work-family issues.

WorkLife Law's 2019 report Exposed: Discrimination Against Breastfeeding Workers found that shortcomings of the existing Break Time for Nursing Mothers law have caused lactating employees to face significant obstacles at work. Even with the current law's protections, breastfeeding employees leaking milk have been denied permission to take pumping breaks; they have been fired just for asking; and refused privacy, forcing them to pump milk with their breasts exposed to coworkers, clients, and the public in physically unsafe conditions. Employees who do not receive the break time and private space they need can face serious health consequences, including illness and painful infections, diminished milk supply, and weaning earlier than doctors recommend. Many employees also suffer economic losses when they are fired or forced to resign following a request for lactation accommodations.

The PUMP Act would correct key shortcomings of existing law that undermine the economic security and health of women and their families.

CLOSING THE COVERAGE GAP THAT EXCLUDES MILLIONS OF WORKERS

Nearly 9 million women of childbearing age are currently excluded from the protections of the Break Time for Nursing Mothers Law, meaning they have no clear federal right to receive break time and private space to pump milk during the workday. This exclusion was unintentional at the time the law was enacted. The resulting coverage gap is considerable and impacts employees in a wide range of occupations, including many of those working in the top two pink-collar occupations: nursing and teaching. The PUMP Act would correct this senseless exclusion to bring all workers whose employers are covered by the FLSA under the law's protection.

PROVIDING APPROPRIATE REMEDIES TO ENCOURAGE COMPLIANCE

Even when clear violations occur, the Break Time for Nursing Mothers provision cannot be counted on to deliver appropriate remedies in a court of law. Because employers cannot be held accountable for intentional legal violations, noncompliance has been widespread. As one judge expressed in the case of an EMT who was fired simply for asking that she be given break time and space: ''While the Court is sympathetic to Plaintiff's argument that this renders [the Nursing Mothers law] ineffective, there is no support from the case law or DOL [Department of Labor]'' to provide a remedy. Another federal judge observed: ''An employer faced with a request to allow an employee to take breaks to breastfeed may simply fire the employee rather than attempt to accommodate the request for breaks. And indeed, the Center for WorkLife Law has heard from too many workers whose employers have done exactly that.

The PUMP Act would correct this absurdity and encourage employers to follow the law by making remedies that are already available in other employment law contexts equally available to breastfeeding workers.

However, the PUMP Act is not expected to lead to a significant increase in lawsuits. A recent analysis by the Center for WorkLife Law found that while enforceable laws increase breastfeeding rates, they do not cause a meaningful increase in litigation rates. The study reviewed all cases filed in each state with enforceable lactation break time and space laws (similar to the PUMP Act) through 2020 and found:

Litigation rates for violations of the state laws were extremely low. Over the combined forty-seven years that the four jurisdictions' break time and space laws have been in effect, there were only six (6) cases total.

The annual likeihood a private employer will be sued under a break time and space law is essentially zero (0.0002 percent). A business owner is over 25 times more likely to be struck by lightning in their lifetime.

Notably, the state laws WorkLife Law studied do not include the additional employer protection found in the PUMP Act that gives businesses 10 days to correct space violations before any lawsuit can be filed, a provision that will further decrease the number of lawsuits that would be filed should the PUMP Act pass.

The PUMP Act is a balanced approach that meets the needs of breastfeeding employees while also serving employers who make reasonable attempts to follow the law. When employers have clear standards to meet, and appropriate consequences if they don't, employers have shown that they are able to provide the break time and space that working mothers need. Complying with break time and space requirements is simple, and creative solutions exist in all industries. As described by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, employers that support breastfeeding with affordable solutions realize cost savings from increased loyalty and retention, reduced sick time, and decreased health care and insurance costs.

Our organization urges all members of Congress to vote in support because the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act would ensure that all breastfeeding women have the full protection of the law and ability to meet their basic needs while away from their nursing babies during the workday. It is a simple solution that promotes maternal and child health, as well as the economic security of women and families.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

LIZ MORRIS,
Center for WorkLife Law,
UC Hastings College of the Law.

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF KRISTIN ROWE-FINKBEINER CO-FOUNDER & EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, MOMRISING BEFORE THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—SEPTEMBER 24, 2021

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI, MINORITY LEADER MCCARTHY, MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: MomsRising submits this letter to the U.S. House of Representatives in full support of the Providing Urgent Maternal Protections (PUMP) for Nursing Mothers Act (H.R. 3110).

MomsRising is a national online and on-the-ground grassroots organization with more than a million members nationwide. We work on a broad range of issues and policies to achieve economic security for all moms, women, and families in the United States.

While nearly four out of five U.S. mothers start out breastfeeding, less than half are still breastfeeding at six months postpartum. One of the main causes for the drop-off in breastfeeding rates is the lack of break time and a private place to pump in the workplace. MomsRising members around the country have shared their stories and pictures about needing better places to pump breastmilk.

Currently, federal law requires employers for most hourly wage-earning and some salaried employees (nonexempt workers) reasonable break time and a private, non-bathroom location to express breast milk for one year after the child's birth, This is a great first step, but it leaves millions of workers without any protections at all. We must close the gap in the law and expand protections for all breastfeeding mothers who work outside of the home. The PUMP Act will close gaps and include meaningful enforcement.

Breastfeeding isn't just good for moms and babies. The fact is that breastfeeding is good for the physical and economic health of our nation. Recent studies have shown if mothers could meet current medical recommendations for breastfeeding it would save the US economy nearly $13 billion per year in paediatric health costs and premature deaths.

With three-quarters of moms being the primary or co-breadwinner these days, we must close the gap in existing law and expand protections for all breastfeeding mothers who work outside of the home. Sadly returning to work is too often a significant barrier to breastfeeding, but we can do better.

Please support all breastfeeding and working moms and support the PUMP Act.

Thank you for your consideration,

KRISTIN ROWE-FINKBEINER,
Co-Founder & Executive Director,
MomRising.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. As these organizations have demonstrated, without these protections, nursing mothers face serious health consequences, including the risk of painful illness and the inability to continue to breastfeed.

Studies have shown the health benefits for breastfed infants. It is really important and can prevent other diseases.

These basic protections would ensure that working moms who want to breastfeed can continue to do so and prevent nursing mothers from being singled out, ridiculed, or fired.

This bill is an important step for work-family balance. We say we support families. Today is a vote for families, work-family balance, and mothers and infants.

Madam Speaker, I urge a strong ''yes'' bipartisan vote.

□ 0930

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS).

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I thank Dr. FOXX for yielding me time to speak on this important issue.

As a mother and a physician, I understand the tremendous value that nursing an infant brings both to the mother and the child.

As the director of the Iowa Department of Public Health, I attended conferences and spoke on the need to encourage mothers to consider breastfeeding and the benefits of breastfeeding, be they nutritional, immunological, or the tremendous bond that occurs through breastfeeding.

It is also why, despite being a working mother who was doing a general surgery internship and ophthalmology residency, I breast-fed both of my children. Because I was a working mother, that included expressing breast milk by pumping.

I understand and I am supportive of the collaboration between employers and nursing mothers to have a private place to do so at their place of employment. I recognize that H.R. 3110 is trying to address this issue and provide accommodations for nursing mothers, which I wholeheartedly support, however, I feel the bill needs improvement.

As it stands, H.R. 3110 puts a one-size-fits-all treatment of nursing accommodations for different businesses and industries. The bill also puts excessive penalties for minor or technical violations of the nursing-accommodation requirements in the Fair Labor Standards Act.

These unreasonable penalties, combined with compliance challenges posed by the mandate, will lead to costly and protracted lawsuits because of their adversarial nature.

The result will be delayed accommodations for working mothers. Rather than a collaborative arrangement between an employer and a nursing mother employee, this bill is punitive in nature.

To address laws and H.R. 3110 and build on current law protections for nursing mothers, I submitted my bill, H.R. 4297, the Supporting Working Mothers Act, to the Rules Committee as an amendment.

My bill is based on legislation introduced in a previous Congress by the sponsor of the bill we are debating today. Unfortunately, the majority refused to allow my amendment to even be debated on the floor.

My amendment represents a workable, feasible, and reasonable approach to the Fair Labor Standards Act nursing-accommodation requirements.

First, my amendment would have modified current law by providing coverage to white collar executive, administrative, and professional employees, while also maintaining current law coverage of hourly employees. My bill also preserved the 50-employee undue hardship exemption threshold as a safeguard for small businesses.

These provisions would ensure coverage for over 80 percent of the women who are not currently covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act nursing-accommodation requirement.

The bill we are debating today, H.R. 3110, significantly increases the penalties for employer violations that are required for breastfeeding accommodations, regardless of attempts at compliance.

These penalties are disproportionate to the technical and unintentional Fair Labor Standards Act violations which could occur under this bill.

My amendment would have preserved the authority of the Secretary of Labor to provide injunctive relief to address shortcomings and accommodations and assessable monetary penalties for repeat violations.

However—and this is critical—my amendment also includes a provision establishing a collaborative process for employees and employers to create and improve accommodations in a timely fashion without relying on time consuming and expensive lawsuits.

Because workplaces are not one size fits all, it is critical that legislation on nursing accommodations provide clear requirements that are adaptable to many kinds of workplaces, so that employers understand their obligations and are able to comply.

Again, given my strong support of breastfeeding, pumping, and storing of breast milk, I am very disappointed that my amendment was not ruled in order by the majority and that Congress did not take this opportunity to address the flaws in H.R. 3110.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington State (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER), the co-chair of the Maternity Care Caucus and the lead Republican sponsor on the bill.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of our bipartisan bill, the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act.

Honestly, the whole goal of this legislation is to protect a nursing mother's ability to provide for her infant by pumping at work.

And let me be clear, this is a business-friendly bill. This is current law. For those who are thinking we are shaking the Earth and doing something brand-new, it actually is current law. There were problems with the way the current law was written; it was actually put in the wrong place in code, and we are fixing that.

So the way it is currently, you could be a mom who gets into working and

you have worked your way up into a career where you are salaried and you make a decent amount of money, but you were excluded from this legislation. You didn't have the right to expect this, even though other workers did.

We are simply making some of those changes to make sure that folks who were not eligible for overtime, like that working mom, would be covered under current law.

This bill gives businesses clarity and predictability and allows small businesses to claim undue hardship exemptions in recognition of the unique challenges that they face.

Making sure our economy works is a huge priority to me, but we have to also recognize that working moms make up a significant portion—and should—of the workforce, and it is going to grow.

I thank my colleagues for improving this bill to reflect its original intent with regard to businesses, namely, differentiating between large corporations and mom-and-pop operations.

As a mom of three young kids myself, I understand finding the balance of raising kids, going to work, and just simply finding a place to pump while working.

My first child was a 28-week preemie. It was imperative for her to have breast milk; we were told this by her doctors. She could not handle formula, and they said it is imperative that you do what you can to breastfeed her. And I joke I am going to write a book called, Oh, the places I have pumped. I have pumped in trains, on planes, in automobiles, in some poor low-ranking officer's office at the Pentagon, at a kibbutz in Israel on a codel; I mean, everywhere. And I can tell you, there are places that are clean and helpful, and it doesn't have to be like the Taj Mahal; you just need something that is not crammed in a public toilet where people are flushing over you.

So on a really serious note, this is a critical piece of legislation that is going to empower women in the workforce to continue to provide for their families.

Imagine a single mother not having that choice, she has to work, and maybe she wants to provide breast milk for her child or maybe she has to in a circumstance like mine. Making sure that mothers of infants and toddlers can continue to do this in the workforce and continue to join the workforce is absolutely vital.

With women making up over half of our Nation's workforce, it is crucial that moms aren't forced to choose between going to their job or breastfeeding their child.

With the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's endorsement of this legislation, this bill seeks to help, not hinder, an employer's ability to provide a safe space for moms to pump.

I am proud to help lead this bipartisan legislation with my colleague, Congresswoman MALONEY, so moms in southwest Washington and across this country can feel secure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters of support from the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Retail Federation.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, September 28, 2021.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVE: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce strongly supports H.R. 3110, the Providing Urgent Maternal Protections (PUMP) for Nursing Mothers Act, as reported from the Education and Labor Committee and as anticipated to be be improved via manager's amendment. We hope this legislation will be further refined as the legislative process continues to address the unique issues related to the air travel sector.

This legislation would update the Break Time for Nursing Mothers Act, which became law in 2010. This law amended the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) to require employers with more than 50 employees to provide a space for mothers to either nurse or, more likely, to express breast milk. It also requires employers to provide reasonable breaks for workers to nurse. Because the legislation amended the FLSA's overtime provision, it did not cover workers exempt from overtime. It also lacks an enforcement mechanism.

The PUMP Act would expand coverage to those workers currently exempt and would provide workers with a remedy if employers fail to provide accommodation or reasonable breaks. The bill as passed by the Education and Labor Committee and the manager's amendment would improve upon the introduced version of H.R. 3110 in several key areas:

Employers would be allowed 10 days to improve space allocated for nursing mothers before employees could proceed with seeking relief from the courts. This provision would assure that more employees can get the accommodations they need in a timely manner rather than triggering a drawn out, costly, and uncertain litigation process.

Department of Labor would be required to issue guidance that is consistent with the existing information from the Office on Women's Health of the Department of Health and Human Services' website in order to assist employers with compliance.

The number of employees necessary for employers to be eligible for the hardship exemption would be made consistent with other provisions of law.

This legislation should be improved to provide a reasonable exemption for the air travel sector. The limitations on space on airplanes would make compliance with this legislation impractical and in some cases impossible. We hope this issue is addressed as the bill makes its way through the legislative process.

The PUMP Act is a win-win for nursing mothers and the companies that employ them. Employers would get clarity and a way to avoid litigation, and nursing mothers would be able to remain in the workforce. The bill as reported by the Education and Labor Committee and augmented by the manager's amendment is the product of collaborative negotiations between employers and advocates for this bill. The Chamber is pleased to strongly support this legislation.

Sincerely,

NEIL L. BRADLEY.

NATIONAL RETAIL FEDERATION,
Washington, DC, October 12, 2021.

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

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: On behalf of the National Retail Federation, I write to express our support for and urge the passage of H.R. 3110, the Providing Urgent Maternal Protections for Nursing Mothers (PUMP) Act.

NRF, the world's largest retail trade association, passionately advocates for the people, brands, policies and ideas that help retail thrive. From its headquarters in Washington, D.C., NRF empowers the industry that powers the economy. Retail is the nation's largest private-sector employer, contributing $3.9 trillion to annual GDP and supporting one in four U.S. jobs—52 million working Americans. For over a century, NRF has been a voice for every retailer and every retail job, educating, inspiring and communicating the powerful impact retail has on local communities and global economies.

For over a decade, federal law has required employers to provide nursing mothers with reasonable break times to express breast milk. Further, employers must designate a facility in which to do so, that is shielded from view and ''free from intrusion from coworkers and the public.'' As enacted, only nursing mothers who are non-exempt from the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) were covered by the new requirements. The PUMP Act would expand coverage to all nursing mothers. This legislation also includes important provisions that will ensure that employers are properly notified if it is alleged that they are not providing appropriate facilities for nursing, including a 10-calendar-day time period for employers to provide such facilities before any litigation can commence.

The PUMP Act is a sound piece of bipartisan legislation that will allow nursing mothers to maintain their vital role the American workplace.

Sincerely,

DAVID FRENCH,
Senior Vice President Government Relations.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this bill.

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

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Person Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member from North Carolina for yielding.

Person Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act, or should I call it the pump for nursing persons act? I can't keep up with the rules of this House.

At a time, Person Speaker, when we have 10 million job openings, why does the Democrat majority have such contempt and disdain for struggling businesses, job creators, and employers?

With businesses already suffering from endless regulations and the resulting costs passed on to consumers, not to mention being saddled with the vaccine mandates, endless COVID restrictions, why are Democrats relentlessly consumed with making things worse?

The fact is, Democrats are economically illiterate. They don't understand that the government doesn't have any money, they can only take it from taxpayers, and businesses don't truly pay taxes or pay for regulations. They have two choices: Close or pass on those costs to consumers.

Democrats believe that employers are abusing and exploiting their workers, and Democrats are working every day to punish them, with the result being more lost jobs, greater supply shortages, and higher inflation as we see around our country today.

We all believe in an equal workplace for men and women, but I oppose legislation that falsely victimizes employees and is truly just another payout for trial lawyers, otherwise known as Democrat donors. They are seeking to exploit these excessive new penalties on businesses.

The fact is employers want happy and productive employees. They are working hard to attract and retain those workers. And they are already making these accommodations without the heavy hand of the Federal Government.

I encourage my colleagues across the aisle to visit a business or talk to an employer.

This regulation was written by trial lawyers, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' and I will be doing the same.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD), the co-chair of the Black Maternal Health Caucus.

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, every mom returning to the workforce after childbirth should be provided the time and space that they need to safely and privately pump breast milk at work.

As a nurse, I understand how critical breastfeeding is to the health of both mom and baby.

Without sufficient workplace protections, breastfeeding employees are at risk of serious and painful health consequences and reduced milk supply. They can also face harassment, docked pay, and even job loss.

Yet each year, millions of workers, including teachers, nurses, farmworkers, and salaried employees are denied this basic protection due to an unintended loophole in current law.

I am grateful to Chairwoman MALONEY for her leadership, and I am proud to join her in leading the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act to close the coverage gap and ensure all breastfeeding moms are protected and supported as they return to work.

This bill is bipartisan and has a broad coalition of support from public health, labor, and civil rights groups, as well as from the business community.

It is also urgently needed, providing commonsense, necessary protections for working moms, as well as more clarity and predictability for employers.

Returning to work after childbirth already poses many inherent challenges for moms and their families, and we must remove barriers for parents making the best choices for their families and themselves.

I urge my colleagues to join me and vote ''yes'' on this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD three letters in support of the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act from the National Education Association, the National Partnership for Women and Families, and the March of Dimes.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, September 24, 2021.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The 3 million members of the National Education Association, who educate and support 50 million students across the nation, urge you to vote YES on the Providing Urgent Maternal Protections (PUMP) for Nursing Mothers Act, H.R. 3110. Votes on this issue may be included in the NEA Report Card for the 117th Congress.

The 2010 Break Time law provided important protections that ensured employees would have reasonable break time and a private place to pump breast milk. However, the law excludes certain categories of employees, including educators; in fact, nearly one in four women of childbearing age is not covered by the Break Time law. The PUMP Act would:

Protect the nearly 9 million employees who are not now covered by the Break Time law;

Require employers to provide reasonable break time and a private, non-bathroom space for breastfeeding employees to pump during the workday;

Provide employers with clarity on when pumping time must be paid and when it may be unpaid, leaving in place existing law protecting many salaried workers and clarifying that any time spent pumping while the employee is working must be counted as hours worked; and

Ensure that nursing mothers have access to remedies that are available for other violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Decades of scientific research tell us that breastfeeding helps put children on the path to life-long health and wellness. This strong foundation, in turn, can pave the way for their future success in school. The PUMP Act supports children's early development, while also recognizing that breastfeeding mothers are crucial breadwinners for their families. We urge you to vote YES on the PUMP Act.

Sincerely,

MARC EGAN,
Director of Government Relations,
National Education Association.

SEPTEMBER 24, 2021.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: The National Partnership for Women & Families is a nonprofit, non-partisan advocacy organization committed to improving the lives of women and families by achieving equity for all women. Since our creation as the Women's Legal Defense Fund in 1971, we have fought for every significant advance for equal opportunity in the workplace, including the Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978 and the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (FMLA). We write in strong support of H.R. 3110, Providing Urgent Maternal Protections (PUMP) for Nursing Mothers Act. This bipartisan legislation will support breastfeeding employees and their families, improving infant health and the economic security of women and families.

Once pregnant workers return to the workplace after giving birth, many will need the ability to pump breastmilk during the workday. While the Affordable Care Act requires employers to provide reasonable break time and a private, non-bathroom space for certain breastfeeding employees to pump, persistent coverage gaps exist. Roughly one in four women of childbearing age are not covered by current law. Since breastfeeding is associated with a host of improved health outcomes, expanding these protections to the 9 million workers currently excluded from the Break Time for Nursing Mothers law is essential to support mothers in the workplace. In addition to closing the coverage gap, the PUMP Act will also clarify for employers when pumping time must be paid and when it may be unpaid, and extend the remedies available for other violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act to nursing employees, ensuring that working parents' rights are protected.

The PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act is crucial because it will fill the gaps in the Break Time for Nursing Mothers law, allowing breastfeeding employees to remain in the workforce while keeping their families healthy. It is time to clarify and strengthen existing federal protections for breastfeeding employees by passing the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act.

Sincerely,

DEBRA L. NESS,
President, National Partnership for Women & Families.

MARCH OF DIMES,
September 24, 2021.

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

Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI, LEADER MCCARTHY, LEADER SCHUMER AND LEADER MCCONNELL: On behalf of March of Dimes, the nonprofit organization leading the fight for the health of all moms and babies, we urge swift passage of the bi-partisan Providing Urgent Maternal Protections (PUMP) for Nursing Mothers Act (S. 1658/H.R. 3110).

We began that fight more than 80 years ago as an organization dedicated to eradicating polio in the U.S., a goal that we achieved. We continue that fight today as we work to address some of the biggest threats to moms and babies, such as premature birth and maternal mortality, through research, education, programs and advocacy.

March of Dimes' ongoing work to improve maternal and infant health is more important than ever as our nation is in the midst of a dire maternal and infant health crisis. Rates of preterm birth are increasing, the U.S. is one of the most dangerous places to give birth in the developed world, and there are unacceptable disparities in birth outcomes between women and infants of color and their White peers. We also know, the health and well-being of mothers and infants are inextricably linked. By improving the health of, and conditions for, women before, during and between pregnancies, we can improve outcomes for both them and their infants. But we have many challenges before us.

One of those challenges is ensuring the ability for a mother to feed her infant after returning to the workplace. When a new mother returns to work after having a baby,

she will need continued support in the workplace to ensure she can continue to breastfeed her child if she chooses. Exclusive breastfeeding has a significant impact the health of the baby, as well as benefits for moms. However, returning to work can make continuing the breastfeeding relationship between mothers and their infants very difficult, especially if employers don't provide employees with adequate break time and an appropriate space to express breastmilk during the workday.

The Affordable Care Act (ACA) included provisions that required certain employers to provide break time and a place for most hourly wage-earning and some salaried employee to pump at work. The Providing Urgent Maternal Protections (PUMP) for Nursing Mothers Act would extend those supports to the 9 million employees that were excluded from the ACA's protections and provide for enforcement of this benefit. These nurses, teachers, retail workers, and managers across a number of industries deserve the same protections as other working mothers. March of Dimes proudly endorses the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act (S. 1658/H.R. 3110).

Thank you again for the opportunity to express March of Dimes' strong support for this bipartisan legislation under consideration, the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act (S. 1658/H.R. 3110). We urge the swift advancement of this important bill and look forward to its passage.

Sincerely,

STACEY BRAYBOY,
Senior Vice President, Public Policy & Government Affairs.

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I thank these groups for their support of the bill and for their tireless efforts on behalf of working moms.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3110, the PUMP Act.

Americans want nursing mothers to have adequate provisions in the workplace. The fact is, they are already provided in the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The bill before us consists of unreasonable burdens on employers and penalties that will end up disincentivizing job creation.

At the same time that nursing mothers deserve protections, employers deserve allowances for flexibility in their workplace.

We are in the midst of an economic, supply chain, and employment crisis. We don't need to put more hurdles in the way of businesses and employment.

When I am in my district and I speak to business owners all around my district, the number one thing I hear is we cannot find enough workers. Why are we going to put more strain on them?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), the co-chair of the Maternity Care Caucus.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the PUMP Act to expand workplace protections for breastfeeding moms and ensure they have access to appropriate and necessary accommodations.

Decades of research have shown that breastfeeding is one of the most cost-effective interventions for improving maternal and child health.

Compared with formula-fed children, breastfed babies have a reduced risk of ear, skin, stomach, and respiratory infections, sudden infant death syndrome, obesity, type 1 and 2 diabetes, asthma, and childhood leukemia.

However, while 84 percent of U.S. babies are breastfed at birth, only 25 percent are still exclusively breastfed at 6 months of age.

I commend my colleague, CAROLYN MALONEY, for her career-long dedication to improving these breastfeeding statistics.

Congresswoman MALONEY's 2010 Break Time for Nursing Mothers law provided the first critical protections to ensure mothers would have reasonable break times and a private place to pump breast milk.

□ 0945

Mothers with this access to workplace support have lower healthcare costs, absenteeism, and turnover and show improved job morale, satisfaction, and productivity.

However, that law unintentionally excluded 9 million women from these workplace protections, including teachers, software engineers, and many nurses.

Expanding workplace protections to include these women is important because research clearly shows that without protections, breastfeeding employees have increased risk of painful illness and infection, diminished milk supply, and are more likely to stop breastfeeding early.

As cochair of both the Maternity Care Caucus and the Public Health Caucus, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the PUMP Act, which is a commonsense solution to eliminating workplace barriers that interfere with successful breastfeeding.

The PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act is critical to ensuring all mothers have the opportunity to reach their personal breastfeeding goals to protect their babies, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter of support from the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics.

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF THE ACADEMY OF NUTRITION AND DIETETICS BEFORE THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SEPTEMBER 27, 2021

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI, MINORITY LEADER MCCARTHY, MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics submits this letter to the U.S. House of Representatives in full support of the Providing Urgent Maternal Protections (PUMP) for Nursing Mothers Act (H.R. 3110).

Representing more than 112,000 credentialed nutrition and dietetics practitioners, the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics is the world's largest organization of food and nutrition professionals. The Academy is committed to improving the nation's health and advancing the profession of dietetics through research, education and advocacy. Our vision is a world where all people thrive through the transformative power of food and nutrition. Our mission is to accelerate improvements in global health and well-being through food and nutrition.

The Academy's impact goals include increasing equitable access to food, nutrition and other life-style related services. As an organization that is overwhelmingly composed of women in the workforce, the struggle to balance professional responsibilities and motherhood is well-known to our members as is the nutritional case for breastfeeding and its continuance despite returning to work. Thus, for the Academy, the issue of workplace accommodations for breastfeeding women is both personal to our members and their health and professional given the unquestionably essential role of human milk in early nutrition for infants.

For over a decade—truly since the passage of the Affordable Care Act—the Academy has advocated for legislation addressing workplace accommodations for mothers doing their best to meet the demands of earning a wage, caring for their infants and protecting their own health but who work for employers not included in existing law.

Women choosing to continue breastfeeding after returning to work should be supported in this very personal yet consequential decision that carries life-long outcomes for both mom and infant.

It is unfortunate that such an important decision is often not supported or understood by employers who benefit directly. In one study, only 40 percent of mothers reported having access to both break time and a private space to pump while on the job. There is also inconsistency regarding how employers meet legal requirements to accommodate breastfeeding workers, even for those currently covered by the law. As shared in the media, stories from women employees report janitorial and other closets as the designated pumping location and reveal barriers faced by moms requesting an unpaid break.

A key recommendation of the 2020–2025 Dietary Guidelines for Americans is, ''For about the first 6 months of life, exclusively feed infants human milk. Sadly, among women who work full-time, only 10% of those who started breastfeeding their babies will still be breastfeeding by the time their infant reaches six-month of age. The anticipation and apprehension associated with how to continue to breastfeed after returning to work prevents some moms from even initiating breastfeeding.

There are three key reasons that Congress should pass the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act: 1) Human milk offers superior nutrition and health benefits compared to infant formula, 2) employers benefit from breastfeeding moms who return to work and 3) increasing breastfeeding initiation and duration are public health priorities of the United States. Examining the rationale more closely demonstrates the positive outcomes expected with passage of the bill.

1. Human Milk Offers Superior Nutrition and Health Benefits Compared to Infant Formula

The Academy has previously noted that ''. . . exclusive breastfeeding provides optimal nutrition and health protection for the first 6 months of life and breastfeeding with complementary foods from 6 months until at least 12 months of age is the ideal feeding pattern for infants. Breastfeeding is an important public health strategy for improving infant and child morbidity and mortality, improving maternal morbidity, and helping to control health care costs. Breastfeeding is associated with a reduced risk of otitis media, gastroenteritis, respiratory illness, sudden infant death syndrome, necrotizing enterocolitis, obesity, and hypertension. Breastfeeding is also associated with improved maternal outcomes, including a reduced risk of breast and ovarian cancer, type

2 diabetes, and postpartum depression. These reductions in acute and chronic illness help to decrease health care related expenses and productive time lost from work.

2. Employers Benefit from Breastfeeding Moms Who Return to Work

Aside from nutrition and the health benefits to the mother and baby, employers gain from women who continue to breastfeed after returning to work. First, breastfeeding employees miss work less often. One-day absences to care for a sick infant or child happen twice as often for mothers who chose to feed their infants formula. Second, since breastfeeding is associated with lower health care costs for mother and baby, employers also benefit from lower medical insurance claims. One insurance company, CIGNA, found that 343 employees participating in a worksite lactation support program resulted in an annual savings of $240,000 in health care expenses, 62 percent fewer prescriptions and $60,000 savings related to absenteeism rates over a two-year period. Finally, for businesses that offer a worksite lactation program, there are even greater tangible benefits to the employer. These include lower turnover rates and absenteeism for working women, fathers and partners; additional health care savings; higher productivity and loyalty; as well as a positive public image.

3. Increasing Breastfeeding Initiation and Duration are Public Health Priorities of the United States

Across federal agencies, significant resources are appropriated and authorized to encourage mothers to initiate breastfeeding and to continue after returning to work. A few examples include:

HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

In 2011 a landmark policy document, The Surgeon General's Call to Action to Support Breastfeeding, outlined measurable goals and objectives for stakeholders' efforts to align national policy with public health goals. While progress has been made over the past decade because of the recommended actions, there continue to be gaps and opportunities to address policies that support breastfeeding including those related to employment and the workforce.

The Office of Women's Health offers support for women through published guidance and notably for employers through its ''Business Case for Breastfeeding.''

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The Women, Infants and Children's Program receives appropriated funds to support its peer counseling program and the program extends participation to women who continue to breastfeed for one-year post-partum.

The 2020–2025 U.S. Dietary Guidelines for Americans led by the USDA recently added new recommendations for children from birth to two years of age. As noted, a key recommendation is that for the first 6 months of life, infants should be fed human milk. After 6 months of life, complementary foods and breastfeeding are recommended until one year of age.

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION

The Centers CDC has made breastfeeding a public health priority and encourages state health departments, hospitals and local communities to implement public health goals and align resources to support breastfeeding rates for communities of color. ''Because of the importance of breastfeeding for the health of mothers and babies, CDC supports breastfeeding through hospital initiatives, work site accommodation, continuity of care, and community support initiatives.''

The federal government advocates for breastfeeding and its continuance for working women, but laws and regulations don't make it easy for women in all sectors of the workforce to fulfill breastfeeding public health goals and objectives.

Why will the PUMP Act help?

It is reasonable to expect that if breastfeeding and workplace accommodations are seen as public health priorities by the federal government and tax-payer dollars are used to fund programs designed to encourage and support breastfeeding for the public, that policies protecting and advancing the interest of the government's investment should be implemented. The PUMP Act is one such policy that will eliminate barriers for women who are teachers, flight attendants and other exempt workers.

The bi-partisan PUMP Act will bring equity to nearly nine million women in the workforce and their families who currently lack protections as they seek to provide recommended nutrition to their new babies.

Women in the workforce are striving for economic stability to help support their families. The country benefits from their contributions to our economy. Instead of focusing on what happens when employees need unpaid time to feed their baby as their doctor, nutrition experts, and the U.S. government recommend, consider what happens and the cost to our nation when they do not. Through WIC, the U.S. government provides services to approximately 53 percent of all U.S. infants. Infant formula is the most expensive item in WIC food packages and costs to the government exceeded $927 million in fiscal year 2010. The direct cost to the government of providing infant formula and the related indirect cost of employee turn-over, absenteeism and most importantly, the increased health care costs of formula-fed infants make this bill a win for all parties and protects the economic interest of the U.S.

Perhaps then Federal Reserve Chair and current Secretary of Treasury Janet Yellen said it best in an essay following her 2017 remarks at the ''125 Years of Women at Brown Conference'' sponsored by Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island:

''. . . a number of factors appear to be holding women back, including the difficulty women currently have in trying to combine their careers with other aspects of their lives, including caregiving. In looking to solutions, we should consider improvements to work environments and policies that benefit not only women, but all workers. Pursuing such a strategy would be in keeping with the story of the rise in women's involvement in the workforce, which has contributed not only to their own well-being but more broadly to the welfare and prosperity of our country.''

The Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics urges all members of Congress to vote in support of this bill because it is the right step to support babies, mothers, employers and ultimately the health and prosperity of our nation.

Thank you for your consideration.

JEANNE BLANKENSHIP, MS RDN,
Vice President, Policy Initiatives and Advocacy, Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 3110 leaves a whole host of unanswered questions for employers regarding their obligations under the bill as written. H.R. 3110 threatens job creators with disproportionate penalties for technical or unintentional violations of the FLSA's accommodation requirements.

For example, are employers required to build a separate room to provide these accommodations?

H.R. 3110 fails to answer this question or the circumstances and specifications an employer would need to know to comply with such a requirement, or how such requirements would interact with other Federal laws.

For instance, the bill does not clarify whether the space must be compliant with Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA, accessibility requirements, or how it will fit in with the ADA requirements, such as clear path of travel. Nor does the legislation give appropriate guidance as to whether the space must be permanent or temporary. In addition, the remedies in H.R. 3110 go far beyond what is recoverable with respect to other proven wage-and-hour and break violations under both Federal law and State laws.

The expansion of remedies in the bill will increase litigation and result in a financial windfall for trial lawyers. But these penalties do not address the employees' main interest in obtaining appropriate break time and space. Expanded monetary damages will undoubtedly lead to more litigation and the additional delays that litigation brings in already overburdened courts. It also should be noted that the Department of Labor is better suited to enforce technical violations of the FLSA quickly and effectively; litigation is no solution.

DOL has institutional knowledge of Federal labor laws, including the FLSA, and is equipped to provide accurate guidance to employers.

To understand the implications of H.R. 3110, one only needs to look at the proliferation of lawsuits for ''gotcha'' technical violations throughout various Federal and State wage-and-hour laws or the ADA to recognize that costly litigation will follow and positive results for employees will be delayed.

Madam Speaker, 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 Civil Rights and Human Services Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bipartisan PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act.

Since 2010, the Affordable Care Act has required employers to provide nursing mothers with break time to express milk, as well as access to a private non-bathroom space for pumping.

Although this was a significant improvement for working moms—one that I didn't have when I was breastfeeding my babies—the law still left 9 million workers uncovered, including teachers, agriculture workers, engineers, and others.

This coverage gap is unacceptable, and it means that each year millions of parents who choose to breastfeed must

decide between the health of their child and maintaining employment. The coverage gap has also disproportionately harmed Black and brown women, who represent 12 percent of the workforce but nearly 20 percent of women of childbearing age who are not covered by the existing break time provision.

The PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act will address this coverage gap by simply amending the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide protections to workers who are not currently covered.

As Representative HERRARA BEUTLER explained, this is current law. We are just closing a gap that is leaving too many nursing moms out. It will also clarify that if a worker is not relieved of their duties during the time spent pumping, then those hours must count as hours worked.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support the rights of women in the workplace and to help their families by joining me in voting for the bipartisan PUMP Act.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter in support of the bill from the United States Breastfeeding Committee.

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF NIKIA SANKOFA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE U.S. BREASTFEEDING COMMITTEE BEFORE THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—SEPTEMBER 24, 2021

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI, MAJORITY LEADER MCCARTHY, AND ALL MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Breastfeeding Committee (USBC) submits this letter to the U.S. House of Representatives in full support of the Providing Urgent Maternal Protections (PUMP) for Nursing Mothers Act (H.R. 3110).

The USBC is a coalition of more than 100 national nonprofits, breastfeeding coalitions, community-based organizations, and federal agency partners that support a shared mission to drive collaborative efforts for policy and practices that create a landscape of breastfeeding support across the United States. We are committed to ensuring that all families in the U.S. have the support, resources, and accommodations to achieve their breastfeeding goals in the communities where they live, learn, work, and play.

We know that the vast majority of people become parents during their lifetime, and their needs and the needs of their infants are neither surprising nor difficult to meet if we plan appropriately. A simple and commonsense policy solution to address ongoing workplace barriers and inequities is within the reach of Congress through the Providing Urgent Maternal Protections (PUMP) for Nursing Mothers Act (H.R. 3110), which strengthens the existing Break Time for Nursing Mothers law and has bipartisan and bicameral support.

HUMAN MILK: A PROVEN PREVENTION STRATEGY

Breastfeeding is a primary prevention strategy that builds a foundation for lifelong health and wellness, adapting overtime to meet the changing needs of the growing child. The evidence for the value of human milk feeding to overall health is scientific, robust, and continually being reaffirmed by new researcher.

Human milk feeding is proven to reduce the risk of a range of illnesses and conditions for infants and mothers. Compared with commercial milk formula fed children, breastfed infants have a reduced risk of ear, skin, stomach, and respiratory infections; diarrhea; and sudden infant death syndrome. In the longer term, breastfed children have a reduced risk of obesity, type 1 and 2 diabetes, asthma, and childhood leukemia. Women who breastfed their children have a reduced long-term risk of type 2 diabetes, cardiovascular disease, and breast and ovarian cancers. The American Academy of Pediatrics recommends infants be exclusively breastfed for about 6 months with continued breastfeeding while introducing complementary foods for at least 1 year.

BARRIERS TO SUCCESS

The great majority of pregnant women and new parents want to breastfeed, but significant barriers in the community, health care, and employment settings can impede breastfeeding success. In 2017, the national breastfeeding initiation rate among infants was 84.1 percent, representing a 13.8 percent increase from 2001. However, by six months of age, only 25.6 percent of U.S. infants exclusively breastfeed. Despite overall increases in breastfeeding initiation and duration, deep racial, geographic, and socioeconomic disparities in breastfeeding rates persist. Compared to national averages, only 73.7 percent of Black infants and 80.7 percent of Native American infants are ever breastfed, contributing to inequalities in maternal and infant health outcomes. Furthermore, a distressing 60 percent of mothers report that they did not breastfeed for as long as they intended.

Structural and environmental barriers can make it difficult or impossible for families to establish an adequate milk supply to sustain human milk feeding at medically recommended levels. For many families, rather than being a matter of personal choice, infant feeding practice is informed by circumstance.

More than half of mothers enter or return to the labor force before their children turn one year old, with as many as one in four women returning within just two weeks of giving birth. When back at work or school, many discover that they are unable to pump breast milk as frequently as necessary or they have no choice but to pump in an unsanitary or unsafe location, such as a bathroom. Economically-marginalized women and non-white women are more likely to return to work earlier than their more affluent white counterparts. Without necessary accommodations, they are too often unable to produce enough milk for a caregiver to feed their child during separations and may not be able to maintain their milk supply.

Breastfeeding families throughout the United States are facing barriers that make it difficult or impossible to start or continue breastfeeding—but it does not have to be this way. Public health initiatives, including legal and policy interventions and approaches designed to enable more infants to breastfeed, have the potential to markedly improve population health.

CURRENT LAWS AND SIMPLE ACCOMMODATIONS ACROSS INDUSTRIES

The Break Time for Nursing Mothers law (Break Time law), passed in 2010, provides critical protections to ensure that employees have reasonable break time and a safe, private place to pump breast milk. All the same strategies that businesses use for any other type of break time, such as rest breaks, meal breaks, or medical breaks can be utilized to support breastfeeding employees.

Businesses of all sizes and in every industry have found simple, cost-effective ways to meet the needs of their breastfeeding employees as well as their business. The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) Office on Women's Health hosts the Supporting Nursing Moms at Work resource, which provides a critical link between the need for workplace support for breastfeeding families and the need for implementation guidance for their employers. The online resource provides a user-friendly tool that employers can use to identify and implement industry-specific solutions to providing time and space accommodations that work from farm fields to grocery stores, and restaurants to offices. These examples are already helping employers and employees identify practical solutions that work for their business.

In many workspaces, compliance is as simple as placing butcher paper or a curtain over a window in a managers' office. In outdoor worksites, pop up tents or the cab of a construction vehicle are used to meet the needs of breastfeeding employees. To be functional, the pumping space simply needs to be furnished with seating and a flat surface such as a desk, small table, or shelf for the breast pump. As long as the space is available each time the breastfeeding employee needs it, the employer is meeting the requirements of the law. If there are no breastfeeding employees, the employer does not need to maintain a space.

GAPS IN CURRENT LAW AND IMPACT ON FAMILIES

Unfortunately, the placement of the Break Time law within section 7(r) of the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) resulted in nearly 9 million women—nearly one in four women of childbearing age—being excluded from coverage. Those left unprotected include teachers, software engineers, and many nurses, among others. Without these protections, breastfeeding employees face serious health consequences, including risk of painful illness and infection, diminished milk supply, or in ability to continue breastfeeding.

Over the past decade we have learned how to make breastfeeding and employment work, but the significant coverage gaps in the Break Time for Nursing Mothers law mean that workplace breastfeeding accommodation implementation is radically inconsistent. Employees of the same company and in the same building frequently do not have access to the same accommodations, and to figure out who must be accommodated can be complicated for businesses.

In addition, little recourse is available for employees who are covered by the Break Time law to ensure they can use their rights. Section 7(r) of the FLSA does not specify any penalties if an employer is found to have violated the break time for nursing mothers requirements. This means that in most instances, an employee may only bring an action for unpaid minimum wages or unpaid overtime compensation and an additional equal amount in liquidated damages. According to the Request for Information on the Break Time for Nursing Mothers provision, which includes the Department of Labor's preliminary interpretations of the law, ''Because employers are not required to compensate employees for break time to express breastmilk, in most circumstances there will not be any unpaid minimum wage or overtime compensation associated with the failure to provide such breaks.

A BIPARTISAN SOLUTION TO SIMPLIFY EXISTING LAW: THE PUMP FOR NURSING MOTHERS ACT

A policy solution with bipartisan support, the PUMP Act would support breastfeeding employees while clarifying implementation for employers across the nation. The bill would strengthen the 2010 Break Time law by closing the coverage gap and providing remedies for nursing mothers that are available for other violations of the FLSA.

The Break Time for Nursing Mothers provision is written with language that provides

immense flexibility and does not require the construction of a permanent, dedicated lactation space. The PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act would maintain this flexibility. More than half of all states have enacted legislation that impacts breastfeeding employees. For many of these states, the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act would have little to no impact on employer requirements.

For over ten years, the U.S. Breastfeeding Committee has worked with organizations and government agencies on this issue. We have documented the experiences of workers and employers, seen the innovative solutions created by businesses of all sizes, and identified the legislative gaps that need to be addressed. After more than a decade of raising awareness and mobilizing action, one thing is clear: America needs the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act.

By aligning federal law with the needs of families and ensuring that employers have the comprehensive resources and support that they need, we can create a better tomorrow together.

Thank you for your consideration.

NIKIA SANKOFA,
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
U.S. Breastfeeding Committee.

Ms. FOXX. 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 such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, supporters of H.R. 3110 claim the bill merely fills unintended gaps in the nursing-accommodation requirements signed into law in 2010, but this description is not accurate.

H.R. 3110 imposes a flawed scheme full of unreasonable expanded mandates, including overly-broad coverage coupled with gratuitous and disproportionate penalties. The bill expands the Fair Labor Standards Act's coverage of break time for nursing mothers to all 143 million employees covered by the act. As a result, H.R. 3110 will require one-size-fits-all nursing accommodations and impose substantial compliance burdens on a wide variety of workplaces and industries.

Admitting this problem in the underlying bill, the manager's amendment attempts to mitigate the bill's requirements so that they are compatible with ensuring safety and security for airline passengers and flight crews.

H.R. 3110 requires that airline employees have access to an enclosed area for pumping breast milk, even though aircrafts designs are regulated by the FAA for safety, security, and reliability, with limited ability to add additional enclosed space. Remote and rural airports also face unique challenges because of the smaller planes in use at those airports. It is even more challenging to provide a private space in a commercial aircraft other than a bathroom, as mandated by H.R. 3110.

Additionally, many of these planes have small flight crews with few redundancies in duties. Under the bill, they would be hard-pressed to maintain appropriate staffing levels and access to services. Exposing businesses to inflexible and unworkable requirements, coupled with increased penalties for alleged violations, will clearly create new incentives for trial lawyers.

H.R. 3110 will only encourage trial lawyers to file more lawsuits of questionable validity targeting unsuspecting business owners. Supporters of H.R. 3110 say the bill is about providing women with better accommodations in the workplace, but the truth is the bill fails to live up to that promise.

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 such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, consideration of H.R. 3110 marks the latest in a series of affronts to small businesses perpetuated by House Democrats throughout the 117th Congress. Last month, Democrat members of the Committee on Education and Labor voted to increase drastically the penalties on employers, including a 512 percent increase in Occupational Safety and Health Act penalties and a whopping 900 percent increase in Fair Labor Standards Act penalties on job creators, including small businesses.

Democrats also voted to authorize the National Labor Relations Board to levy $50,000 and $100,000 fines on small business owners for business activities that are currently lawful.

Republican Members offered several amendments at the committee's reconciliation markup to exempt small businesses from the devastating impacts of those provisions. However, these commonsense amendments were voted down by committee Democrats on party-line votes.

The bill we are debating today was reported out of committee with disturbing implications for smaller employers. Currently under the FLSA, businesses with fewer than 50 employees may demonstrate that the FLSA's nursing-accommodation requirements would impose an undue hardship. The FLSA's unique hardship provision is an affirmative defense to claims that small businesses must demonstrate in court.

Committee Democrats chose to cut the undue hardship exemption in half to fewer than 25 employees. While this Democrat affront to small business was corrected in the manager's amendment, more changes are necessary to protect small businesses fully.

H.R. 3110 imposes excessive penalties for minor or technical violations of the FLSA's nursing-accommodation requirement, while failing to anticipate workplace realities in providing accommodations. These excessive penalties, combined with the high probability of minor or unintended infractions related to compliance with a complex mandate on hundreds of thousands of new businesses, will lead to a proliferation of expensive and protracted lawsuits, resulting in delayed accommodations for workers.

In contrast to the shortcomings of H.R. 3110, Dr. MILLER-MEEKS submitted a responsible substitute amendment for consideration, which implements commonsense and workable alterations to the FLSA's nursing-accommodation requirements. The Miller-Meeks' amendment adds nursing accommodation coverage for white collar executive, administrative, or professional employees while preserving FLSA treatment of unique and disparate workplaces.

Her amendment also preserves the Secretary of Labor's FLSA enforcement authority to address shortcomings in workplace accommodations through injunctive relief or levy civil monetary penalties against repeat and willful violators.

DR. MILLER-MEEKS' amendment would not only ensure that the needs of small businesses are protected, but would also update FLSA nursing-accommodation requirements in a way that meets the needs of both mothers and employers.

It is disappointing and unfortunate that the Democrat leadership prevented the Miller-Meeks' amendment from being considered today.

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 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. VAN DUYNE).

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Madam Speaker, if we adopt the motion to recommit, we will instruct the Committee on Education and Labor to consider an amendment to exempt certain industries with unique workplace environments from the requirements in the underlying bill.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. UNDERWOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

□ 1000

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Madam Speaker, H.R. 3110 imposes one-size-fits-all nursing accommodation requirements on different kinds of work environments, including those found in the airline, shipping, and agriculture industries.

As a mother of two who nursed both children while working, I understand the importance of having these accommodations in the workplace.

Under current law, the Fair Labor Standards Act provides hourly employees with access to accommodations while providing for certain industry and job specific exemptions. This approach includes special protections to include the smallest of farms, which are not proportionally impacted by regulatory mandates such as the one we are debating today.

The mandate in H.R. 3110 would impose the same requirements on all 143 million employees covered under the FLSA. This would impose substantial compliance challenges and introduce safety concerns based on the nature of business operations in certain settings. For example, this would fail to account for the unique working conditions found in the aviation industry.

H.R. 3110 requires that airline employees, who are currently exempt from FLSA breastfeeding accommodation requirements, have access to a space for pumping breast milk. This is despite the fact that aircraft designs are regulated by the FAA for safety and reliability purposes with limited ability to add additional private spaces.

Modification of aircraft space would be prohibitively expensive and require the removal of airline seats. This requirement is even more challenging for smaller planes with fewer passenger seats that service regional airports.

Additionally, pilot and flight attendant duties are heavily regulated by the FAA with few redundancies in duties among staff, complicating the ability of aviation businesses to maintain appropriate staffing levels and access to services when faced with inflexible government-mandated breaks.

Democrats acknowledged this problem in their manager's amendment to H.R. 3110 but failed to mitigate the negative impacts the bill would have on critical passenger safety and security functions, both on the ground and during flight.

Because workplaces are not one-size-fits-all, it is critical that any legislation in this area preserves flexibility for airline, shipping, and small farm employers to work with their employees to develop best practices in meeting individual workplace needs.

Sweeping and overly prescriptive requirements that do not adequately address both the workplace environment and workplace needs will not lead to the best results for working mothers.

Nursing mother accommodations should be encouraged, and the ongoing efforts of businessowners to ensure access for their workers are to be applauded and supported.

I am going to offer this motion to recommit to ensure certain businesses have the flexibility to be able to develop nursing accommodations that meet the needs of their employees while accounting for unique working environments.

Madam Speaker, I urge the adoption of this motion to recommit.

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

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 3110 is not the right way to empower women in the workplace.

I support expanding flexible nursing accommodations in the workplace for women, but not in such a way that will unnecessarily increase liability for employers without helping nursing mothers.

Furthermore, this bill levels excessive penalties for minor technical violations, opening our job creators to expensive and spurious lawsuits.

Dr. MILLER-MEEKS' Supporting Working Mothers amendment is a responsible alternative. It expands nursing accommodation coverage to a variety of workplaces but also maintains exceptions for unique workplaces.

That is the kind of flexible pro-woman and pro-jobs solution we need. We have had enough of Democrats' one-size-fits-all approach and overly broad mandates that hurt the very job creators we are relying on to help our economy recover from this pandemic. It is very disappointing that the majority denied debate on a practical alternative that will meet the needs of working mothers.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.R. 3110. This bill would do much more harm than good. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters in support of the bill from the AFSCME and the Association of Flight Attendants-CWA.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,
Washington, DC, October 21, 2021.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.4 million members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I urge you to vote yes on the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act (R.R. 3110). This bill prioritizes both the physical and economic needs that new mothers must balance upon returning to work. It strengthens federal employment standards that protect working women who need break time and a private space, other than a bathroom, to express breast milk.

The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) currently requires employers with more than 50 employees to provide a space for mothers to either nurse or express breast milk. Covered employers must also provide reasonable breaks for workers to nurse. An estimated 8.65 million women of childbearing age are excluded from these nursing mother protections because they are not covered by wage and hour standards under the FLSA. Current law also lacks broader enforcement mechanisms for workers denied these protections.

H.R. 3110 improves current protections by:

Expanding the number of nursing workers protected by the law.

Extending the duration of the protections from one year after the child's birth to two years after the employee gives birth or begins providing breast milk for a nursing child.

Limiting undue hardship exemption to employers with fewer than 25 employees, rather than employers with fewer than 50 employees under current law.

Clarifying that banned workers can seek legal and equitable relief for their employer's failure to provide them with the needed break times and private space to express milk.

We urge you to stand with working women and their families by voting to pass H.R. 3110.

Sincerely,

BAILEY K. CHILDERS,
Director of Federal Government Affairs.

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF THE ASSOCIATION OF FLIGHT ATTENDANTS-CWA (AFA), AFL-CIO BEFORE THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—SEPTEMBER 27, 2021

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI, MINORITY LEADER MCCARTHY, AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: The Association of Flight Attendants-CWA (AFA) AFL-CIO submits this letter to the U.S. House of Representatives in full support of the Providing Urgent Maternal Protections (PUMP) for Nursing Mothers Act (H.R. 3110).

AFA represents nearly 50,000 Flight Attendants at 17 airlines. Our union has advanced the Flight Attendant profession for 75 years, beating back discrimination and improving wages, benefits, working conditions, and aviation safety, health and security in the aircraft cabin. When the profession began Flight Attendants could not be married or pregnant, among other discriminatory conditions of employment.

For years, AFA has identified the need for federal protections for nursing Flight Attendants because none exist. In 2010, the Break Time law, which amended the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) to require that employers provide reasonable break time as well as a private place other than a bathroom to express milk provided a monumental step in the right direction. However, millions of nursing mothers were unintentionally left out of this important piece of legislation. The PUMP Act finally rectifies this oversight and includes Flight Attendants.

In 2021, AFA conducted a survey of almost 400 Flight Attendants to understand their perspective on pumping and expressing breast milk during the course of their work day. An overwhelming majority (86 percent) of Flight Attendant respondents indicated that they faced significant obstacles pumping while on and off duty, as well as in between flights. As a result, 75 percent of Flight Attendant respondents decided to quit pumping and expressing breast milk before they planned to because it was too difficult to find the time, a private location, a clean environment, and access to cold storage for their milk.

We support the PUMP Act because it will alleviate many of these obstacles for nursing Flight Attendant moms to ensure they have the right, along with the privacy, to pump and express milk. We realize this is a complex issue for Flight Attendants who work in an unconventional workplace. However, we can and should do better to support these nursing mothers in the workplace.

We urge all members of Congress to vote in support of H.R. 3110, the PUMP Act.

Thank you for your consideration,

STEVE SCHEMBS,
Director of Government Affairs, Association of Flight Attendants-CWA (AFA).

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

Madam Speaker, it has now been more than a decade since Congress passed critical protections to guarantee nursing workers break time and private space to express breast milk at work.

As we have heard today from Members on both sides of the aisle, these protections are essential to protecting the health of nursing workers and their

families, yet nursing workers are continuing to suffer from gaps and weaknesses in the Federal law.

The need to address these gaps is even greater today as our economy recovers from COVID–19. Millions of workers, particularly working mothers, are looking to re-enter the workforce after being forced out of their jobs during the pandemic.

The PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act would provide workers with the peace of mind that they will not have to choose between returning to work and protecting themselves and their babies.

Madam Speaker, we have an opportunity to deliver on our promise to help all workers recover from the pandemic, stay safe, and succeed in their careers. This legislation will strengthen existing law, improve the lives of nursing workers across the country, and help our economy get back on its feet.

We know this program works because the provisions in this bill are already law on the Federal level and in several States, without the kind of problems that have been suggested that might happen—those have not occurred under present law—and without any explosion of lawsuits. These provisions are already law, and there have not been lawsuits.

The substitute offered by the minority does not expand to as many mothers as this bill does, and it would actually roll back some protections they already have.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) and the gentlewoman from Washington State (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER) for their leadership on this bipartisan legislation.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I rise today as chair of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protection; co-founder and co-chair of the Black Maternal Health Caucus; as one of the original cosponsors of the bipartisan PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act; and as the mother of Jeanelle and Billy.

The issue before us today is one of equity and fairness. In our country, mothers often have to choose between providing for their families or nursing their babies.

The PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act ensures that millions of working mothers have the access and protections they need to nurse for as long as they choose to do so.

So, why is this Bill so important? As the co-chair of the Black Maternal Health Caucus, I know how important it is to break down the barriers that hold nursing mothers and their children back from the best possible health outcomes.

Every major medical authority strongly encourages nursing for at least the first year of life, as it provides significant health and nutritional benefits to both the mother and infant.

By closing an unintended loophole, the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act provides protection and support to an additional 9 million working mothers who have been forced to choose between nursing and earning a paycheck.

Fundamentally, this bill says that nursing mothers should not be punished for making the best choices for their health, and the health of their children.

Especially during this pandemic and America's maternal health crisis, I urge each of my colleagues to cast a vote for this critical legislation, and I urge the Senate to send it to President Biden's desk.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support H.R. 3110, the "Pump for Nursing Mothers Act," which will close an unintentional loophole in the 2010 Break Time for Nursing Mothers Act.

The 2010 law requires employers to provide break time and a place for hourly wage-earning and some salaried employees to express breast milk at work for one year after the birth of the employee's child.

Unfortunately, this law unintentionally excluded a quarter of all working women—nearly nine million employees—from protection.

H.R. 3110 closes this coverage gap by extending the law's protections to cover salaried employees as well as other categories of employees currently exempted from protections, such as teachers, nurses, and farmworkers.

H.R. 3110 would also provide employers clarity on paid and unpaid pumping time.

The bill leaves in place existing law protecting many salaried workers from having their pay docked and clarifies that employers must pay an hourly employee for any time spent pumping if the employee is also working.

Lastly, the bill would ensure that nursing mothers have access to remedies that are available for other violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

According to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, women with children are the fastest-growing segment of the workforce, and balancing work and family is an important priority for all employees.

More than 80% of new mothers in the United States begin breastfeeding, 1 and 6 in every 10 new mothers are in the workforce.

New parents face an incredible amount of increased difficulties while juggling work, family and mental and emotional tolls that are exacerbated as a new parent.

According to a study published in Reviews in Obstetrics and Gynecology, breastfeeding provides health benefits for not only infants, but also for mothers.

For mothers, abstaining from breastfeeding has been associated with an increase in developing various types of cancers, type 2 diabetes, heart attacks, retained gestational weight gain and metabolic syndrome in adult women.

For infants, not being breastfed is associated with infectious illnesses such as pneumonia, ear infections, gastroenteritis, and can increase the risk of developing childhood-onset obesity, type 1 and 2 diabetes, leukemia and SIDS.

This bill will ensure that mothers will no longer be forced to choose between their own health, their infant's health, and their income.

This includes individuals like Melissa Hodgkins, who has had to bring suit against her employer simply to provide workers with a clean, private place and breaks to breast pump at work.

Her coworkers were often of losing their paychecks to ask the airline to accommodate them; in fact, when some of her coworkers did ask for breaks and a place to pump, her employer actually prohibited them from pumping at work, and even forced them off the job without a paycheck.

The PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act will stop such bad actions by employers and alleviate the disparities that currently exist between breastfeeding employees and their coworkers, sending a clear message that the workforce will protect and support women who opt to balance a career and motherhood.

For these reasons, I encourage all Members to support H.R. 3110, the "Pump for Nursing Mothers Act."

[From ACLU, Sept. 30, 2021]

THE PUMP ACT WOULD PROTECT NURSING WORKERS LIKE ME

(By Melissa Hodgkins)

I took Frontier Airlines to court for making it impossible for me to pump breast milk at work. Other workers shouldn't have to fight for their rights like I did.

When started my career as a flight attendant, I never imagined that I wouldn't be able to continue breastfeeding after I went back to work. I thought that, like most workplaces, my airline would be required by federal law to provide workers a clean, private place and breaks to pump at work. (That's thanks to a provision known as the Break Time for Nursing Mothers law.)

But it turns out my employer isn't. That's because flight attendants are among the approximately 9 million women who are excluded from the law's protection—along with other transportation workers, teachers, agricultural workers, nurses, and many others. A bill before Congress right now—the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act—would fix that. Congress should act now to pass it.

I first realized the pickle I was in when I became pregnant with my first child and found out that my employer, Frontier Airlines, didn't provide any accommodations for nursing moms. I'd watched other flight attendant moms trying to make it work pumping on the job—and I saw how stressful it was for them.

They were too fearful of losing their paychecks to ask the airline to accommodate them. When some of my coworkers did ask for breaks and a place to pump, Frontier actually prohibited them from pumping at work, and even forced them off the job without a paycheck.

That was when I started to feel like Frontier was making me choose between my career and breastfeeding my baby. I believe breast milk is optimal for babies, and I wanted to give him those health benefits. At the same time, I didn't feel great about pumping in an unsanitary airplane lavatory, and having to scramble to find time to pump between flights, especially given my unpredictable schedule. I was worried I'd lose my job if I had to pump on duty and got reported. Even though I desperately wanted to keep nursing my baby, I just couldn't see how I could make it work. It was a wrenching decision, but I decided I had no choice but to give up breastfeeding in order to go back to work and support my family.

No woman should have to make that kind of decision. But because of the gap in coverage under the current law, too many of us still do. The ACLU is representing me in a lawsuit arguing that Frontier's treatment of pregnant and breastfeeding pilots and flight attendants is discriminatory. But if the airline had not been exempt from the duty under the existing federal Break Time Law to provide breaks and a clean place to pump, we probably would have never had to take Frontier to court over that in the first place.

The PUMP Act would give workers like me the protection we need: a clear requirement that all employers must provide workers who are nursing with the basic accommodations they need. Solutions exist in all industries—including airlines—that would allow employees to pump safely. And the bill would strengthen the law in other ways, extending protections from one year to two years, clarifying that it covers situations like adoption or stillbirth, and ensuring that when employers are not in compliance, there is a meaningful way to enforce it.

The bill has bipartisan support in Congress. Let's make sure it becomes law so that all workers—no matter what industry they work in—have the choice to continue breastfeeding and the ability to get back to work.

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

Each further amendment printed in part D of House Report 117–137 shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. ROSS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part D of House Report 117–137.

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. REPORT.

Not later than 24 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate that contains recommendations as appropriate to improve compliance among covered employers, including what is known about employee awareness of the rights afforded to them by the amendments made by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 716, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge support for my amendment. My amendment to the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act would help ensure women have sufficient notice of the new protections afforded to them in this bill.

By ensuring that eligible people are provided with sufficient informational resources, more women will be able to exercise their rights and the likelihood of employer defection will be reduced.

In many places in this country, including my home State of North Carolina, it is easier to take a smoke break than for a mother to take a pump break. This is simply unacceptable.

By passing the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act, we can end this discrimination against breastfeeding workers and guarantee that no mother will have to choose between earning a living and feeding her child.

But a law is only as effective as its enforcement, and we have unfortunately witnessed countless occasions where businesses have failed to inform workers of their rights. Just in this last year, the Department of Labor investigated six businesses in North Carolina for violations of breastfeeding rights under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

My amendment would provide the necessary information to ensure these workplace violations do not continue. We owe it to our nursing mothers, their families, and our local communities to be vigilant about overseeing the implementation of this law.

This is a gender equality issue, a labor rights issue, and an economic justice issue that demands our attention.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters from the director of La Leche and the National WIC Association.

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF DIANE THOMPSON, DIRECTOR OF LA LECHE LEAGUE ALLIANCE FOR BREASTFEEDING EDUCATION BEFORE THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—SEPTEMBER 24, 2021

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI, MINORITY LEADER MCCARTHY, MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: La Leche League Alliance for Breastfeeding Education submits this letter to the U.S. House of Representatives in full support of the Providing Urgent Maternal Protections (PUMP) for Nursing Mothers Act (H.R. 3110).

La Leche League Alliance for Breastfeeding Education (LLL Alliance) is a division of La Leche League International in the United States. While we receive our 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status as a charitable organization through our association with LLLI, we are a separately incorporated entity.

Representing over 1000 Leaders spread across 43 states, LLL Alliance provides resources and support for La Leche League Leaders and Area Administrators, as well as information and support for parents.

La Leche League believes that breastfeeding, with its many important physical and psychological advantages, is best for baby and mother and is the ideal way to initiate good parent-child relationships.

Breastfeeding is crucial to the health of both mothers and babies. It provides protections and health benefits for far longer than the duration of the breastfeeding relationship. Why would the USA not want to encourage and support the feeding of human milk? Some of the advantages include for mothers: lower risk of breast cancer, lower risk of ovarian cancer, lower risk of rheumatoid arthritis and lupus, and less endometriosis. For children: fewer instances of allergies, eczema, and asthma, fewer childhood cancers, including leukemia and lymphomas, lower risk of type I and II diabetes, fewer instances of Crohn's disease and colitis. See the CDC, American Academy of Pediatrics and the World Health Organization.

We have Leaders and parents that are supported who are denied the opportunity to pump at work because of the types of jobs they have. Especially affected are teachers in the K–12 system and nurses who are not currently covered. This can have several effects. Mastitis caused by not pumping—these leads to lost days at work and possibly the cessation of breastfeeding. It is disappointing that those individuals who do so much caretaking can be deprived of caretaking for their own children.

Why would the PUMP act be helpful? Among other reasons it would close the coverage gap. The bill would protect nearly 9 million employees excluded from the 2010 Break Time law by extending the law's protections to cover salaried employees as well as other categories of employees currently exempted from protections.

It would provide employers clarity on when pumping time must be paid and when it may be unpaid. The bill leaves in place existing law protecting many salaried workers from having their pay docked and clarifies that any time spent pumping while the employee is also working, a common occurrence for many employees, must be counted as hours worked.

This is not a partisan issue—parents of any party benefit.

La Leche League Alliance for Breastfeeding Education urges all members of Congress to vote in support because as stated above it closes gaps in the current law. Individuals should not have to choose between going to the bathroom or pumping.

Thank you for your consideration.

DIANE THOMPSON,
Director, La Leche League Alliance for Breastfeeding Education.

SEPTEMBER 27, 2021.

Re National WIC Association Support for the Providing Urgent Maternal Protections (PUMP) for Nursing Mothers Act (H.R. 3110).

On behalf of the National WIC Association (NWA), the 12,000 service provider agencies we represent, and the approximately 6.3 million women, infants, and young children our members serve, we write to express our strong support for the Providing Urgent Maternal Protections (PUMP) for Nursing Mothers Act (H.R. 3110). This legislation is a critical step towards ensuring healthy child development and postpartum health outcomes for working mothers served by WIC.

Because millions of nursing moms are in the workforce and need protections to pump breastmilk, the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act is imperative for protecting the nation's breastfeeding women, including WIC participants. The Dietary Guidelines for Americans, based on longstanding recommendations from the American Academy of Pediatrics, promotes exclusive breastfeeding for the first six months and encourages ongoing breastfeeding as complementary foods are introduced. More than half of mothers return to the paid labor force before their children are three months old, with as many as one in four returning within just two weeks of giving birth. Many of these mothers choose to continue breastfeeding well after their return to work to meet the standards reiterated in the Dietary Guidelines—and those employees need to express (or pump) breast milk on a regular schedule.

The Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) is the nation's leading breastfeeding promotion program, serving about 500,000 breastfeeding women with a combination of professional and peer support. Over the last

two decades, WIC providers have worked to increase the rates of breastfeeding initiation amongst women participating in the program by 30%. As WIC works to address societal, intergenerational, and historic barriers to breastfeeding, employment protections are vital for the 15.2 million women who live in households that earn less than 185% of the federal poverty line.

According to the Surgeon General, breastfeeding protects babies from illnesses like ear, skin, and respiratory infections, diarrhea, and vomiting, as well as longer-term conditions such as obesity, type 1 and 2 diabetes, and asthma. Mothers who breastfeed for the recommended duration benefit, from lower risks of breast cancer, heart disease, and other ailments. Higher breastfeeding rates in the United States are associated with lower healthcare costs, with the American Academy of Pediatrics projecting $13 billion in health care savings if 90% of families in the United States exclusively breastfed for six months.

Research indicates that significant breastfeeding disparities are sustained by both income and race/ethnicity. Lower-income women experience lower breastfeeding rates than middle-higher income women. Furthermore, Black women experience significantly lower breastfeeding rates than White women and Latinas. Barriers to breastfeeding for these vulnerable groups include family and social pressures, a rapid return to work after delivery, lack of facilities to breastfeed or pump in the workplace and in public, and targeted marketing by the infant formula industry. In order to further improve these rates, specifically amongst low-income women and women of color, workplace barriers to breastfeeding must be addressed.

Passed in 2010, the Break Time for Nursing Mothers provision included in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, provided critical protections to ensure that employees would have reasonable break time and a private place to pump. Since the law was tied to language in the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), millions of nursing mothers were left without an express statutory right to pump at work. Without these protections, nursing mothers face serious health consequences, including risk of painful illness and infection, diminished milk supply, or inability to continue breastfeeding. Employment is compatible with breastfeeding, and solutions to support nursing mothers exist in all industries. In fact, studies show that supporting nursing mothers leads to lower employer health care costs, absenteeism, and turnover, as well as improved morale, job satisfaction, and productivity. Without protection, nursing employees are likelier to face harassment, reduced wages, and job loss.

The fact remains that nursing mothers are suffering negative health consequences and being forced to choose between breastfeeding and earning a paycheck. The PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act would strengthen the 2010 Break Time law by:

CLOSING THE COVERAGE GAP

The bill would protect nearly 9 million employees excluded from the 2010 Break Time law by extending the law's protections to cover salaried employees as well as other categories of employees currently exempted from protections. Unfortunately, the 2010 Break Time law's placement within the part of FLSA that sets overtime meant that nearly 9 million women—nearly one in four women of childbearing age—were excluded from coverage and have no clear right to break time and space to pump breast milk under federal law. Those left unprotected include teachers, software engineers, and many types of nurses, among numerous others. The categories of employees excluded under FLSA predate the 2010 Break Time law, and were created specifically with overtime exemptions in mind. There is no principled reason why these working mothers should be ineligible to receive break time and space to pump breast milk under federal law. The PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act fixes this harmful error.

PROVIDING EMPLOYERS CLARITY ON WHEN PUMPING TIME MUST BE PAID AND WHEN IT MAY BE UNPAID

The bill leaves in place existing law protecting many salaried workers from having their pay docked, and clarifies that any time spent pumping while the employee is also working, a common occurrence for many employees, must be counted as hours worked. Under the existing Break Time law, breaks do not need to be paid unless they are concurrent with paid breaks. The PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act clarifies that although the breaks taken under the law are typically unpaid, if hourly workers are not actually relieved from duty while pumping, then that time should be counted as hours worked. The bill also specifies that it does not change existing protections preventing employers from deducting compensation from the salaries of employees who are exempt from receiving overtime.

PROVIDING REMEDIES FOR NURSING MOTHERS

The bill would ensure that nursing mothers have access to remedies that are available for other violations of the FLSA, bringing this law into alignment with other requirements that are familiar to employers. Another unintended consequence of the 2010 Break Time law's placement in the FLSA is that an employee who is denied break time and space has no effective remedy for the violation. An employer that violates the 2010 Break Time law can be ordered to pay the employee ''the amount of their unpaid minimum wages,'' but violations of the Break Time law typically do not involve unpaid wages. This leaves those who are denied the ability to pump without any meaningful way to enforce their rights, or to address the negative health consequences (such as physical or emotional suffering from infections or early termination of breastfeeding) or financial harms (like unpaid leave or job loss) that they may suffer. In light of the many exemptions and the absence of an effective way to enforce the law's requirements, it is no surprise that sixty percent of breastfeeding employees still did not have access to break time and space after the 2010 Break Time law was in effect. The PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act fills the gaps in the 2010 Break Time law so all breastfeeding employees receive the full protections of the law.

The PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act represents the next critical step toward bringing federal legislation into alignment with the nutrition and practical needs of our nation's families and their employers. On behalf of WIC's national network of lactation support professionals and the mothers that we serve, we urge your support for this vital legislation.

Sincerely,

THE NATIONAL WIC ASSOCIATION.

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Madam Speaker, this amendment does nothing to address the shortcomings of H.R. 3110. We do not need a GAO report to know that employers will face numerous challenges in complying with the sweeping requirements imposed by H.R. 3110.

The Fair Labor Standards Act ensures that hourly workers have access to time and space to pump breast milk, while exempting certain professions and industries with unique operating environments.

Working mothers deserve proper accommodations to nurse in a clean and safe environment without fear of losing their jobs, but failing to account for differing workplaces, as H.R. 3110 does, is not the way to help women.

The bill imposes one-size-fits-all treatment on a wide variety of businesses and industries without providing feasible compliance options.

H.R. 3110 would also impose new and excessive penalties for minor or technical violations of the FLSA's nursing accommodation requirement. These unrealistic penalties, combined with compliance challenges resulting from the bill's mandate, will lead to a proliferation of costly and protracted lawsuits. The result will be delayed accommodations for workers.

A report which acknowledges the complexities and liabilities inherent in H.R. 3110 and is released 2 years after the bill takes effect will do nothing to mitigate the bill's failures.

Madam Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise strongly in support of the amendment offered by Representative DEBORAH ROSS from North Carolina, and I thank her for her leadership in North Carolina and here in Congress for working mothers, for infants, for families. We need more work-family balance. We need more support for working mothers.

We now know with COVID that many families are not going back to work; they are reassessing their values. When you have a child and you want to breastfeed, and there is no accommodation, there really is no way you can go back to work, so this is pro-business, pro-worker, and pro-family.

Her amendment directs the U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO, to conduct a study on how employers are complying with the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act. Even the best legislation must be monitored.

I am excited about the opportunity to ensure that employers are protecting the rights of nursing mothers. It is pro-family when you protect our mothers and our children.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I have the right to close.

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of my amendment and the bill. Both are essential for our working mothers, for

our families, and for the health of the next generation.

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

□ 1015

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, we have a unique situation here this morning with two Representatives from North Carolina who have totally different opinions of this bill and this amendment.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this bill. We can do better. And I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the amendment; it is a day late and a dollar short. We should know what these things are in advance and not after the fact. It is what some of us might call a run-on amendment. We should have had the GAO study earlier to get a better feel for what this bill would do to working mothers and to businesses in our country.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 716, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS).

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. STRICKLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part D of House Report 117–137.

Ms. STRICKLAND. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. REPORT ON RACIAL DISPARITIES.

The Comptroller General shall—

(1) conduct a study on what is known about the racial disparities that exist with respect to access to pumping breastmilk in the workplace; and

(2) submit to Congress a report on the results of such study containing such recommendations as the Comptroller General determines appropriate to address those disparities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 716, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. STRICKLAND) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

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

Madam Speaker, there are several contributing factors to why nursing mothers may choose not to breastfeed and pump milk when returning to work. They include inflexible work schedules that make nursing and pumping breast milk regularly difficult; the lack of accommodations to pump and store milk; and concerns regarding support from supervisors and colleagues to pump milk.

In addition to these factors, women of color and low-income women often experience the need to return to work shortly after giving birth, in many cases earlier than 12 weeks, and they face additional barriers such as racial discrimination and bias whether intentional or not.

This is why I am proud to offer my amendment to H.R. 3110, the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act, the underlying bill that protects vulnerable workers by expanding access to breastfeeding accommodations in the workplace.

This important piece of legislation advances our goals of equity in the workplace, and my amendment seeks to strengthen this bill by directing the GAO to conduct a study on the racial disparities that exist in access to pumping breast milk in the workplace.

This amendment will also require that GAO submit a report to Congress on the results of this study with recommendations to address any disparities.

Employers can begin to address these barriers by offering private lactation rooms, or nursing rooms, for both breastfeeding and pumping with proper cleaning and storage facilities such as a table, sink, and small refrigerator, providing employees with adequate pump breaks, allowing flexible work schedules, and guaranteeing paid family leave.

In fact, we can look to my home State of Washington as a prime example of how to lead on this issue. In 2019, the State legislature passed and signed into law House Bill 1930, which goes one step further than the current Federal law by expanding pump break rights to include both salaried and hourly employees, requiring employers to provide a private space for pumping that isn't a bathroom, and allowing mothers to get pump breaks for up to 2 years after birth. Washington is also one of the very few States that provides people with up to 12 weeks paid parental leave after the birth or adoption of a child.

Yet, despite current Federal law, strong State-level protections such as the ones in Washington, and the gains that have been made in this area by employers in different sectors across our Nation, racial disparities in the workplace still exist for women wishing to pump. My amendment aims to close this gap and equip Congress with the data it needs to create meaningful solutions.

We must ensure that women and mothers everywhere and from all backgrounds have the support they deserve in the workplace.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill, the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 3110 exposes a sweeping, one-size-fits-all mandate on businesses of all sizes that is unworkable and unreasonable. The bill treats all nursing mothers and workplaces as if they are the same, despite known differences in employees' needs, industry-specific challenges, and employers' abilities to meet the requirements.

This amendment calls for a Government Accountability Office study on racial disparities with respect to access to workplace accommodations to pump breast milk and for GAO to submit recommendations to Congress—after the bill becomes law.

Madam Speaker, let me be clear, crystal clear. I abhor any type of discrimination. There should be no place for discrimination in our country, in our employment, or anywhere.

A study of this kind, however, should have been commissioned before the committee debated far-reaching legislation to impose a flawed mandate on all businesses in the United States. Instead, H.R. 3110 was rushed to a committee markup within 2 weeks of introduction. Democrats often put the cart before the horse, and this amendment does nothing to remedy the shortcomings of this legislation.

Nursing women are not a monolith. They have unique needs that this legislation ignores. H.R. 3110 is reductive and, working women deserve better.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. STRICKLAND. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from A Better Balance.

SEPTEMBER 23, 2021.

Re The PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act (H.R. 3110).

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of A Better Balance, I write to express our strong support for the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act (''The PUMP Act''; H.R. 3110) because no one in this country should have to choose between feeding their baby and earning an income for their family. The PUMP Act will mean millions of workers, excluded under current law, will have adequate break time and space to express milk at work. The PUMP Act will further the health of our nation's parents, babies, and economy. Affording protections to workers so they can pump milk to feed this country's children should be a priority for every member of Congress. We urge every member to support this bipartisan legislation and vote yes on the PUMP Act.

A Better Balance is a national legal advocacy organization, using the power of the law to advance justice for workers, so they can care for themselves and their loved ones without risking their economic security. We founded A Better Balance fifteen years ago because we recognized that a lack of fair and supportive work-family laws and policies, or more broadly, a ''care crisis'' was harming a majority of workers, particularly women, especially Black and Latina women, in low-

wage jobs. In the case of nursing parents, too often, parents return to work without the supports they need to continue expressing milk at work and are forced to choose between giving up breastfeeding and maintaining their employment.

As I shared with the House Education and Labor Committee in my March 2021 testimony:

We hear over and over again on A Better Balance's free legal helpline, new mothers returning to the workplace face unfair treatment because their employers refuse to provide them with the time and space needed to express breast milk, forcing them to choose between a paycheck and providing breast milk for their child. Some workers reduce their schedules, are terminated, or are forced out of the workplace, foregoing vital income and familial economic security because their workplaces are so hostile to their need to express milk. Others simply stop breastfeeding altogether, sometimes even before entering the workplace, perceiving (typically correctly) the challenges as insurmountable. Too many who continue in their jobs struggle with harassment, health repercussions, and dwindling milk supply to feed their babies. These challenges face many new working parents, but disproportionately low-wage working mothers of color. These harsh workplace conditions for breastfeeding parents represent a fundamental unfairness and inequity in our legal system—and reinforce the stereotype that motherhood and employment are irreconcilable.

One worker who recently called A Better Balance's helpline, Sarah, is a certified medication assistant at a large long-term care facility in Kansas. Despite having thousands of employees, her employer disparaged her and put up roadblock after roadblock when she needed to pump at work, telling her once ''I gave my baby the bottle—I couldn't imagine having a baby attached to me.'' After her supervisor berated her for needing to pump, and she attempted to find a space in the office to pump to no avail because a co-worker walked in, told her to ''hurry up'', and refused to leave the room, Sarah resorted to pumping in her car just once a day. Even then, her supervisor came to the parking lot to try and stop her from pumping. Because she was only allowed to pump once a day, she frequently became engorged and suffered painful clogged milk ducts. Meanwhile, at least of six Sarah's coworkers took smoke breaks multiple times a day without comment or issue. The contrast is startling and deeply upsetting.

Sarah is not alone in her struggle. I also shared Izabel's story with the committee:

Izabel, a dental assistant in North Carolina, was fired shortly after submitting a doctor's note requesting three 15-minute pumping breaks during her shift. Prior to submitting the note, she had requested pumping breaks and her employer told her she could only pump once per day during her lunch break—which did not medically meet her breastfeeding needs—even though there were roughly three other dental assistants working in the office who could have helped her with her job duties while she took breaks. Although likely covered by the 2010 Break Time for Nursing Mothers Act, because of the law's limited enforcement, Izabel's ability to get her job back or be made whole were extremely limited.

BEASTFEEDING HAS MYRIAD BENEFITS FOR PARENTS & BABIES BUT, AS WE KNOW FIRSTHAND, TOO MANY WORKPLACES LACK ADEQUATE PROTECTIONS FOR WORKERS

Breastfeeding is increasingly common among American parents. According to a recent study by the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention survey, more than 84 percent of infants born in 2017 were breastfed for at least some amount of time. The U.S. Dietary Guidelines for Americans and the American Academy of Pediatrics recommend exclusive breastfeeding for about 6 months, and continuing breastfeeding while introducing complementary foods until a baby is 12 months old or older. At the same time, more than half of working parents return to their jobs before their babies are three months old; twenty-five percent of workers return within just two weeks of giving birth. This means that working parents who wish to continue breastfeeding will need to pump milk on a regular basis upon returning to work in order to continue feeding their children and to avoid serious health consequences. However, many parents returning to work find it incredibly challenging to pump because they are not provided with adequate break time or space to do so. This may explain why, although 84 percent of infants born in 2017 breastfed for some period of time, only slightly more than 58 percent were still breastfeeding at six months.

The health benefits of breastfeeding are numerous. As I outlined in my testimony:

Research shows that breastfeeding has substantial health benefits for both mothers and babies. Breastfeeding protects babies from acute illnesses, such as infections and diarrhea, which can be serious especially in very young and vulnerable babies like those born preterm, as well as from longer-term conditions like childhood obesity and asthma. Likewise, as Nikia Sankofa, the Executive Director of the U.S. Breastfeeding Committee, made clear in testimony before the House Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions and the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections in January 2020, the health benefits for mothers who breastfeed are significant, and include lower risk of breast cancer and heart disease. Medical consensus urges breastfeeding infants for at least their first year of life in order to achieve these health benefits.

CURRENT FEDERAL LAW LEAVES BEHIND MILLIONS OF LACTATING WORKERS

In 2010, Congress passed the Break Time for Nursing Mothers Act as part of the Affordable Care Act. The law amended section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207) and affords workers ''reasonable break time for an employee to express breast milk for her nursing child for 1 year after the child's birth each time such employee has need to express the milk'' and ''a place, other than a bathroom, that is shielded from view and free from intrusion from coworkers and the public, which may be used by an employee to express breast milk.''

While groundbreaking, the 2010 law has three critical problems: 1) it excludes millions of workers; 2) it has inadequate remedies for employees whose rights have been violated; and 3) it lacks clarity around breaks and compensation.

1. Current law excludes millions of nursing parents. The 2010 law is housed in the overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standard Act (''FLSA'') which means that those workers exempted from overtime—nearly nine million women of childbearing age—are also excluded from the law's protections. These millions of workers, including transportation workers, executive, administrative and professional workers, and many others, have no federal right requiring their employer to provide them break time and space to express breast milk. As I emphasized in my testimony, ''There is no principled reason why these employees should be denied the law's protections: each industry is fully capable of standard or innovative solutions to ensure their employees do not have to choose between breastfeeding and their jobs. . . The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Office on Women's Health maintains an extensive and detailed website describing how various industries, such as restaurant and retail, can provide lactation break time and space, including video testimonials, employer best practices examples, and other resources. In 2021, there is simply no excuse not to meet the needs of breastfeeding workers.''

2. Current law has inadequate remedies for workers who experienced violations. Given the current law's placement in the overtime provisions of the FLSA, the remedy for violations of the Nursing Mothers law is misaligned. Currently, the available remedy is to pay a worker any overtime owed to them. As I explained to the Education and Labor Committee in March,

''Such a remedy makes sense in the context of overtime: an employee who works forty-five hours in a week without overtime pay should be compensated with the missing payment to be made whole. For a breastfeeding worker who has been denied time and space to pump, however, this remedy is nonsensical. A breastfeeding worker who is told she cannot clock out to pump has been denied an unpaid break. Therefore, she has no entitlement to payment and the law's contemplated remedy—compensation for wages—is meaningless to her . . . These weak enforcement mechanisms are antithetical to the goal of ensuring that breastfeeding workers can get the timely accommodations they need to continue breastfeeding and keep their jobs''

3. Current law lacks clarity regarding pumping breaks and compensation. Under current law, pumping breaks that are not taken during a paid break do not need to be paid. However, often, workers who are pumping may clock out but will still take phone calls, emails, or other work requests while pumping, and are then denied compensation for their time worked while pumping. Because the language in the law says that breaks may be uncompensated, confusion persists and violations can occur when employers continue to require employees to work while taking an unpaid pumping break.

THE PUMP ACT WOULD CLOSE GAPS IN THE LAW, PROVIDE APPROPRIATE REMEDIES FOR EMPLOYEES, AND GIVE CLARITY AROUND COMPENSATION. ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS FALL WELL SHORT OF THIS GOAL

The PUMP Act will close the gaps in current law and extend the 2010 law's protections to nearly nine million employees who are currently uncovered, including nurses, teachers, and software engineers. Corporate leadership, coupled with employees, advocates, and government agencies, have already devised innovative, affordable, and flexible solutions for nearly every workplace environment. In addition, the Committee on Education & Labor also added language at the bill markup requiring the U.S. Department of Labor to work with the Department of Health and Human Services to build out guidance for employers.

The legislation will also provide employers additional clarity as to when break time can be unpaid, and will provide remedies that are already available for other FLSA violations if a worker's rights are violated. At the Education & Labor Committee mark-up of the bill, the Committee also added language ensuring fairness for employers by requiring employees to inform their employers about inadequate space to express breast milk 10 days before they file suit for violating the requirement. The PUMP Act will benefit workers and business alike, as there are well-recognized bottom-line benefits for employers

in providing break time and space for lactating employees, such as reduced absenteeism, lower healthcare costs, and greater recruitment and retention. This is why the U.S. Chamber of Commerce supports this legislation.

At the Committee markup, the minority introduced an Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute, and subsequently, a bill which mirrored that substitute amendment. Now, there is an attempt to include this language again as a substitute amendment to this bill. Although encouraging to see members voice support for break time and space, this substitute amendment does not afford the protections that breastfeeding parents need because it does not address the two main problems that the PUMP Act is addressing. The alternative bill continues to exclude millions of workers from break time and space protections and continues to leave workers with no meaningful remedies. Supporting the alternative bill and not the PUMP Act is hollow at best and offensive to working parents who need real protections.

The PUMP Act will finally close the gaps in the law that have left too many working parents without the ability to pump at work and thrust into the painful position of choosing between breastfeeding and their job. Congress has the opportunity to right a fundamental wrong and pass the PUMP Act. We urge you to support nursing parents in a meaningful way and pass the PUMP Act.

Sincerely,

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

Ms. STRICKLAND. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her leadership on this important bill.

Madam Speaker, I strongly support the amendment offered by Representative STRICKLAND from Washington. It is sensitive, important, and strengthens the bill. It directs the Comptroller General to conduct a study on racial disparities in breastfeeding and submit recommendations to Congress that address those disparities.

As a member of the Black Maternal Health Caucus, we are studying disparities in this caucus on healthcare and the challenges that some women face.

Breastfeeding contains many health benefits for children and for their mothers and should be accessible to all women no matter what their race, and we should study any disparity and try to strengthen access and availability.

This is an excellent amendment, and I support the gentlewoman for her work and sensitivity.

Ms. STRICKLAND. In closing, Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment that benefits all of us regardless of our political affiliation. This is a bipartisan bill, it deserves our support as well as the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, let me reiterate again: I have no tolerance whatsoever for any type of discrimination in the workplace or anyplace else. However, if we are going to do a study about potential discrimination, it should be done before a bill is drafted, introduced, and voted on.

This amendment does not improve the very bad underlying bill, H.R. 3110. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the amendment, vote ''no'' on the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 716, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. STRICKLAND).

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Van Duyne moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3110 to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The material previously referred to by Ms. VAN DUYNE is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 5. EXEMPTIONS.

The amendments made by this Act shall not apply with respect to employees described under subsection (a)(6) and under paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (b) of section 13 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 213).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. VAN DUYNE. 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 200, nays 224, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 330]

YEAS—200

Aderholt
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
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
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
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—224

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Burchett
Bush
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
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
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gosar
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Greene (GA)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Hice (GA)
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.

Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Allen
Brady
Bustos
DesJarlais
Lamborn
Pence
Sherrill

□ 1059

Messrs. COSTA, DOGGETT, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. CHU, Messrs. CASTEN, GOSAR, O'HALLERAN, DELGADO, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. BURCHETT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Messrs. SWALWELL and TORRES of New York changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. LUCAS, WEBSTER of Florida, and Mrs. BOEBERT changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Adams (Brown)
Bowman (Khanna)
Castro (TX) (Escobar)
Cawthorn (McHenry)
Cicilline (Pingree)
Cooper (Clark (MA))
Cuellar (Costa)
DeFazio (Brown)
Doyle, Michael F. (Cartwright)
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))
Fulcher (Johnson (OH))
Garamendi (Sherman)
Garbarino (Jacobs (NY))
Garcia (TX) (Escobar)
Gonzalez (OH) (Herrera Beutler)
Harshbarger (Kustoff)
Hartzler (Bucshon)
Hice (GA) (Greene (GA))
Huffman (Stanton)
Jayapal (Raskin)
Jones (Jacobs (CA))
Kahele (Case)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lee (NV) (Clark (MA))
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lynch (Trahan)
McEachin (Wexton)
Meng (Jeffries)
Mfume (Evans)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Napolitano (Correa)
Nehls (Fallon)
Ocasio-Cortez (Escobar)
Payne (Pallone)
Perlmutter (Neguse)
Porter (Wexton)
Rodgers (WA) (Joyce (PA))
Rush (Underwood)
Salazar (Cammack)
Sires (Pallone)
Smucker (Joyce (PA))
Speier (Scanlon)
Steel (Obernolte)
Stewart (Crawford)
Suozzi (Panetta)
Timmons (Reschenthaler)
Vela (Correa)
Waltz (Diaz-Balart)
Wasserman Schultz (Soto)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Williams (GA) (Jacobs (CA))
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 276, nays 149, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 331]

YEAS—276

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amodei
Auchincloss
Axne
Bacon
Balderson
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Burgess
Bush
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Feenstra
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gimenez
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Granger
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Joyce (OH)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
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
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Steel
Stefanik
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Yarmuth
Young

NAYS—149

Aderholt
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brooks
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davidson
DesJarlais
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gibbs
Gohmert
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McClain
McClintock
McKinley
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Palazzo
Palmer
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steil
Steube
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Van Duyne
Walberg
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—6

Allen
Brady
Bustos
Lamborn
Pence
Sherrill

□ 1134

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. FEENSTRA changed his vote from ''no'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I was attending to an urgent matter in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall No. 330 and ''nay'' on rollcall No. 331.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Adams (Brown)
Bowman (Khanna)
Castro (TX) (Escobar)
Cawthorn (McHenry)
Cicilline (Pingree)
Cooper (Clark (MA))
Cuellar (Costa)
DeFazio (Brown)
DesJarlais (Fleischmann)
Doyle, Michael F. (Cartwright)
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))
Fulcher (Johnson (OH))
Garamendi (Sherman)
Garbarino (Jacobs (NY))
Garcia (TX) (Escobar)
Gonzalez (OH) (Herrera Beutler)
Harshbarger (Kustoff)

Hartzler (Bucshon)
Hice (GA) (Greene (GA))
Huffman (Stanton)
Jayapal (Raskin)
Jones (Jacobs (CA))
Kahele (Case)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lee (NV) (Clark (MA))
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lynch (Trahan)
McEachin (Wexton)
Meng (Jeffries)
Mfume (Evans)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Napolitano (Correa)
Nehls (Fallon)
Ocasio-Cortez (Escobar)
Payne (Pallone)
Perlmutter (Neguse)
Porter (Wexton)
Rodgers (WA) (Joyce (PA))
Rush (Underwood)
Salazar (Cammack)
Sires (Pallone)
Smucker (Joyce (PA))
Speier (Scanlon)
Steel (Obernolte)
Stewart (Crawford)
Suozzi (Panetta)
Timmons (Reschenthaler)
Vela (Correa)
Velázquez (Jeffries)
Waltz (Diaz-Balart)
Wasserman Schultz (Soto)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Williams (GA) (Jacobs (CA))
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for next week.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend, the majority leader.

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

On Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business with votes postponed, as usual, until 6:30 p.m.

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

And on Wednesday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

Madam Speaker, the House will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today.

With the short-term extension of the Surface Transportation Program through October 31, the House will aim to consider the bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act and the Build Back Better Act this work period.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 2119, the Family Violence Prevention and Services Improvement Act of 2021, sponsored by LUCY MCBATH of Georgia. That bill modifies and expands and reauthorizes, through fiscal year 2026, the Family Violence Prevention and Services Program, which funds emergency shelters and supports related assistance for victims of domestic violence.

Madam Speaker, if time allows, the House may also consider H.R. 3992, the Protecting Older Jobs Applicants Act, which allows applicants to bring disparate impact claims under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 when they experience discrimination while seeking a job.

Lastly, additional legislative items may be possible when and if they are ready.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman. As we go through the bills that may come up next week—of course, we just finished a week bringing some bills to the floor, but as we look around the country, clearly the main concern we are hearing from families are all of the various crises that are facing American families.

You have an inflation crises with goods of all kinds costing dramatically more when people go to buy things at the grocery store. If they try to get a new appliance, they are waiting longer, they are paying more money.

You think about the energy crisis with families paying 50 percent more for gasoline, in some cases, with dramatic increases at the pump and the pain that it causes, especially lower income families.

The border crisis, where every day we see stories of thousands of people coming across our border illegally. The Attorney General was before the Committee on the Judiciary and he couldn't even give a number of how many people have illegally crossed or plan to address it.

The supply chain crisis that we see getting worse and worse with ships backed up, maybe almost all the way to China, because that crisis is not being addressed.

So when you think about all these crises that families are angry about—it is hurting hardworking families, it is costing them, it is taking money out of their paychecks—there has not been a single bill brought to this floor last week. It doesn't sound like any is being brought to the floor next week to address any of those crises.

I would ask the gentleman, would he be open to bringing actual legislation to the floor to address the various, serious crises that families are facing today?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments and question.

Let me say that I mentioned two bills that will have a very, very substantial impact on the welfare of Americans, of their families, of their health, and yes, even of their environmental security in the Build Back Better plan and the BIP plan, which is a bipartisan bill on the Senate side.

I hope to bring both of those bills to the floor next week, if they are ready. Unfortunately, we don't have help from your side on either of those bills so it is more difficult to get unanimity on our side of the aisle.

Madam Speaker, I will tell my friend, all those problems that you mentioned, would be extraordinarily worse if we hadn't passed the American Rescue Plan in March of this year, which helped families extraordinarily and generously to stay above water. Not a single person on your side of the aisle voted for those.

So when the gentleman asked me, are we going to bring legislation to the floor, we brought it to the floor. You all opposed it, however—unfortunately—that helped families, helped childcare, helped healthcare, helped health workers, helped States all to meet the pandemic that this administration inherited.

The pandemic was not the previous administration's fault, obviously, but the failure to deal with it effectively was their fault.

So I tell the gentleman that 5 million jobs have been created since this administration took office. Some people lamented the 233,000 jobs last month, how awful that was.

In the best year that Donald Trump had, that was his average production of jobs—in the best year he had, which was from January 2018 to January 2019.

So I will tell my friend, we hope to be able to bring these bills to the floor. We think they will have a very substantial, positive impact. We inherited, of course, because of the pandemic—again, not the fault of any—well, we don't know whether it was the fault of somebody purposely, but in any event, for whatever reasons, extraordinary amounts of people were laid off around the world.

□ 1145

Then, because of the American Rescue Plan, we finally gave some people the resources that they could buy things that they had needed and wanted for them and their families, and now we have a supply shortage.

The President acted through executive order, as the gentleman knows, to make sure that we had a 24/7 operation at the ports off Long Beach, off other ports in our country, to try to make sure that we, A, got goods on those ships that you say are to China—I don't know whether they are to China, but there are a lot of them; you are absolutely right on that—to get them offloaded, to get them on trucks, and to get them to where they could be distributed and available for businesses.

Then, of course, we have a substantial shortage of chips, which the gentleman knows, which was caused by a lockdown for major producers—Singapore being one—of chips.

So, we are dealing with that. The executive is dealing with that as well.

I very much hope the gentleman will help us get that legislation passed, which will make a major difference. Who says? Fourteen or 17 laureates who wrote to the White House and said if these bills passed, it is not only going to help jobs, it is not only going to help climate, it is not only going to help health, but it is also going to help bring down inflation, which is a problem.

Why do we have inflation? Because we have too many dollars chasing too few goods, so prices go up. That is true of employment as well, which probably is good news in terms of salaries going up for people around the country.

I tell my friend that we do have some very substantial, important legislation

that we are trying to get done. It would be a lot easier to get it done if we had help from your side of the aisle. And your answer will be, well, it would be very helpful if you would take some of our ideas. I get that.

I will also tell you, if the gentleman is concerned about all of those issues, if we don't protect the full faith and credit of the United States of America, they will all get disastrously worse. And not one of you is prepared, in a debt that we all created, all of us, not all on the same thing—it may have been cutting revenues, increasing spending, this, that, and the other.

We all essentially voted for very substantial spending last year to meet the crisis of the pandemic. All of us did. The CARES Act, the largest of those, $2 trillion, was unanimously passed by a voice vote in one instance.

The only thing I would say to the gentleman is that we are very, very concerned about what is happening. We are very glad that we created 5 million jobs. Nine million jobs were lost the year before under Mr. Trump. He had a net loss of 2 million jobs over his 4 years—a net loss of 2 million jobs. This President has a net gain, and we are going to try to continue that. I hope we get some help from your side of the aisle.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, clearly, we stand ready to help on all of those issues. But had Washington spending and borrowing money solved the problem, we would not have any of these crises because trillions of dollars have been borrowed and spent under this administration.

In the previous administration, we worked together on those budget deals, every one of them. The Paycheck Protection Program and the CARES Act were all very bipartisan, and it included addressing the debt that went along with it.

There has been nothing bipartisan in any of the debt that has been racked up under this administration. So if the gentleman is concerned about the full faith and credit of the United States, which we all are, then stop borrowing and spending trillions more dollars.

Families get this, by the way. Families know that if spending trillions was going to solve the problem, there wouldn't be a problem because trillions have been borrowed and spent just from January to October. What they know is it is the very borrowing and spending of trillions of dollars in Washington that has exacerbated these problems.

The inflation crisis would not exist if you didn't have Washington borrowing and spending trillions more dollars, making it harder for people to get back into the workforce, making it harder for the supply chain to be addressed.

What was inherited? I think we know what was inherited by the Biden administration. We had energy dominance the day President Biden took the oath of office. Not only were we producing enough energy for our needs, but gas was less than $2 a gallon all across America. We were exporting oil and natural gas to our friends around the world. We were undermining our enemies around the world.

Instead of President Biden begging OPEC and Russia to produce more oil, we were actually shipping oil and gas to our friends because we could produce enough for ourselves. We created great American jobs here at home. We had low-cost energy.

By the way, the technological advances we made here in this country, if there is anywhere in the world where fossil fuel production is going to be done, you want it done here because we have actually lowered carbon emissions. We were lowering carbon emissions in America while producing more energy. Now we have become more reliant on OPEC nations, on Russia.

Not only is that bad for American families, but they are paying more at the pump because of that crisis created by President Biden's actions. He inherited an energy-dominant Nation. Now you have the President of the United States begging OPEC and Russia to produce more oil, which they are not going to do because they want oil to be over $80 a barrel, but they actually emit more carbon to produce the same oil.

Oil is going to be needed to run an economy, any economy anywhere in the world. You want to make it here because we do it better than anybody else. But that is not what is being done. We have an answer for it.

I know, last night, President Biden was asked specifically about this crisis that he created. His response was, ''I don't have a near-term answer'' for high gas prices.

Well, President Biden might not have an answer, but we do. We have a number of bills, and I know the gentleman has pointed it out. We have a number of answers.

Here is one. H.R. 684 green-lights the Keystone pipeline. You want to talk about creating thousands of good jobs, private-sector money, more energy independence for America; this bill would do just that, and it would do it today.

If pipelines were a problem—I know President Biden doesn't want American pipelines, but he green-lighted the Russian pipeline, the Nord Stream II. So, clearly, it is not pipelines; it is American pipelines he doesn't want.

Why don't we bring up H.R. 684 to create jobs and lower energy costs? H.R. 543 and H.R. 859 would both green-light more production in America that President Biden shut down. There was production going on all across America, really good, safe, environmentally sound production. Again, our standards are the best in the world.

For people who want to bash America, go find a country that produces energy that does it better than America. We do it best. Yet, President Biden, through executive action, shut a lot of that production down. These bills would open that back up again. These bills would lower gas prices.

I know President Biden isn't interested in that because, in his own budget, he specifically blocks the Corps of Engineers from doing infrastructure projects that would lower energy production. President Biden blocks that. You would think OPEC would have come up with that idea or maybe Russia would have come up with that idea. No, that was President Biden in his own budget who said you can't even do infrastructure projects if it lowers energy production. Who would come up with that? Yet, that is in his budget.

Then you go to the border crisis, again, self-created. President Biden inherited a secure border. A wall was being built. You had agreements with South American and Central American countries.

Remain in Mexico was a great policy that President Biden reversed; he blocked it. Did he block it because it was bad policy? No, it was working really well. It was an agreement between two neighboring countries. He just blocked it because President Trump did it. It was working, yet he got rid of it. He could go and reinstate that tomorrow.

We have bills that would solve the border crisis. I will read a few of them off.

H.R. 4828 is a bill I brought to the majority leader's attention back a month ago, in September. This is a bill that deals with a number of problems facing our border today, and it would give more tools to our Border Patrol agents to secure our border.

H.R. 471 is another bill I brought to the gentleman's attention a month ago that would help secure America's border, dealing with the crisis.

None of these bills seem to draw the interest of the majority even though every one of them would address these very real crises facing families that were not around a year ago.

President Biden inherited a secure border; he inherited energy dominance; and he inherited an economy that was recovering from the worst pandemic we have seen in lifetimes. Then, on top of that, there is a proposal to raise trillions more in taxes, more in Soviet-style spending coming out of Washington that would make inflation worse.

The gentleman is correct. We don't support those ideas that would make inflation worse, that would raise gas prices even higher. But we bring a lot of good ideas that would address these crises. We just want to see these ideas brought to the floor.

When you look at the floor schedule and there is nothing last week, next week, a month ago to address any of these crises, these are the things that families are having the hardest time with, and they are struggling.

Inflation is the biggest tax on lower and middle-income families. President Biden promised he wouldn't raise taxes on anybody making less than $400,000.

Yet, in the tax proposal that President Biden wants to bring forward by next week so that he can go fly to Europe and talk about other proposals that would make it impossible to produce energy in America, they include, among other things, a natural gas tax. That tax would fall the hardest on lower income families, not the millionaires and the billionaires. It would be people making less than $60,000 that would be hit the hardest by a natural gas tax. Yet, it is in the bill.

You talk about adding 83,000 IRS agents. Maybe some people in Washington think that is job creation. Most people in America have shivers running down their spines at the thought of the Federal Government, which now wants to track every transaction if they make more than $10,000 a year, to track all their transactions with 83,000 new IRS agents. Again, maybe to some that is called infrastructure, but to most people, it is called a nightmare right before Halloween.

Why don't we bring bills to the floor to address these crises? If these aren't the bills that the majority likes, let's work on some other ones. All of these would address these problems, and many of them would get us back to the point where we were, where we had a secure border, where we had energy dominance, where we had jobs being created.

Each of these last few months you have seen jobs created dramatically lower than what the projections were because there are all of these self-created crises by the administration that are making it harder on hardworking families. It is the lowest income families that are being hit the hardest by these failed policies and all the Big Government socialist spending coming out of Washington. We don't need more. We need to actually go and confront the problem that is creating a debt crisis and all the other crises that families are facing.

It is not going to be by spending more money and taxing people more. It is going to be by working to address each of them, starting at the root of the problem and what created them. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I don't think I can respond, nor do I intend to respond, to each one of those assertions. I noticed that the gentleman totally ignored the facts.

The presentation the gentleman made, Madam Speaker, was as if the Republican policies were in place, we would be in high cotton.

Let me remind the gentleman, Donald Trump was President; the Republicans were in the majority, Madam Speaker; and over those 4 years, we lost a net 2.876 million people from jobs. The last 12 months of the Trump administration, 9,416,000 jobs were lost. Let me remind you, the best year you had, you had 2,820,000 new jobs. That is about an average of 235,000 jobs a month. Last month, when we were all wringing our hands because it came down substantially from expectations, it was 233,000.

In other words, the wringing of the hands over the poor job performance you seem to reflect was the average of Mr. Trump's best year. In fact, under this administration, helped by a bill, the American Rescue Plan, that every Republican voted against—what was the difference between the first five bills that were passed and the bill of 2021 that every Republican voted against? Donald Trump was President, and then Joe Biden was President.

It is like the debt limit, Madam Speaker. They know the debt limit has to be raised, or all the things that the gentleman just referenced are going to be hurt very, very badly.

Before you start criticizing people for not doing things to help, why don't you stop hurting the ability of the United States to present a balanced fiscal posture to our own economy and to the rest of the world and have some certitude that America is going to remain fiscally responsible and viable and pay its bills? I don't know the answer to that question. Perhaps, Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana knows.

□ 1200

The gentleman from Louisiana comes from a very important and critical energy producing State of our Nation. I don't blame him for being concerned about energy. He ought to be. We all ought to be. But, very frankly, we ought to also be very concerned about global warming, which the national security apparatus of the United States of America, even during the Trump administration, said was one of the biggest existential threats to the welfare of our people and the global community.

So, yes, we are very concerned about reaching an environment which is not dangerous for life on this planet. That is a very big issue for us. My friend is right, and we are going to deal with that in the Build Back Better plan. We are dealing with it, and we are dealing with it in the BIP plan.

Now, the BIP plan is a plan to spend $1.2 trillion on infrastructure investment over the next 10 years which will make our country more competitive, will increase our ability to produce goods here in America, Make It in America, which will make us more independent and self-sufficient. We found during the pandemic we weren't as self-sufficient as we should be and wanted to be.

These bills that we are considering will do that.

I don't expect many Republicans to vote for it. Even the transportation bill that I think they ought to be for—Donald Trump said he was going to spend $1 trillion, have a $1 trillion infrastructure program during his campaign, and then we went down to the White House, we had a meeting with him, and he said: No, $1 trillion is not enough, we ought to do $2 trillion.

He did zero, Madam Speaker, zero when the Republicans were in charge. Zero.

We are going to pass this infrastructure bill, and it is going to make a real difference. It is going to make a real difference on jobs, it is going to make a real difference on inflation, and it is going to make a real difference because we can increase the supply chain. It is going to make a real difference on the health of our globe.

So I tell the gentleman that he raises a lot of issues, and I would hope his party would start returning to a sense of bipartisanship in dealing with legitimate problems that the gentleman raises which we did in 2020.

Now, we did. We were in the minority. We voted with President Trump. Actually, we were in the majority, but President Trump was President, and we helped support his and the Treasury Secretary's objectives and our own objectives, and we came to an agreement, a bipartisan agreement.

Very frankly, it is unbelievable to me, Madam Speaker, that in the debt limit the minority leader of the United States Senate—and, very frankly, the gentleman just said that we all understand we don't want to—I presume he doesn't believe we ought to not raise our debt limit. I believe he wants us to pay our bills because he knows the catastrophic impact if we don't. But I don't understand why they won't support this. That is not an issue of Democrat or Republican. We all created that debt in one form or another. Certainly, last year we did a big number because we thought we needed to meet the pandemic. We did, and we saved millions of jobs in the process.

So my friend has these bills, we have bills, we are prepared to talk about proposals, as I have told my friend in the past. But, very frankly, there needs to be on some issues—that ought not to be political at all, like the debt limit—a statement that we are loyal to our country, not to Democrats. I said this the other day to the gentleman, the loyal opposition, not to Democrats, not to me as the majority leader, not to any of us, but to the country.

I would implore my friend, because we are going to have to do the debt, we are going to have to do the omnibus, we are going to have to do the debt limit, we want to do Build Back Better, and we want to do the infrastructure bill, those are four pieces of big legislation we want to do before December 30, I am hopeful that we can get some cooperation from the Republicans.

I mentioned the debt limit because that is an issue that the gentleman came to us under the Trump administration and asked us to help with. We knew it was critical for the interests of the country, and on three different occasions we voted with the President at the Secretary of the Treasury under the Trump administration's request and voted to make sure that America did not default on its bills.

Can I ask if the gentleman will at least, Madam Speaker, indicate that

they will support making sure that America continues to pay its bills?

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I sure hope that the gentleman is concerned not just about making sure the credit card bill is paid but making sure that the spending that maxed out the credit card is being done responsibly.

There are some key facts the gentleman left out in his conversation about how we got here. We got here because in January, one party, the Democratic Party—who is in the majority in the House, is in the majority in the Senate, and has control in the White House—made a decision—I don't agree with the decision—but made a decision that they were going to go it alone on the spending side. They decided that they were going to go max out the credit card. We urged them not to do it. We still to this day are urging not to go and just spend trillions and trillions more dollars.

If my friend wants to work with us on what the responsible decision should be, we are right here. We have been here from the beginning.

Madam Speaker, do you know, to this day President Biden has not met—we are in October, late October. President Biden has not met with the House Republican leadership on any of these issues—any of them.

The gentleman referenced a number of opportunities where it was described we were there to help President Trump. The majority wasn't just there to help President Trump, the majority was in the meetings when the decisions were being made.

The Paycheck Protection Program was not a partisan exercise. In fact, it was one of the most successful bipartisan exercises I have seen Congress come together and do. Everybody was in the room making those decisions. They were all very important decisions and big decisions that involved a lot of money, and we all made those decisions together. We all voted for those bills together, and then, ultimately, the spending that went along with it, the debt that went along with it was part of that negotiation and we voted for it together.

There has not been a decision made this year where the majority has negotiated with the minority to figure out if we could come to an agreement, so the majority did it on their own and look, the majority had the votes to do it.

But when the majority maxes out the credit card on their own, don't come and chide our side and say: Well, you need to be there to pay the bill when we weren't included in the decision to max out the credit card. And now that the credit card is maxed out, it is not as if there is an effort to slow down, in fact, it seems like it is full steam ahead, damn the torpedoes, spend trillions of dollars more on additional things like, again, 83,000 more IRS agents.

Madam Speaker, do you think anybody on this side supports that?

That is not something we support. It will rack up more debt, by the way. We don't support it, but I guess the gentleman expects we should pay for it even if we don't support it. Maybe if there was a negotiation where both sides were part of it.

SAM GRAVES, who is the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, has not been included in any of these decisions on infrastructure. Yet, I am sure the gentleman would expect him to vote for whatever comes out of a partisan exercise. That is not how things work, and I know the gentleman knows that.

Again, if the President wants to work with us—

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman continues to say facts that are not true.

Mr. SCALISE. Of course, those are true.

Mr. HOYER. They are not true.

Mr. SCALISE. We all negotiated on the three different debt ceiling increases that happened under the Trump administration, including CARES and the Paycheck Protection Program. They were very bipartisan.

Does the gentleman disagree with that?

Mr. HOYER. I do not disagree with it.

Mr. SCALISE. Those are the facts. And so when the gentleman looked at those facts, the gentleman talked about jobs and COVID. Before COVID happened, we had the hottest economy maybe in the history of our country. Wages were up for every demographic group. Those are facts. The gentleman saw small businesses up and women-owned small businesses were up over 20 percent. African-American unemployment was at its lowest level, Hispanic unemployment was at its lowest level, and then COVID came along.

Maybe there is a reason why the majority won't hold a hearing on the origin of COVID, but if the gentleman wants to just say because of COVID all of that is Donald Trump's fault, clearly the economy shut down, and we worked to get it back going again, and it is coming back. Frankly, some of the efforts to pay people not to work—and it is not just enhanced unemployment, it is a whole list of things—are hurting the recovery.

But those things were happening before COVID hit a year and a half ago, and it was because of good, sound policies that got us a secure border and that got us energy dominance, and, frankly, it was things like that that helped us get the economy going again because it was creating good jobs.

Keystone pipeline was moving forward. Those are good union jobs, by the way, and that was ended by President Biden unilaterally. He never even tried to have a meeting and a conversation with us to see if we could come to an agreement.

Again, I guess it is the prerogative of the majority. If the gentleman is in the majority, then the majority doesn't have to talk to the minority. But just because the majority didn't talk to the minority and they made decisions on their own about what they wanted to do, they didn't try to reach an agreement with us, to come to us after the fact when the majority has spent trillions of dollars, it has wreaked havoc through our economy, it has led to inflation we haven't seen in generations and gas prices we haven't seen in decades, then the majority wants to come and not ask us how to fix it—we have got ideas on how to fix it—the majority asks us to pay the bill.

Why don't we work together on the front end and not rack up trillions more in spending?

Because the things the gentleman talked about would rack up trillions more in spending which created these problems, and we were not a part of those conversations. I wish we were a part of the conversations and it was done in a bipartisan way. But, again, President Biden, 10 months into his administration, has yet to sit down and meet with House Republican leadership to talk about any of these ideas and solutions we could come up with together which is how it should be done.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

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

The reason I said he was misstating the facts is we have a bipartisan bill. It wasn't done by the Democratic leadership. It, frankly, wasn't done by the Republican leadership. It was done by Members of the United States Senate on the Republican side and on the Democratic side.

That bill was sent over here with almost half of the Republicans in the United States Senate voting for it, and my friend's leadership is lobbying against that infrastructure bill which would help all the issues the gentleman raised.

My friend is urging a ''no'' vote on that, and he is threatening Members who are going to vote for it—maybe not very many—because they know it is a bipartisan bill.

Mr. SCALISE. No one is being threatened.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, the whip is talking about bipartisanship. There has been so little bipartisanship, and when there is bipartisanship, their Members are disciplined. When there is bipartisanship on saying that it wasn't a protest, it was an insurrection, there was no bipartisanship on that.

It was a: ''We don't care what it was. We don't care that some people were killed. We don't really care that they were trying to stop the counting of votes for the President of the United States of America. It was just a protest.''

That is what former President Trump said the other day. What a bunch of hooey. There clearly has been a conscious decision made by the leadership on the other side of the aisle, Madam Speaker, against a bill that had 69 votes in the United States Senate. We only have 50.

And it is being lobbied against. Why? To hurt Joe Biden.

Yes, they voted, Madam Speaker, for the five bills.

Why?

Because ultimately Donald Trump was for them. Not everybody voted for them, but the majority. And as I said, CARES, $2 trillion, absolutely essential, was passed. But the gentleman refuses to answer the question except to say: Well, the credit card was maxed out.

The credit card was maxed out by date in a couple of those votes which we helped as the responsible opposition, as we did with John Boehner and Paul Ryan when they couldn't get votes to pass bills to keep government open or to keep the United States from defaulting. Yes, we cast the responsible vote.

It is not a popular vote because it is demagogued, Madam Speaker. It has nothing to do with the debt. The debt happens when you pass spending or pass revenue cuts. That is what affects the debt, and that is what all of us do one way or the other.

So we are all responsible and we ought to all be responsible. But the Senate leader on the Republican side of the aisle has said he is not going to do anything.

Not only will he not do anything, Madam Speaker, he will not allow the majority to do it on their own because he is going to filibuster so it requires 60 votes. We don't have 60 votes. We have 51.

□ 1215

Not only will they not do the responsible thing on debt, which would adversely affect, if we do not extend it, all the things that the minority whip lamented were wrong; it would all be adversely affected if, for the first time in history, Madam Speaker, we fail to extend the debt limit, which, by the way, very few countries have—one or two—because it is a phony issue. The debt is not phony, but the limit is controlled by what budgets we pass, what tax cuts we pass, what policies we pass.

Once we do that, we go in the store, or as JIM MCGOVERN, the chair of the Rules Committee said, we go in the restaurant and buy the steak. You need to pay for the steak. The argument, Madam Speaker, of, oh, well, you are proposing a lot of spending in the future, is totally unrelated. The debt limit is caused by the debt that we already incurred. The two bills that we had, they don't affect the debt limit. We have met it now, not when we passed these bills, not after we make that commitment.

We have a debt limit coming up now on December 3, which was totally irresponsible in and of itself, for political reasons only, coterminous with the funding of government. In 2019, when we took over, the government was shut down. We spent a lot of time opening it up. That hurt the economy. That hurt jobs. Now, at that point in time, it didn't hurt inflation. And I have been amazed over the years, over the last 10 years, that we haven't had more inflation for a number of reasons.

But he didn't answer the question, whether he would help on that. That is not for us. It is not for Democrats, not for Republicans. It is for our country. It is for our economy. It is for global fiscal stability.

So I would hope at least in that area—not for us. I am not asking you to do it for me, Madam Speaker. I am not asking anybody to do it for me or for my party or for the President of the United States. MITCH MCCONNELL says it is the country and the global community that could not afford default, and that is true.

Let me tell you, I think that is the first step to showing bipartisan responsibility together; not for one another, but for our country, Madam Speaker. And I hope that at some point in time we can show that kind of good faith.

I included this morning the remarks that President George W. Bush made in Shanksville, Pennsylvania, on the kind of America that he wanted to see. I would hope all of my Republican colleagues would read what George W. Bush had to say. It is so different from the rhetoric of the current leader of the Republican Party, Donald Trump, in terms of bringing us together as a country.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I would be happy to answer the question. It might not be the answer the gentleman wants, but I would be happy to be part of an actual bipartisan negotiation on how to solve our country's debt. That has not happened.

But if you look at the bill that the gentleman brought to this floor to deal with the debt over a month ago, it absolutely dealt with spending, not that already happened, but that will happen in the future, including the trillions of dollars of debt-laden bills that spend more money in Washington.

It picked a date, and the date that the gentleman put in the bill that was brought to this House floor was December 31, 2022. That is not spending we have already done. That is spending that the majority plans to do in a very partisan way, not just through this year but through all of next year.

When we are not even included in those decisions, then you come and say, well, you should just be expected to pay for whatever we want to spend, trillions more, between now and the end of a year, over a year from now, that is not a negotiation. That is not even an attempt to want to work with the other side.

Now, again, the gentleman is in the majority. In the Senate, they are in the majority, and the gentleman very well knows that both sides have the ability, if you want to do the spending on your own, to address the debt that would be created by all of that spending on your own. It doesn't take 60 votes. The gentleman is well aware that there is a legislative instrument that if all the spending wants to be done in a partisan way—and I am talking about the trillions that are still laying in front of us that the gentleman said may come to the floor next week, not necessarily will, might come to the floor, might come to the floor a month from now, might come to the floor a year from now. And we won't even be included in those negotiations, but we ought to be expected to vote for the debt that would be racked up by it?

If the other side were being asked to do that, you know your majority wouldn't go for that. But we wouldn't do it. We would at least include you in a negotiation. If we didn't want to, then we would be responsible for doing it on our own if we did the spending on our own. And the tools are there to do just that.

Threatening to default on the Nation's debt when legislative instruments are included in this majority to not have default is irresponsible. That threat keeps being thrown out there by the majority, even though the majority knows they could, with a majority vote in the House and a majority vote in the Senate, address the debt that wants to be racked up between now and next December.

Again, I would urge that all of that new spending doesn't happen, that we come together and negotiate what budget limits should be like we have done in the past under Republican and Democrat Presidents. Those were bipartisan deals. There has been no bipartisan attempt to do that this year.

Why is there opposition to infrastructure? Well, first of all, if there was a desire to do bipartisan infrastructure, you are going to find a lot of takers over here. I know the gentleman made an assertion—probably not realizing it—but there would have been no threats, no threats made on our side of the aisle on a bill.

Now, I see people being followed into bathrooms on the other side and all kinds of other things being done. There are no threats on this side. What we said is, we want an infrastructure negotiation. But the day that the deal was reached in the Senate with the President, he turned around about an hour later and undermined that deal by tying it, linking it, to the tax-and-spend bill.

That is when it became a problem because taxing and spending trillions more dollars would be a problem to this country. It would hurt middle-class families and lower income families to have that natural gas tax, to have all the additional inflation on top of the inflation they already see. It became a problem for all of those reasons, that package, not the individual bill.

As the President himself has said multiple times, as the Speaker herself has said multiple times, it is not a standalone bill. It is not two standalone bills. It is a package. They are married together at the hip.

That is where the opposition comes from. By the way, there is a really

good bipartisan infrastructure bill that is out there. S. 3011 came over from the Senate unanimously. $500 billion of infrastructure is authorized in this bill. If the gentleman would bring this up for a vote, it would probably fly overwhelmingly. It would allow for, again, about $500 billion immediately that could be spent on infrastructure all across this country, plus an additional large sum next year—maybe $100 billion next year—on top of the $500 billion.

It just passed out of the Senate unanimously; every Republican, every Democrat supported this bill. This is real infrastructure. This is not tied to some tax-and-spend bill that maybe the gentleman might think is a good idea. We surely don't. We know how damaging it would be to our country and to our economy and to middle and lower income families.

This is a very bipartisan bill that could be bipartisan here, where we could be a part of a negotiation on something really good, where States wouldn't have to wait months. They have the money ready to go today. This gives them the flexibility to make their own decisions on what is best for the infrastructure in each of these States.

Maryland would be able to control their own destiny on over $1 billion. Louisiana would be able to control their own destiny on over $1 billion today if this bill passed.

So, absolutely, we support real infrastructure. If it is tied together and married to something that would be devastating to the economy, of course not. Maybe if the majority would look at delinking those two and abandoning the bill that would raise taxes—and even internally in the Democrat Caucus those discussions have been going on. That is not just Republicans asking for that. There are a number of Democrats asking for that, too. That would be a bipartisan initiative to say we are jettisoning this idea that we are going to raise hundreds of billions, if not multiple trillions—whatever the number—if it is $1 trillion, $5 trillion it would be devastating to our economy and middle-class families.

Let's abandon that and go work on something that would actually be real infrastructure that we could all rally behind. It would pass overwhelmingly. It would be good for the country. President Biden would get to sign it into law. We would support that.

I ask the gentleman to look at S. 3011, and if he is not a supporter of that plan that passed with 100 Senators, maybe there is a better idea. But this one is a really good one that got every Republican and every Democrat in the Senate earlier this week to say yes. We would be happy to say yes to it as well if we are given that opportunity. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I think that bill passed the Senate Wednesday, so we will look at it, but we haven't had a chance to look at it at this point in time.

I want to get back—and I know this sounds like a broken record on the debt limit, but the gentleman makes the point, Madam Speaker, that somehow we have raised the debt to accommodate spending. That is what you always do because if you reach the debt limit, you are done. You stop Social Security. You stop veterans' payments. You stop any support payments. You stop paying the armed services of the United States. That is the spending you stop when you can no longer incur debt. Why? Because we spent a lot of money. We put it on the credit card, and it is coming due. It comes due on a regular basis, and we have to pay it on a regular basis.

The gentleman has voted for bills that do exactly what the bill he lamented, and none of his colleagues voted for, Madam Speaker, exactly what he asked us to do, extend it by a date, not a number, by a date. Then he hypothesizes, well, in that timeframe, you are going to incur additional expenses. He is absolutely right.

So, he is lamenting and giving as a reason for his not voting for it is because there are some proposals to spend money in the future. There are lots of them from all sides.

Then he brings up this ''tied together.'' Let me tell you who has tied it together. The Republican leadership has tied these together. Yes, the President talked about it. He said, no, they are not tied together. He said, first of all, they are tied together, and then he said, no, I negotiated this bill; don't do it.

But I will tell the gentleman, as the majority leader who brings bills to the floor, their infrastructure bill passed overwhelmingly in a bipartisan vote and put together in a bipartisan vote Republicans, Democrats, and the President of the United States.

Now, he is the President of the United States. I know the gentleman voted against certifying his election in a bipartisan move, I suppose.

But, Madam Speaker, that bill will be brought up separately, and you vote for that bill on its merits and vote against it on its merits. Do not hide behind the fact that you don't like some other bill.

Donald Trump said he was going to do a trillion dollars on infrastructure to help our economy. He didn't do it. Then he said it was going to be $2 trillion. He didn't do it. Republicans were in the majority. They controlled the House and the Senate. They didn't do it.

We have a bill they can vote for. I would urge them to vote for extending the debt limit so our country meets its full faith and credit obligations and for the infrastructure bill because I think it is a bipartisan bill negotiated by Republicans, by Democrats, and by the President of the United States which will help our economy and, as I said and will reiterate, every issue that the gentleman raised, Madam Speaker, in his opening remarks.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman again for his comments.

There is clearly a bipartisan bill on infrastructure that we would be happy to support, S. 3011. Nobody in the House on the Republican side was included in any of those negotiations, including the ranking member of the Transportation Committee who he himself has been urging a large bill. $450 billion was put on the table, which, by the way, if that were passed, it would be the largest infrastructure bill in the history of the United States. He was pushed out of the negotiations.

Again, the majority has that ability because they are in the majority, but they surely never tried a bipartisan negotiation, as well the gentleman knows, on those prior budget agreements.

It wasn't just voted for or against because of who was in the White House. It was voted for by both parties because the negotiation on what that spending limit was was agreed upon by the leadership of both sides.

Mr. HOYER. That is not accurate, and you know it.

Mr. SCALISE. The House, Senate, Republican, Democrat, we came to agreement on those budgets, and that is why the gentleman voted for it. That is why I voted for it, because it was a negotiated agreement. There was give and take on a number of items but ultimately agreed by a date certain but under a budget agreement.

□ 1230

There is a date certain of December 31 of 2022 that has no bipartisan agreement. We know what a lot of the spending will be, because trillions have already been spent that we were not included in and we strongly opposed. The gentleman knew that when he brought the bills to the floor, but he wanted to bring them to the floor anyway because you had the votes. I get it. That is the way majorities work.

But if you decide to exclude one party from negotiations and go spend the money anyway and then have a whole list of trillions more in spending down the road and include that in a bill, I don't really think anybody expects the people who were pushed to the curb to vote for the credit card limit being increased with all the spending that is going to continue to be racked up—not that has already been racked up—that will be racked up between now and December 31 of 2022 is going to be done in a partisan way. That is what the record has been so far this year on the trillions that have already been added by bills passed by this majority. They weren't bipartisan. Again, that is the prerogative of the majority.

We have stood here ready. We have listed bill after bill to address crisis after crisis, none of which have been brought to the floor. We are still ready to go to solve these problems. We have

talked about a bipartisan bill on infrastructure that we can support. Ultimately, the majority makes that decision.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, if this Congress had never met this year, we would have to extend the debt limit at some point in time this year. That is a fact.

Mr. MCCONNELL has said it is inconceivable that we would not extend the debt limit of the United States of America and fail our obligation under full faith and credit. As a matter of fact, the Constitution, in the 14th Amendment, says it shall not be questioned, but we have to take some legislative action.

The issue is what is our responsibility to the United States of America, not all this argument that pretends that somehow some bills that are proposed on spending or some that may have been passed this year, if they hadn't been passed, somehow we wouldn't have to do this. If anybody on either side of the aisle believes that to be the case, they ought to be defeated by their constituents because they don't know what is going on here, on either side of the aisle.

This is a very serious issue with respect to jobs, infrastructure, inflation, healthcare, and environment. All of those will be adversely affected, and the global community itself, if we do not extend this debt. We can argue about the other issues, but there is no argument about this issue.

Every Republican President has asked that this be done. Every Republican Secretary of the Treasury, since I have been in this Congress, 41 years, has asked that we extend the debt limit; every one of them, without fail. Every one of them has said—President Reagan on—that if we did not do it, the country's economy, reputation, and well-being would be put disastrously at risk.

I don't want bipartisanship. I want patriotism. I want people committed to their country and their country's well-being to stand up and say: I am not going to demagogue an issue that is so critically important to the welfare of my Nation.

I say to the gentleman again: Exactly what they passed when they were in the majority, and we voted for it, setting a future date—not a number, a future date. Exactly. We didn't ask them to do anything more than we did.

In terms of bipartisanship, I will again say: You have got a bipartisan bill negotiated in a bipartisan way that will be coming to this floor at some point in time, I hope earlier rather than later, separately—not tied to I don't like this bill, I don't like that bill, I won't do this, I won't do that, I won't do the other—which will substantially grow jobs in our country and deal with the climate crisis in our country.

I would ask you to support both of those propositions when they come to the floor in a show of bipartisan support for our country, not for each other, but for our country.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, we need to do this in a bipartisan way, which hasn't happened. But partisanship is not patriotism, and we have seen a lot of partisanship.

I have served in leadership under three different Presidents now. When we had to negotiate how to come together on the priorities of our government, how to properly fund things and deal with our debt, under President Obama, we had those bipartisan meetings in the White House. When President Trump came in, we had those bipartisan meetings in the White House. Still to this day, late October, 10 months into his Presidency, there has not been a single time where President Biden has brought a bipartisan group of our leadership together.

I understand he has met with Democrat leadership many times in the White House. Again, that is his prerogative. He is the President; you are in the majority. If you want to do all of this in a partisan way, I don't suggest it is healthy and I don't suggest it is the right way. Every President I have served under in leadership has had bipartisan meetings to have these conversations and come to an agreement. That has not happened under this President.

He ought to go and live by the words that he promised during the campaign, that he would work with both parties in a bipartisan way. To not have met with House Republican leadership once during his Presidency, 10 months in, is not an acceptable way to run this government.

Then all of a sudden, things end up partisan, and everybody throws their hands up and goes: How did this happen? Just reach out. He is the President of the United States. If he says let's go tomorrow, we will be there tomorrow. But he won't do that. We have asked for meetings. At some point they have to have them.

Again, if he doesn't want them to happen, that is his prerogative, because the same party controls all levers of government. But if the same party controls all levers of government and wants to just toss aside the other party in either Chamber—oh, we worked with Senators. Even some of those Senators that were mentioned are not supporting what is happening with debt, because there has been no negotiation with both parties on the debt, on the spending that gets us to the debt. So there can be proposals for trillions more in spending. If we oppose it, we have been very clear why we have that opposition.

It wasn't us that married those bills together. President Biden came here just two weeks ago. They said he was going to be closing the deal. He was going to be the closer. We were going to have a vote on the House floor. The Speaker promised there would be a vote on the House floor.

Instead, at that meeting, it has been reported that he said the two bills are tied together. Since then, he said: I want both of them coming to me. He has tied them together. I wish he wouldn't. That is the President's prerogative. He has made it very clear. The Speaker has made it very clear. It has not been our side that has done that. We want to separate those as a package, but they have been kept together as a package. Until then, at least we have been looking for other opportunities, and we found one in S. 3011 that passed the Senate unanimously. That would be $500 billion in real infrastructure today. Every Governor of every State would have the ability to start doing $500 billion in new infrastructure projects. We think that would be really good for our country. We support it. We are ready to negotiate.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, this needs to come to an end, obviously, but I will tell you this, as I stand here, as somebody who sat on this floor on January 6 and the question was would the House perform its function of accepting the electoral college vote to elect this President—it wasn't that there hadn't been voices in the past who had raised questions. But there was no effort by Ms. Clinton, who received the majority of the votes, or Mr. Gore, who received the majority of the votes, to raise a question about the legitimacy of the election.

But we had an insurrection incited by, invited by, and deployed by the President of the United States. So we didn't start on a very good bipartisan basis, again, not because Republicans should have been happy that their candidate was not elected or any more than we were happy that our candidate was not elected in the Clinton and Gore campaigns.

It was, at least, that we ought to uphold the constitutional principles. Vice President Pence did, and there were people in this Capitol on that night who wanted to see him, apparently, eliminated. That wasn't a good bipartisan start, Madam Speaker. The majority of Republicans voted against certifying the electoral college results in State after State. But we ought to put that behind us. That is done. What we are doing now is we are acting on behalf of the country.

The two issues that I dwelt on, because I think we have agreement on that, rhetorically and intellectually but not electorally, not in terms of voting, is the debt limit should never be breached and that we need to invest in infrastructure, two simple propositions.

The Senate minority leader says: We should never breach the full faith and credit of the United States of America, but I won't help you do it. I don't get that. Frankly, it seems to be kind of irrational.

And then an infrastructure bill passed overwhelmingly by the United

States Senate, which we are putting on the floor unchanged, as it was, not coupled—as it is and was—and saying let's vote for that.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, we stand ready to work, if there is bipartisan efforts made. We will see if that develops.

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

REMEMBERING SUMMER BARROW

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

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak on the House floor about Summer Barrow.

Summer was born on July 4 and was named for the season. Her mother, Carey Colvin, said that Summer was a firecracker, she was vivacious, she loved to dance, she loved to sing, and she loved music. But Summer died of a fentanyl overdose in January of 2020.

Summer's substance use disorder began after she was prescribed oxycodone after a car accident, and when the prescription ran out, she turned to heroin.

This vibrant young woman lost her life to a substance use disorder, and amid her loss, her mother, Carey, has turned to advocacy.

In her honor, I was proud to introduce the bipartisan Support Recovery for Addiction Act, legislation that would create a guaranteed funding stream for recovery support services and community organizations.

Of her daughter, Carey said: ''I know what she would want to say is: 'Please get help.'''

This bill would help deliver that help to others, just as Summer and so many others that we have lost to substance use disorder would have wanted.

□ 1245

RESTORE THE HYDE AMENDMENT

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, there comes a time to dispel the myth that we must choose between women's rights and children's rights. Now is the time because we can protect both.

Sadly, abortion reveals society's inability to love, to protect, and to care for the most innocent and helpless among us.

When we devalue life, our society suffers. When we deem some to be nonessential, we devalue their lives.

I am strongly pro-life, and I consistently stand up for the rights of the unborn and the born.

Our society is willing to and does care for the mother in need. Perhaps she is scared and alone. Americans across the country reach out to help mothers and the children that they are nourishing in their wombs.

I must rise today to express my grave concern that our Democrat colleagues' proposed spending bill lacks crucial protections that ensure that taxpayer funds do not pay for abortions.

Without this protection, taxpayer-funded abortions not only harm us as a society but violate the religious freedoms of thousands of Americans.

The longstanding, bipartisan Hyde amendment ensures just that, that taxpayer funds do not go toward abortion. However, the Democrats' currently proposed multitrillion-dollar build back broke plan does not contain those lifesaving protections.

In 1994, then-Senator Joe Biden wrote, ''Those of us who are opposed to abortion should not be compelled to pay for them.''

In God we trust.

CHILD TAX CREDIT PROVIDES CRITICAL SUPPORT TO FAMILIES

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, 7 months ago, Democrats passed a historic tax cut for middle-class families and lifted millions of children out of poverty.

Since then, some of my conservative colleagues have had the audacity to complain that we helped too many children.

In my district, here is what it means when 97 percent of families are eligible for the child tax credit:

For Yvette, it means healthy food on the table.

For Sara, it means being able to afford her child's preschool tuition.

This money goes straight into our local economy, helping parents get back to work and build the future that their children deserve.

But without a clean extension of the child tax credit, American families will lose this critical support just as the economy begins to recover.

This tax credit isn't a handout. It is about putting hard-earned tax dollars back in the pockets of working families with children.

For any of my colleagues who won't vote to help their constituents, let me be clear: I will vote for the families in your districts and mine because our children deserve nothing less.

CONGRATULATING ADMIRAL FALLER ON HIS RETIREMENT

(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 to recognize the storied career of Admiral Craig Faller, commander of the U.S. Southern Command.

Admiral Faller is a native of Fryburg, Pennsylvania, a small town located in Clarion County, in Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District.

His naval career started in 1983, following his graduation from the U.S. Naval Academy with a degree in systems engineering. From there, he went on to serve during the Gulf war.

During his service, Admiral Faller has held a variety of posts and positions, from supporting the United Nations' sanctions against Iraq and the humanitarian efforts following the devastating tsunami off Indonesia to supporting Operations New Dawn and Enduring Freedom. His service took him all over the world.

Regardless of location, either on the sea or shore, Admiral Faller consistently provided leadership and guidance.

Admiral Faller currently serves as commander of the U.S. Southern Command and will be retiring from the Navy at the end of this month.

Admiral Faller, thank you for your service to the United States of America. Your dedication to our country is admirable. Enjoy your retirement. You deserve it.

MAKING AMERICA THE BEST COUNTRY IN THE WORLD

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, it gives me great joy when I can come to the floor and really speak directly to the moms and dads and families that right now, as we stand on the floor, are probably looking to gather children from schools, looking at what they are going to do over the weekend, maybe doing grocery shopping and looking at the resources that they do have or do not have.

It is important that we immediately pass the Build Back Better Act and that those who have a difference of opinion realize that it is always the greater good that America has always been about. When we have gone to war, we have not gone to war to be an offender. We have gone to war to defend principles of democracy.

I believe the Build Back Better Act will provide greater pricing of prescription drugs, strengthening the Affordable Care Act, expanding Medicaid for some 12 States. The State of Texas happens to be one of them, where 733,000-plus people are uninsured. These are working people. Expanding Federal Medicaid is going to help those people in States like Kansas and South Dakota. If they won't speak for themselves, I will speak for America.

In addition, the care economy really says that we must give childcare and universal kindergarten to people so that we can be advanced and our people can be helped.

Finally, let me say that voting is important and crucial. We must pass voting rights.

This is Build Back Better America, and build back makes America the best country in the world.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND BRAVERY OF CORPORAL DUANE E. DEWEY

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Corporal Duane E. Dewey for his service, sacrifice, and dedication to our country.

Corporal Dewey's instinctive action and bravery saved the lives of a number of his fellow soldiers and earned him the highest military decoration for valor, the Medal of Honor.

He began his service in the Marine Corps in 1951 when he enlisted for the duration of the Korean war.

On April 16, 1952, Corporal Dewey and his fellow marines were engaged in a firefight where they were outnumbered more than 20–1. During this fight, Corporal Dewey was wounded in the legs by an enemy grenade. While being treated for this injury, another grenade was thrown within reach.

At a moment's notice, Corporal Dewey grabbed the grenade and literally sat on it while pulling the medic who was treating him onto his body, using his body as a shield to save those around him.

Amazingly, although he sustained severe injuries from both grenades and a separate additional bullet wound to the abdomen, Corporal Dewey survived the fight.

These actions of this great, brave, and courageous man earned Corporal Dewey the Medal of Honor, which I hold here today, his challenge coin. It was actually presented by President Dwight D. Eisenhower himself, the first one that he did personally, who notably remarked—accurately, I would say—that Corporal Dewey must have a ''body of steel.''

Madam Speaker, Corporal Dewey is the epitome of an American hero. May we honor his legacy and never forget his selfless actions.

NO VACCINE MANDATE FOR OUR MILITARY

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

Mr. LONG. Madam Speaker, in 1886, a product was brought online, Coca-Cola, and it remained one of the most popular products of all time until 1985, 99 years later, when they came out with a great idea, New Coke.

The problem is, New Coke was a terrible idea, and 3 months later, they brought back what they call Classic Coke because of this terrible, terrible idea that had to be fixed.

Making our military be vaccinated against their will is a terrible, terrible idea that needs to be fixed.

Let me be clear. I have been vaccinated, and I have encouraged everyone to talk to their doctors and see if the vaccine is right for them. But ultimately, vaccination is a choice that shouldn't be mandated on our fighting men and women.

As of yesterday, 30 percent of our total force remains completely unvaccinated. Are we prepared to lose 30 percent of the total force? How do we think that is going to impact military readiness? The Pentagon, when they came out with this program, said it was for military readiness. Come on.

Some branches of the military offer waivers for religious reasons, but what if a breastfeeding mother isn't comfortable getting the vaccine? I have heard from several breastfeeding mothers.

This needs to be fixed. I ask all my colleagues to join me in this effort. New Coke is not working.

NO SPYING ON AVERAGE AMERICANS BY IRS

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

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my continued opposition to ELIZABETH WARREN and House Democratic efforts to expand the IRS to spy on everyday Americans' bank accounts with transactions over $600. I know there has been talk of raising that to $10,000. I am opposed to all of this.

Madam Speaker, the banks already have mechanisms in place to catch suspicious activity. Those are called SARs or specific activity reports. We don't need additional tools by the IRS to harass everyday working Americans who are struggling to pay their bills.

If the intention by the Democrats is to go after people who are billionaires and multimillionaires who are not paying their taxes, then spying on average Americans' bank accounts with over $600 transactions is not going to do it.

We have to do things in a better way. We have to focus the IRS' time to where it is best served, and that is to focus on tax cheats, not everyday, average working Americans. I urge opposition to this infringement of our rights.

HYDE AMENDMENT SAVES LIVES

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

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express, once again, my sincere dismay that Democrats continue to ignore the wishes of the American people by removing the Hyde amendment and other life-affirming protections for the unborn from their bills, including their Big Government, socialist tax-and-spend reconciliation bill.

My constituents are righteously angry that Democrats in control of this body time and time again choose to violate the sanctity of life. Moreover, they are furious at the thought of their tax dollars being used to violently end the lives of millions of unborn babies, millions of precious heartbeats in the womb.

Madam Speaker, you and I both know full well that the Hyde amendment has saved lives. This is not just an opinion but a proven fact that simply cannot be ignored.

I will always stand in support of the Hyde amendment and unapologetically fight for the sanctity of life. I urge my Democrat colleagues to abandon their political charade and restore the Hyde amendment in the bipartisan way it has been supported for almost 45 years.

Again, I urge you to restore the Hyde amendment.

DR. FAUCI MUST RESIGN

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, any trust that Dr. Fauci might have gained over the course of the pandemic is now completely out the window. He must resign and his case be referred for prosecution for perjury.

For the past year and a half, critical decisions for the whole country have hinged off of Dr. Fauci's advice and decrees. Two Presidents have used his advice as the basis for our Nation's response to COVID–19. Yet, here we have clear proof that he has been intentionally lying to Congress.

How can any American trust his judgment or that he will tell them the truth when he can look Members of Congress in the eye and boldly lie about the gain-of-function research?

Dr. Fauci has repeatedly testified in the House and Senate that the National Institutes of Health did not fund research that was gain of function, and he had a heated exchange over the specific claim with Senator RAND PAUL.

The NIH notified Congress that it was aware, as of 2018 and 2020, that EcoHealth Alliance did conduct gain-of-function research at the Wuhan Institute of Virology in China. This research was not allowed under the grant's rules.

EcoHealth Alliance had also sought a grant from DARPA in 2018 but was denied funding because they were worried that it might be potentially gain-of-function research.

Dr. Fauci must resign and must be prosecuted.

CRISES IN AMERICA

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, we are living through interesting times. I understood that was also a curse, ''May you live in interesting times.'' We certainly are enduring that.

An article from the New York Post, October 18, 2021, is titled ''Biden secretly flying underage migrants into NY in dead of night.''

Now, what we have come to see at the border in Texas is that this administration has learned that, gee, we have a record number of people pouring into this country illegally, but if we can ship them away from the border quickly enough, people don't see them amassed by the thousands. So if they don't see them, no harm, no foul.

□ 1300

I guess they are thinking if no one is in the forest to hear a tree fall, does it really fall? Well, the truth is, when you abandon the rule of law, then a Nation based on the rule of law will not last much beyond that.

This is devastating to the country, and some would say, well, you know what, it is so compassionate to invite people. Well, when you hear from doctors that probably 25 percent of the women they see have been raped along the way, you see children separated from their parents in order to come to this country to give them a better chance of staying in the United States so the parents can someday follow, you see people that become indentured servants of the drug cartels selling drugs, sex trafficking, human trafficking, that is not very compassionate.

It seems the most compassionate thing that the United States Government could do for our friends and neighbors to the south, would be to secure our southern border so nobody comes in illegally. That would keep out the drugs, the fentanyl, those things that are killing 70,000 people a year in the United States.

But the big thing for our neighbors would be that the tens of billions of dollars pouring across our border to the drug cartels that allows them to corrupt every level of Mexican Government would stop and people wouldn't have to live in fear of the drug cartels controlling Mexico, controlling countries to the south. That would be the compassionate thing to do.

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There are so many crises in this country right now. While many of us recognize that this President was a hard left radical, probably most of us underestimated the speed and the effectiveness with which he could ruin just about every situation, every issue in our country.

It is hard, therefore, to identify what is the greatest threat to the country right now, what is the greatest crisis that faces our country right now—with no hope on the horizon, by the way, for any of them to get better under this administration; whether it is the vaccine mandates, things we couldn't imagine just a year or two ago.

When this President ran for office, he said he wouldn't issue a vaccine mandate if he would win, and now we see today where people are being laid off. Those who were heroes over the last year and a half are now zeros and are getting fired from their jobs. Those who kept us safe on a daily basis, the first responders, the healthcare workers, our military. So is it the vaccine mandates?

Is it the out-of-control reckless, irresponsible, unprecedented spending that we see? I mean, we already have 28, $29 trillion worth of debt, which is some 80 to $90,000 per American and yet, we find ourselves today with the majority party trying to determine how they can come together for another 5, $6 trillion, whatever the amount might be. Is it the spending?

Is it our education system? Whether it is the product that we are not getting with how much we spend on education, the Federal mandates, the intrusion into local and State education. Whether it is the teaching of CRT or that sort of philosophy where there is transgender policy. Whether it is masks and vaccines on children, which as others have submitted—and I would agree—is child abuse with no demonstrated medical justification for masks on children or vaccines for young adults who are at almost no risk from COVID.

Are those the greatest issues?

Is it foreign policy? We have got China saber-rattling, shooting off missiles. We have the debacle in Afghanistan. North Korea, Iran, and Russia certainly have no reason to fear us under this President.

Is it the 30 percent rise in violent crime while our police are at threat of their funding being reduced or they are being undermined and harassed? They are told to stand down in the face of looting and violence in their cities.

Is it massive inflation? The hidden tax on every American, where their savings, their hard-earned resources, are being depleted by too many dollars chasing too few goods?

Is it the breakdown of the supply chain and what that is going to mean in the coming months ahead?

Is it our declaring war on American energy, forcing us to again depend on foreign provision from hostile nations for our energy; the jobs that are lost in that? The higher gas prices?

But I submit to your point, Congressman GOHMERT, immigration, illegal immigration, and the invasion, the absolute invasion at our southern border may be the biggest crisis.

As you know well, the Constitution says in Article IV, Section 4: It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to protect the States from invasion, and that is clearly not happening.

And I submit, as we talk about this issue, never in the history of our country has our own President intentionally done more to harm the Nation than what this President has done with the invasion at our southern border.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I couldn't agree more. And it is not compassionate to lure people, lure children into this country away from their parents with some hope down the road maybe they get back together. That is not compassionate when you lure people to their detriment.

In fact, if the U.S. Government were susceptible to being sued by people that have been lured into the country to their detriment and by the open border policy that ends up causing them to be basically, totally under the control of the drug cartels, then there would be attractive nuisance lawsuits against this President and against our Federal Government for not securing our border and drawing people in who are then harmed.

There are constantly people being found that are dead that tried to make it in, and yet, the drug cartels being so heartless, they don't care if they die or not. But they do want to continue to add employees or indentured servants all over the country.

It is just rather dramatic how this President, this administration is doing so much to aid and abet the drug cartels in getting their servants all over the country in cities and, yet, it is true we have Americans that are paying for the drugs, paying for sex trafficking, and we should be doing so much more as a Federal Government to prevent those things from happening.

There is an article here from Politico of all places: ''It's not just Republicans. Everyone's mad at Biden over migration.''

You have got Daily Mail from October 20: ''Facebook admits users can share information on illegal immigration and being smuggled: Arizona Attorney General calls for investigation into tech giant for 'facilitating human and sex trafficking.'''

So, once again, just like with our elections, you have got the Democrats in positions of power in the government working hand in hand with the tech giants for something that is just terrible for human beings, and that is facilitating human and sex trafficking.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. This is the greatest country in the world, as you know, Congressman GOHMERT. There is a reason why people from all over the world want to come to the United States. Never in the history of the world has a nation been more welcoming to immigrants, to people from all corners of the globe who are seeking a better life, seeking freedom. No nation in the history of the world has given more opportunity to people of all backgrounds, all ethnicities, all nationalities who come here legally seeking to join us, to strengthen us as a nation, to make us a stronger nation, a more perfect Union, people from all religions, all faiths, all races, all ethnicities seeking desperately to come to the United States of America, a country that is under assault for who it is as a nation by those on the left, by

those on the other side of the aisle who condemn this country and want to change and transform this country into that from which these people are fleeing.

I had a reporter say to me once, well, there is not an easy fix here to the immigration situation. And I said, well, it may not be easy, but it is simple: All we have to do is go back to the policies that were working a year ago that had largely defeated illegal immigration at our southern border.

We know that walls work. I have had the privilege of going to the border three times, twice to Arizona and once to Texas, in my first nearly 10 months here serving in this Congress, something that apparently our President has never done, and our Vice President has certainly never done during her time as the ''border czar.''

But as I went and saw firsthand for the first time in my life—I had driven past the border previously just from a car and I could see the meager fence that was there before the previous President, but I had never actually gotten out and visited and walked and talked with the people who live there, the people who are subjected to this illegal invasion, these folks, some of which are very dangerous, but all of which are coming very desperately for different reasons, coming on their property, vandalizing, invading, threatening, and in some cases, harming.

I met with a rancher family who had a family member killed by an illegal alien. But meeting with ranchers, law enforcement officials, border patrol, those on the frontlines living with and then also working as best as they can under this administration—frankly, against this administration—to try to do what they can to deal with the border crisis.

Walls do work. The enforcement that we had in place a year ago was working, ending catch and release, establishing MPP—the remain in Mexico policy—turning folks away through Title 42 policies. We were on the way to fixing our illegal immigration situation.

But this administration with complicit help and support from this Democrat majority in this Congress is not just neglecting our southern border, not just failing to fix our broken illegal immigration situation, but they are part and parcel complicit and intentional in facilitating this invasion, and as you know all too well, as you have already touched on, hiding it from the American people as they do it.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, as my friend has noted, there are so many crises that are going on right now. We have the economy being harmed even more by policies of this administration with the President and all of those working with him and for him demanding that everyone be vaccinated.

And the President himself has said we need to protect the vaccinated from the unvaccinated, and he said the way to do that is to make sure all the unvaccinated are vaccinated.

So this administration's solution is we have got to protect the vaccinated from the unvaccinated by making the unvaccinated get the vaccination. That does not protect you from the unvaccinated. It makes no sense.

□ 1315

And some doctors have said, if somebody put out a vaccine that killed 200 people, they would immediately slam the brakes and say, Whoa, wait, let's hold up. We have got to find out what the problem is here. But we know from reports that have been made that there are people that have died from having the vaccination.

We are thrilled that the vaccines were produced so quickly. President Trump got a lot of the red tape out of the way. However, it ought to be a choice after talking, between a doctor and a patient, and the doctor understanding the risks inherent because of the biological makeup of this person for taking the vaccination, and then let the individual decide.

But if the vaccination works as good as we were told originally it did, then there should be no vaccinated person really concerned about those that are unvaccinated because they would be protected.

I am glad that the administration is starting to have cracks in their adamant position that having had COVID and having antibodies is just not nearly as good as having a vaccination. I am glad they are starting to—some of them at least—observe the science, that it is probably a little better if you had COVID, had the antibodies, as far as your future and fighting it off. So I am encouraged by that.

But then, I see this article from October 19. As we talked about before, the President, I believe, he is doing something illegal in saying you have got to have the vaccination. And then he comes out and says, we are going to have OSHA put together a rule requiring everybody to have the vaccination. But the President, himself, does not sign an executive order, which could be taken to court. It is just the general policy of blackmailing companies, private firms, that we are coming after you if you don't force your employees to have the vaccination. It is really a bit insidious. You don't even really give people a chance to file suit. You just state a policy you are going to follow and then have everybody follow it, it makes it much more difficult to sue.

But this article says, ''OSHA will not enforce 29 CFR 1904's recording requirements to require any employers to record worker side effects from COVID–19 vaccination.'' The Biden administration is forcing you to take the jab in order to work. And simultaneously, the Biden administration does not want the employer to tell them about workers who were injured by the jab. Simply more evidence that the vaccine mandate is not about your health.

So that is a little disturbing. You would think if anyone cared about science and really cared about people, you would want to know about every abnormality, every adverse consequence of taking the vaccination, because we are really concerned about individual health. But that is not this administration. They are putting out that we don't want to know things that are bad.

I was informed about a person that had the vaccination, and immediately died after the vaccination; was full of blood clots—not one, but many. And the physician noted the cause of death was blood clots from a vaccination. And then the family was told the health official will not certify a death certificate if it blames the vaccination for the death.

So the widow is in a real bind because you have got to have a death certificate in order to legally move forward and get things changed after the person died. You got to show proof. And yet, the health officer refusing to attribute the cause of death to what it really was, according to the doctor, the vaccination.

So that is pretty remarkable that the government does not want to do its job in protecting people. I would think that if someone in government really cared about people instead of caring about being a dictator, they would say, We want to know exactly what happened after a vaccination that went wrong and which vaccine was it so we can document which ones are safer than other vaccinations. But that is not, apparently, what is going on in this country right now.

So we really need people stepping up and letting this administration know, letting their Members of Congress, their Senators know that they expect them to speak up. We want complete transparency. What works; what doesn't work. We don't want the government hiding things from us anymore.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, once again, I'll say how privileged we are to be among the some 5 percent of the world's population that gets to live here, in spite of all the things that we are battling through and we are struggling through as a Nation, the crises we are facing, the tyranny of this current regime that is leading us.

Our first President, who I believe was our greatest President, I believe divinely inspired, appointed by God to be that first President for the United States, who would not be king, refused to be king. And instead, we find ourselves today with one who seemingly would be king, if he could; or thinks that he is king, it seems, by actions.

In a free country, which we still are, to some degree——

Mr. GOHMERT. To some degree.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. To some degree, it is not the government's role to protect us from ourselves. We choose, in a free society, to endure or be exposed to some risks for our precious

freedoms. We are a Nation of the people, by the people, for the people. A Nation whose founding documents proclaim our God-given right to life, liberty, and the pursuit—not the government provided—but the pursuit of happiness.

And here we find ourselves today, something we could almost not have imagined even a year or two ago, where our most precious, most basic of freedoms, have been under threat, under assault, or worse, stripping away from us in the name of a pandemic, in the name of an emergency.

The American people should make no mistake, that COVID policy needs to be viewed through a long-term lens. There is no such thing as a one-time exception. What we will endure or accept or submit to today becomes the pattern, the model for the future.

And, again, our most basic freedoms we have seen are freedom of movement, where we can go; our freedom of assembly, who we can be with; our freedom to work and to provide for ourselves and our family, to open our business, to frequent a business, to worship. And then the most basic of freedoms of all—our freedom of our person. That we now have a President, again, who a year ago, because he would not have gotten elected otherwise, said he would not enforce a vaccine mandate, later said he did not have the authority to enforce a vaccine mandate. And you know better than I, constitutionally, has no authority to enforce this vaccine mandate.

Setting aside whether or not it is helpful or justified medically, just speaking legally and constitutionally, the Federal Government has no authority to do this. Certainly, the executive does not have the authority to act like a king and do this. And certainly, he does not have the authority to compel businesses to do that which he does not have the authority to do.

And yet, we see a total disregard. This was a President that ran as the uniter in chief, and instead, he is the divider in chief, separating and dividing people based on vaccine status. Demanding that people disclose their most basic of personal information, whether or not they have received a vaccine, and then under threat of penalty of their job and worse, not be able to, again, go where they want to go and do what they want to do, if they don't comply with the heavy hand of the Federal Government.

And in this terrible, terrible spending package, which is not just the trillions of dollars, but it is what is in it, one of many, many terrible things in it that the American people need to know about it is making the penalty for a business that doesn't comply with this vaccine mandate up to $700,000 dollars per occurrence.

And to your point, what a shame, what a travesty that our own government is lying to us about COVID and about the vaccine. Here, we know that medicine and science is supposed to be challenged. It is supposed to be debated. It is supposed to be learned from. We don't want the same medicine from yesteryear. We want the very best from today, that we don't just hold on to what was before. We get a medical diagnose that is troubling, we get a second opinion; we consult with more than one person. We learn. We establish the evidence.

But as you know, this government, this Federal Government, this executive administration, with their complicit allies in the media and in Big Tech, shuts down any dissent—to your point—on the stated narrative, the approved narrative, no matter how many times over the doctor in chief, the celebrity doctor in chief is proved wrong or contradictory—whether it is on gain of function or whatever it might be—any dissent is shut down on the risks of the vaccine. And there are risks.

And some people understandably make the decision that for them, because of their health, because of their youth, because of their exposure, or because they have natural immunity because they have already had COVID, or the religious reasons or whatever it might be, they decide they don't want to have the vaccine. And this government and their complicit allies that we have already mentioned, are lying to us that there are risks to the vaccine.

They obviously have been lying to us about the efficacy of the vaccine, because as you made the great point, we are going to force the unvaccinated to get the vaccine that doesn't protect the vaccinated from the unvaccinated. They are lying to us about the efficacy of masks.

As you know, what we are forced to wear in this Chamber when we are not speaking at the lectern, pretending that a cloth mask makes a difference. There is medical documentation for that, which there is very little conclusive evidence to that effect, as you know.

Mr. GOHMERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOHMERT. I did read results of one study that indicated that if you wear a mask, you are two-tenths of one percent less likely to get COVID. So there is that. There is at least two-tenths of one percent that it is apparently helpful but we don't know the results of long-term wearing a mask, the additional CO_2 that may be taken in, or germs that are kept in a mask that would have not been breathed in repeatedly. We don't know the results of all that.

That is fine, but that is still very different from forcing someone to have an injection, which we know can have very adverse effects. And that is why it ought to be an individual decision to make.

□ 1330

But then again, it also contributes to a crisis in enough people doing jobs that allow us to have a supply chain that is intact and getting people the things that they need.

Little did I know—you may have anticipated it—but there were people making jokes after the Vice President had said several weeks ago—it may have been in August—that people needed to get their orders in now so they would get things by Christmas. Wow. Apparently, they saw this coming.

But the point that has been made by my friend about the various opinions from the same people, when it comes to Dr. Fauci, when it comes to the President, it is hard to find an issue that they haven't been on more than one side of.

Fauci would say, no, don't use a mask. Yes, you should use a mask. And then he says, use a mask. And then he is saying at a baseball game you do not need to wear a mask, not social distance.

He has given different opinions, and it reminded me of Winston Churchill's comment about Keynes, the economist. Of course, a lot of people say that is Keynesian economics. But if you look back and do some research on the guy, often when he got into debate and was confronted that some theory he had wasn't true and didn't work, he would immediately take the other position and say he was not for that, he was for this.

So Winston Churchill had once said—I believe this is close to verbatim. He said if you put two economists in a room, you would have three different opinions unless one of them was Sir Keynes, in which case you would have an unlimited number of opinions. I am getting that impression from Dr. Fauci.

Apparently, even Dr. Fauci needs to come to grips with the fact that when he says the U.S. never funded any gain-of-function research—okay, the evidence is there. He had us going for a while, but the evidence is in, and that is absolutely not true.

Hopefully, in all the myriad of opinions he has, he will come around and find the truthful opinion when it comes to his group contributing to gain-of-function research that helped weaponize the COVID virus.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this administration, this executive branch of government, as you said, is weaponizing its agencies, its departments, its resources against the American people.

On the COVID vaccine mandate that you were mentioning, what greater weapon can we use than to strip folks of their ability to earn a living? But it is part and parcel with this government, this administration, this Presidential regime which believes that the greatest threat to America is Americans, conservatives, patriots, those who vote the wrong way, as they see it, those who might have supported the previous President, those who show up to school board meetings, those who don't get a vaccine that they say you have to receive.

They are weaponizing the IRS. Here in this budget that they want to approve, the trillions of dollars, they want to hire some 85,000 more IRS agents so they can be more effective in their assault on the American people.

Here we are turning the Federal Government against parents who show up at school board meetings to express their concern for their children or what is being taught in their schools, which they have to pay for, by the way, that they have to fund.

You see that this administration looks with contempt upon the American people, with contempt upon our law enforcement and first responders, with contempt upon our military. They have told our military that the greatest threat to the country, in addition to climate, is white supremacy in the military, racism in the military. We see the CRT forced upon our military, while we have the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs saying he wants to understand what white rage is.

I would like for him to understand what China is doing, what is going on in Afghanistan, what is up with North Korea, what is up with Iran, what is up with Afghanistan. Instead, they are focused on weaponizing the Federal Government and all of its resources against our very citizens.

Mr. GOHMERT. My friend has such a great point. To have the Attorney General of the United States jump into the issue of disagreements at school board meetings is absolutely astounding. We have record crime, especially in cities controlled totally by Democrats. Crime is going up tremendously.

I know that Merrick Garland knows the Constitution, or at least he has at one time. He knows that there is no mention in the Constitution of a Federal role in education. Yet, he sends out a memo saying—basically, it is pretty intimidating—that we are going to start digging into these school board meetings and using the Justice Department to go after people who have differences of agreement that happen to agree with Dr. King that people should be judged by the content of their character and not by the color of their skin.

Who would have believed that 40 to 50 years after it seemed we were so close to Dr. King's dream being realized that you would have an administration totally committed to undoing Dr. King's dream and going back to judging people by the color of their skin instead of the content of their character? It is just shocking.

Of course, the saying in Washington is and has been for many years, no matter how cynical you are, it is never enough to catch up. Well, we find out, after Attorney General Garland sends out the letter that he is going to go after these people that are in disagreement, lo and behold, it turns out his son-in-law and daughter make a tremendous amount of money selling things in support of critical race theory, judging people by the color of their skin and not by the content of their character.

It is Panorama Education Company founded by Xan Tanner. They sell surveys to school districts, according to this article from Callie Patteson, that has a nationwide focus on ''social and emotion climate,'' which is interesting. I guess they are wanting that climate changed as well.

With contracts in more than 50 of the 100 largest school districts in the U.S., Panorama Education claims to be supporting ''13 million students in 23,000 schools and 1,500 districts across 50 States.'' Panorama Education Company's cofounder Xan Tanner is Attorney General Merrick Garland's son-in-law.

It then goes on to talk about the 21 different States where they are spreading this stuff. Their surveys reportedly give justification for new curricula in schools, which parents have recently taken issue with, such as critical race theory.

But since 2017, the company has raised $76 million from investors. Just last month, Panorama Education struck a $60 million private financing raise with General Atlantic.

It is rather amazing. Just when you think you can't get more cynical about what this administration is doing, we find out, gee, there is pecuniary gain afoot here on this issue of the Attorney General weighing in on school board meetings. Of course, that is kind of flying in the face of the idea that white supremacy and climate change are the two biggest dangers to America.

For those of us that had incredibly good constitutional law professors, we know those professors would say: Where is the Federal nexus? There has to be some Federal reason, something that gives the Federal Government the right to come in and control school board meetings.

Of course, shortly after I got here, I had a law that I was working on. Having family involved in schools—my mother was a schoolteacher—I know back then the administrators had the teachers' backs. But now, because of so many lawsuits so easily and quickly filed, administrators would say things to teachers like: Look, I realize this student is a total disruption to your class, but his mother or father, or both, will file lawsuits, and we don't need a lawsuit, so just do the best you can. And that would disrupt the education of other students.

My thought was, as a judge, I had what was called judicial immunity. You might not like my rulings, but you can't just sue because you don't like the rulings. It was judicial immunity. I thought, what if we created an educational immunity? You may not like what a school does, or a teacher or principal, but unless they have committed a crime, you can't sue them. That would allow things to get to the place where they used to be.

When I was growing up, if you had a problem with a teacher or some issue in the school, you went to the school board meetings—like the Attorney General is trying to stop now. If somebody on the school board or too many on the school board didn't see it as a problem, then you ran for the school board, got elected, and fixed it.

But because of lawsuits, that has totally changed the way schools have had to approach things. So what if we gave them educational immunity? I had asked the national education folks. They came and I made the presentation, and I was totally shocked when they said: We are not sure that we could support that. I said, but it would keep your teachers from being sued at the drop of a hat. People could go complain to the school board, but you couldn't just go after a teacher.

Well, it turns out, they eventually got back to me and said they wouldn't be able to support that bill. I was just mortified—mystified, too. Why would they not be behind that?

□ 1345

Then one of my friends who spent his life in education said, Louie, do you not understand the biggest cash cow, the biggest moneymaker for the teachers unions, is liability insurance?

If you take away their liability, then the teachers unions can't sell and make money off of liability insurance. There goes that big cash cow.

Yes, it would make life easier for teachers, but the unions, the people who are making money from unionizing teachers, will not ever support something like that.

So, just, again, going back to the old adage: No matter how cynical you get around here, it is not enough to catch up. I am constantly being reeducated on that issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Virginia.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman GOHMERT for allowing me to participate with him.

The final thing that I will add is we certainly have agreement and recognition, as I think most Americans do, that we have surrendered control of K–12 through college of our education system to the hard left radicals, and it is refreshing to see parents engaged and parents standing up and saying that this is not what they are paying for and this is not what they are going to stand for.

That is the silver lining of the pandemic, as more parents became aware of it.

I will make one more reference to my final words here on the spending package that is being debated by the majority as they are trying to come to an agreement to bring it to the floor for a vote.

It would take it a step further, as my friend knows, it would take it to not only free community college, which is a step toward free college and probably eliminating faith-based institutions that wouldn't be eligible for the free college, by the way—the marketplace

would probably eliminate them as families chose the free public education—but it would take it to the preschool and the childcare that is now proposed to be free. Faith-based institutions would not be eligible for the free childcare, daycare, and preschool. That is an assault on the choice that families make.

Then the requirement in this bill would be that daycare workers and preschool workers would have to have a college education, and that is an assault on those home-based daycare and preschool facilities because this administration and their allies in academia are determined to get control of our children now from age 2 or 3 in preschool and beyond at your provided taxpayer expense.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for allowing me to be with him.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Virginia more than he can ever know, and I am glad he is here.

But along the lines of rights that we have had, and that the Constitution has assured, we are finding civil liberties still are being trampled.

I have an article here by Glenn Greenwald, and it is just an excellent summary on what the title tells us: ''Civil Liberties Are Being Trampled By Exploiting 'Insurrection' Fears.''

We have people in this body who are constantly referring to the insurrection on January 6. We have heard the President and others say that it was the worst attack on democracy ever. Even a person whom I don't often agree with, FBI Director Christopher Wray, even he pointed out that, gee, it is kind of tough for those of us who recall 9/11 to say January 6 was a worse attack on democracy.

If you were just judging by time, I heard from Attorney General Garland and spinning the news, many, I think 2 to 300, were charged with obstructing an official session of Congress for 4 to 6 hours. But, Mr. Speaker, if you go back to June 22 of 2016, we had 26 hours of obstruction of an official session of Congress. Congress twice tried to go back into session and was prevented each time. It was about 26 hours before the efforts of so many to obstruct Congress finally were withdrawn so we could have Congress again.

I didn't realize back then that this offense was out there. I knew there were many violations of House rules that went on, but then, Mr. Speaker, when you see, oh, my gosh, just obstructing Congress carries up to 20 years in prison. I would be interested to know if any of those people who were obstructing an official session of Congress realized that they were committing a Federal felony carrying up to 20 years in prison and up to a $250,000 fine.

But fortunately for them, Paul Ryan was Speaker and chose not to really do anything. Those are the kind of things that when the American public sees that people are doing things wrong who are supposed to be making the laws and following the laws and yet they are the worst violators, it is not helpful nor healthy for the country.

I know one of my constituents—and I am not defending any crimes that have been committed—but he is a guy, he was on Ellen after rescuing dogs in a hurricane; he was arrested for his role in the Capitol. What I have learned from him and his family, gee, these people are being so mistreated. We have heard from other people. But we had a Federal judge here who said: Enough is enough.

He finally held the warden in contempt. As I understand, the warden has lost the job of being warden.

There is an article from Sarah Lynch saying that the jail violated the civil rights of a U.S. Capitol riot defendant, but these folks not being allowed to—at least some of them—not to shave, not to get a haircut, and I thought we were decades past those days, because I know all the county jails with which I am familiar, they would make sure people were dressed out, had a haircut and shaved, if they wanted to, before they came to court, that they were not going to have them forced into an appearance like the Unabomber looking like some wild, crazy person making it easier for a jury to convict them because they looked like a Neanderthal. Yet, that is exactly what the D.C. Jail has been doing.

It was reported that after the judge held the warden in contempt, that there was a late-night effort by the people at the D.C. Jail that, as I understand it, is partially under the control of the Bureau of Prisons, but they sent people to start scrubbing the black mold that was causing problems for some of the prisoners, painted areas that were disgusting and that they let some of these folks who were arrested because of the January 6 events, let them know that we hold you accountable and you are going to pay for it. Then some noted the terrible smell of cleaning fluid on their food that they couldn't eat. Many are tired of eating bologna sandwiches for months and months in a row.

I do know this: the reports we have been getting indicate that the folks here who are being held in pretrial confinement and are being punished—although that is unconstitutional to punish somebody while they are awaiting trial and not having been convicted—that they are not treated nearly as well as bloodthirsty murderers who are being held in Guantanamo.

I have been down there more than once. I have seen how things go there, and it is rather tragic that American citizens are being treated so much worse than individuals who want to destroy America and who have killed and participated in the killing of thousands of Americans.

Here is one from Gateway Pundit: ''Newly Released Video Shows January 6 Political Prisoner Jeremy Brown Saving a Female Trump Supporter Who Was Trampled By Capitol Police.'' That is from October 20.

Here is an article that was this summer titled, ''Six Months Since the January 6th Attack on the Capitol.'' It points out that it works out to be an average of three defendants arrested every single day, including weekends, since January 6. Nearly 235 defendants have been charged with corruptly obstructing, influencing, or impeding an official proceeding, or attempting to do so.

And this article from Sarah Lynch, October 13, ''Jail Violated Civil Rights of Capitol Riot Defendant, U.S. Judge Says,'' and a copy of that order.

But AG Garland tried to blame D.C. for conditions at the jail and treatment at the jail when actually he is in charge of what happens to pretrial prisoners that the Department of Justice is going after.

So nice try, but we need people here facing up to their responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I will just conclude with a comment that I never ever thought I would hear myself say, but after seeing the partisanship, the use of official position to help a daughter's and son-in-law's finances, thank God MITCH MCCONNELL didn't bring him to be confirmed as a Supreme Court Justice.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHNEIDER). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

GLOBALISM OR AMERICA FIRST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD) for 30 minutes.

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, this July 4 we celebrated our 245th anniversary as a nation, and we, indeed, have a lot to celebrate.

Margaret Thatcher once observed that while Europe was created by history, America was created by philosophy. To Thatcher's point, the United States is unique in history in that we are founded on the principle that we are all created equal and that our inalienable rights are not a grant from government, but they are endowed to us by God; and that a just form of government derives its power from the consent of the governed.

These founding principles have made us a city on a hill and an example of freedom and liberty to the world. We truly hold a special place in history.

Like every nation in history, we have had our challenges and we have made our mistakes. But we have introduced into humanity the model of a nation not defined by our government but by ''We the People.''

With each generation we have perfected our understanding of what it means to realize that truth that all of us are created equal and that we are always working toward that more perfect union.

A young nation in the scope of history, we stepped onto the world stage with unmatched confidence. Knowing that our cause was just, we pushed back against the designs of those intent on world domination, Marxism and its authoritarian expression of communism and socialism, emerging victorious after World War II.

When most nations throughout history would have required tribute, we instead offered the world the opportunity for partnership and peace, a world where trade among nations, even those nations that would oppose us, would be protected by U.S. strength.

□ 1400

In this conflict and others since, we have sought friendship, not lordship with former foes, working often at our expense to build other nations.

Free of political shackles, our scientists have brought the world innovation that has improved people's lives. From the availability of electricity and energy, automobiles and airplanes, our advancements in medicine have saved lives the world over and improved the quality of life for millions.

We have reached for the stars, sharing our newfound mysteries of our universe with our planet's co-inhabitants, and with America's rise, humanity has benefited. Here, for example, we see the life expectancy during what we have come to know as the American century, has almost doubled, actually over doubled.

While there is still work to be done, we can see that global abject poverty has declined dramatically during this time. And while there is legitimate debate about our involvement in global conflicts, in the broader scope of history and humanity, we have overseen a period of relative peace.

As you can see, our growth in military strength has corresponded with historic lows in conflict fatalities during what historians have called the Pax Americana.

Indeed, for so many of us who are the recipients of these blessings, it could seem like these hard-earned, relative peace, and prosperity we enjoy as Americans and have shared with the world are guaranteed to us and that they will automatically endure for generations to come. To assume this would be a grave, arrogant, and costly miscalculation.

Ronald Reagan once said that:

''Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction. We didn't pass it to our children in the bloodstream. It must be fought for, protected, and handed on for them to do the same, or one day we will spend our sunset years telling our children and our children's children what it was once like in the United States where men were free.''

We would be wise to reflect on history and take stock of this moment and see if there is, indeed, anything we can learn from history. It is notable that the average lifespan of superpowers throughout history is just around 240 to 250 years, and as I mentioned at the outset, this July Fourth the United States celebrated our 245th anniversary.

History would also tell us that there are fundamental reasons for the rise and fall of great nations. Historian and philosopher Will Durant wrote in his 11-volume work titled, ''The Story of Civilization'' that, ''A great civilization is not conquered from without until it has destroyed itself from within.''

According to British historian and international relations scholar Paul Kennedy:

> Former great powers typically exhibit the same factors. . . . an overextension of the military and foreign liabilities, economic decline of important manufacturing and agricultural sectors, and fiscal irresponsibility.

Does this sound familiar to us in this Chamber? But history also reveals to us that is there a cycle to the rise and fall of a great nation, a pattern, if you will, that typically the global power structure goes from a multipolar to a bipolar to a unipolar nation.

Most recently we saw this coming out of World War II. Going into World War II, the world consisted of multiple great powers, Britain, Germany, Japan, and Russia struggling for preeminence. After the war, we moved to a bipolar world with the United States and the Soviet Union being the dominant forces.

Then in 1991, the Soviet Union dissolved, resulting in the United States as the unipolar power fully ushering in what we now know as Pax Americana.

Now, a multipolar world is not a great place to be. Historically, multipolar worlds have been much less stable. Commerce, freedom, travel, and navigation for people are hampered. Human flourishing is stifled as resources are devoted to global struggles instead of innovations and improvements in the quality of life like hospitals, schools, and research.

In spite of this, it should not surprise us that there are powers across our globe that take issue with America's strong influence; that there are nations that would like to restructure the balance of power to diminish American influence and push us into a multipolar world. Indeed, this has been something that Iran has talked about for decades, and they have been vocal in their desires and efforts to diminish U.S. influence and usher in a multipolar world.

In Moscow on April 23, 1997, China and Russia signed the ''Joint Declaration on a Multipolar World and the Establishment of a New International Order'' which states that: ''The parties shall strive to promote the multipolarization of the world and the establishment of a new international order.''

These nations have something in common. They have sought to consolidate and maintain their power, not through the guaranteeing of freedom for their people, but, rather, through authoritarian rule over them.

As Americans, and certainly as policymakers, we would be gravely mistaken to recognize as morally equivalent governing systems that seek to promote, protect, and preserve human liberty with these authoritarian systems that survived through the contraction of these human liberties.

And while I may not agree with another nation's efforts to move us toward a multipolar world, I certainly can understand them. I can understand their aspirations to diminish the United States' influence and supplant it with their own. I can understand that they would strive to take the United States' wealth and power for themselves. But what would be shocking to most Americans, though, is to find that in addition to adversarial nations, there are sources within our government that have been advocating for and working toward this multipolar objective for decades.

They work to distort the American system, to gather wealth and power from the sweat, blood, and tears of hardworking, taxpaying Americans. Generations of freedom-loving Americans, both in and out of uniform, have given their best under the assumption that this government had their best interests in mind.

In 2008, the United States National Intelligence Council released this report: ''Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World.''

In this report, the United States National Intelligence Council declares:

''The unprecedented shift in relative wealth and economic power roughly from West to East now under way will continue.

''The United States' relative strength—even in the military realm—will decline and U.S. leverage will become more constrained.''

They went on to explain the major causes for this. They said:

''In terms of size, speed, and directional flow, the transfer of global wealth and economic power now under way—roughly from West to East—is without precedent in modern history. This shift derives from two sources. First, increases in oil and commodity prices have generated windfall profits for the Gulf states and Russia. Second, lower costs combined with government policies have shifted the locus of manufacturing and some service industries to Asia.''

So they said there are two major trends causing this massive shift in wealth from the American people to authoritarian regimes overseas; to summarize: ceding our oil and gas industry overseas and shifting domestic manufacturing overseas.

Now, if the report were simply an honest look at trends—perhaps even a warning to us—I could appreciate that evaluation. But instead of making the necessary adjustments to counter this trend, our bureaucrats in D.C. embraced it and sought to help, aid in this fleecing of American wealth and transition toward a multipolar world.

As a matter of fact, the report called this transition ''one of the world's relative certainties.'' The report, however, based these conclusions on assumptions that we now know are false or, at best, incomplete.

As a matter of fact, the Trump administration showed us just how quickly these assumptions could be upended as: The United States in a matter of months went from an energy dependent to an energy dominant Nation; and policy changes were put in place that began to encourage rather than discourage companies to return to the U.S. soil, including manufacturing.

Yet, those in entrenched places of power in our government continue to endorse this transition as inevitable and look down on those who don't embrace this worldview of the sunset of America's greatness as being inevitable.

As a matter of fact, on July 22, 2009, in a speech given in the Ukraine then Vice President Joe Biden said of the Obama-Biden administration, ''We are trying to build a multipolar world. . . .''

We are trying to build a multipolar world. The Biden administration continues that effort in earnest today and they are doing it in a couple of different ways. They are earnestly at work to both prop up competing powers and also working to diminish American strength.

Suddenly, as we consider more recent history, what has seemed like a series of policy missteps and blunders begins to make sense. We can now understand the stifling of energy production here at home while encouraging that same energy production overseas with far less environmental standards abroad; the tax and economic policies that drive American businesses and jobs overseas; the sending of billions of dollars in foreign aid to prop up corrupt powers overseas.

We can think about Afghanistan, and the withdrawal debacle, and the leaving of billions of dollars of our best technology overseas, and the policies that discourage the American worker and stifle economic growth seem less like a tragic miscalculation and more like a plan.

All of these factors contribute to this march toward multipolarism, that unprecedented transfer of economic power, wealth, and influence from the American people to competing adversarial regimes. Shall we call that a fleecing of the American people?

In this time of turmoil in our Nation, the lurching from crisis to crisis, the American people have become disillusioned with ''leadership'' from Washington, D.C. They have watched the fruit of their best efforts squandered away. They have watched their sons and daughters sent to fight endless wars with obscure objectives. Trillions have been spent by politicians with very few actual problems solved.

The globalists in our government have been selling away our Nation's treasure, the treasure that our parents, our grandparents, and their grandparents worked hard and fought for.

This has become the real divide in our Federal Government. The contrast between a multipolar, globalist worldview that wishes to shame us out of our Nation's strength and send America into her sunset years, or a world that believes that what is precious and right in America is worth preserving, and that we should aspire to be that moral beacon of liberty for the world to see: that city on a hill.

Here is the good news. Never has a nation been so blessed with abundant natural resources, access to the Earth's great oceans, a river system that waters our fertile grounds and facilitates commerce both in our Nation and to the world.

We have a people who, unshackled by the burden of an overreaching government, stand ready to do their best work; to apply themselves to the next generation of innovation and invention, of scholarship and learning; ready to develop the next generation of cures; to provide affordable food and fuel for our neighbors here at home and abroad; and, yes, also to stand ready to respond when those intent on tyranny, destruction, and world domination rear their ugly heads.

The answer for our Nation and, indeed, for the world, is not the dismantling of the American system. It is not the embrace of socialist, progressive policies that have failed time and time again, leaving in its wake the shattered dreams and lives of millions.

It is not an America ducking its head in shame and retreating from its place of leadership. Rather, it is to embrace what has made America great in the first place. It is in a renewal of the American promise. It is in a return to our shared foundational values, albeit practiced more perfectly.

It is in an embrace in our hearts and minds as Americans that we the people are what defines us as a nation; that we are one Nation under God with liberty and justice for all.

This is the great work that lies before us as Americans, for those of us who serve in this Chamber, and to those for whom we represent. May our efforts be noble and just, and may God shed His grace on us.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until noon on Monday next for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 25, 2021, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC–2497. A letter from the Associate Division Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Rhode Island; Infrastructure State Implementation Plan Requirements for the 2015 Ozone Standard [EPA-R01-OAR-2020-0562; FRL-8855-02-Region 1] received October 19, 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–2498. A letter from the Associate Division Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Propamocarb; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0347; FRL-8871-01-OCSPP) received October 19, 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–2499. A letter from the Associate Division Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Washington: Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revisions, Codification and Incorporation by Reference [EPA-R10-RCRA-2021-0452; FRL 8849-01-R10] received October 19, 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–2500. A letter from the Associate Division Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Nevada, Las Vegas Valley; Second 10-Year Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan [EPA-R09-OAR-2021-0242; FRL-8725-02-R9] received October 19, 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–2501. A letter from the Associate Division Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; Sacramento Metro Area; 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Requirements [EPA-R09-OAR-2020-0425; FRL-8723-02-R9] received October 19, 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–2502. A letter from the Associate Division Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Wisconsin; Attainment Plan for the Rhinelander SO2 [EPA-R05-OAR-2021-0256; FRL-8692-02-R5] received October 19, 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–2503. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Privacy Act Exemptions received October 19, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–2504. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Affairs and C.A., Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Indian Business Incubators Program [212A2100DD/AAKC001030/A0A501010.999900] (RIN: 1076-AF63) received October 5, 2021,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC–2505. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Implementation of Nonresident Alien Deposit Interest Regulations (Rev. Proc. 2021-32) received October 19, 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–2506. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel, Office of the Chief Counsel, Trade Enforcement and Compliance Unit, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulations To Improve Administration and Enforcement of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Laws [Docket No.: 210813-0162] (RIN: 0625-AB10) received October 19, 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–2507. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations — Guidance on the Treatment of Qualified Improvement Property Under Sections 250(b) and 951A(d) and Guidance Related to the Foreign Tax Credit [TD 9956] (RIN: 1545-BP70; 1545-BP91) received October 8, 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–2508. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulation — User Fee for Estate Tax Closing Letter [TD 9957] (RIN: 1545-BP75) received October 8, 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–2509. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations — Treatment of Distributions of Property From a Corporation to a Shareholder [TD 9954] (RIN: 1545-BN80) received October 8, 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–2510. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Extension of COBRA election and premium payment deadlines under section 7508A(b) [Notice 2021-58] received October 19, 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.

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 Ms. DEAN (for herself, Mr. MFUME, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 5676. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish an Office of Prison Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Ms. DEAN:

H.R. 5677. A bill to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 2, United States Code, title 50, United States Code, and title 52, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROW (for himself, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LIEU, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 5678. A bill to require federally licensed firearms manufacturers, importers, and dealers and their employees to undergo annual training to be eligible to sell a firearm, to require a notice to be posted at retail firearms locations that describes the signs of unlawful firearms purchases, to require such licensees to maintain physical security elements to prevent theft and a minimum level of business liability insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 5679. A bill to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 7, title 20, and title 43, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMUCKER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, and Mr. MAST):

H.R. 5680. A bill to repeal the sugar program under the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 and certain other programs relating to sugar, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 5681. A bill to authorize the reclassification of the tactical enforcement officers (commonly known as the ''Shadow Wolves'') in the Homeland Security Investigations tactical patrol unit operating on the lands of the Tohono O'odham Nation as special agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN (for herself, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas):

H.R. 5682. A bill to reauthorize the port of entry donations acceptance program of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAMMACK (for herself and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 5683. A bill to direct the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to assess contracts for covered services performed by contractor personnel along the borders of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LIEU, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POSEY, Mr. TRONE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. ROSS, Ms. SALAZAR, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 5684. A bill to amend the Bill Emerson Good Samaritan Food Donation Act to provide protection for the good faith donation of pet products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. AGUILAR (for himself, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. CARSON):

H.R. 5685. A bill to require institutions of higher education to designate at least one employee to coordinate compliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLOUD:

H.R. 5686. A bill to permit civil actions against the United States for COVID-19 vaccination mandates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLOUD:

H.R. 5687. A bill to authorize a private right of action for an individual who suffers a vaccine-related injury or death as a result of receiving a COVID-19 vaccine, as required by their employer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 5688. A bill to establish the People-Centered Assistance Reform Effort Commission, to improve the social safety net and increase social mobility by increasing access to resources which address the underlying causes of poverty; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, Rules, the Judiciary, and Natural Resources, 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. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida):

H.R. 5689. A bill to improve the provision of Federal resources to help build capacity and fund risk-reducing, cost-effective mitigation projects for eligible State, local, Tribal, and territorial governments and certain private nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 5690. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to follow certain procedures in placing a child who has been removed from the custody of his or her parents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 5691. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 with respect to certain requirements for institutions of higher education whose students receive TEACH grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself and Mr. AMODEI):

H.R. 5692. A bill to prevent the spread of aquatic invasive species in western waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. GARBARINO (for himself and Mr. ZELDIN):

H.R. 5693. A bill to require advance consultation with State and local officials and monthly reports to Congress regarding the resettlement, transportation, and relocation of aliens in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROTHMAN (for himself, Mr. TIFFANY, and Mr. FITZGERALD):

H.R. 5694. A bill to reduce the threshold for mandatory minimum penalties for fentanyl-related offenses under the Controlled Substances Act and the Controlled Substances

Import and Export Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. ISSA:

H.R. 5695. A bill to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions which were formerly classified to chapters 14 and 19 of title 25, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS of New York (for himself, Mr. CASE, and Mr. RUTHERFORD):

H.R. 5696. A bill to provide for certain requirements for the collection, transmission, processing, or disclosure of camera or microphone data by the manufacturer of an internet-connected device or developer of an application installed on such a device, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 5697. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to make grants to, and enter into cooperative agreements with, States and units of local government to develop, implement, or expand one or more programs to provide medication-assisted treatment to individuals who have opioid use disorder and are incarcerated within the jurisdictions of the States or units of local government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAMB:

H.R. 5698. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Agency to establish a program to enhance the transparency, quality, and availability of lifecycle assessment data, and harmonize lifecycle assessment approaches to calculating greenhouse gas emissions and other environmental factors, in the production of products made primarily of eligible materials through environmental product declarations or a similar mechanism as determined appropriate by the Administrator, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Reform, and Science, Space, and Technology, 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. O'HALLERAN (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 5699. A bill to expand the definition of qualified persons for purposes of the Public Readiness and Emergency Preparedness Act to include health professional students; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ (for herself, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. MENG, Mr. JONES, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CARSON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 5700. A bill to provide individuals who performed rescue, recovery, demolition, debris cleanup, or other related services after the September 11 terrorist attacks an opportunity to adjust their status to that of lawful permanent residents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ROY, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 5701. A bill to repeal the renewable fuel program of the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 5702. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies from granting a work authorization to any alien for the purpose of replacing unvaccinated U.S. healthcare workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. PRESSLEY (for herself, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. MEIJER):

H.R. 5703. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize the President to provide professional counseling services to victims of emergencies declared under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Mr. CARSON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POCAN, and Mrs. HAYES):

H.R. 5704. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require payroll tax withholding on independent contractors of certain large businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. MCCLAIN, and Ms. TENNEY):

H. Res. 741. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the month of September 2022 as ''Macedonian American Heritage Month'' and celebrating the Macedonian language, history, and culture of Macedonian Americans and their incredible contributions to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. LYNCH):

H. Res. 742. A resolution supporting the designation of October 23, 2021, as ''AADC Deficiency Awareness Day''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself and Mr. BIGGS):

H. Res. 743. A resolution impeaching Merrick Brian Garland, Attorney General of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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 Ms. DEAN:

H.R. 5676.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sect. 8

By Ms. DEAN:

H.R. 5677.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CROW:

H.R. 5678.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. 1, Sec. 8, cl. 13.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 5679.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 5680.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the United States Constitution

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 5681.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 5682.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 United States Constitution.

By Mrs. CAMMACK:

H.R. 5683.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RASKIN:

H.R. 5684.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 5685.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. CLOUD:

H.R. 5686.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 12

''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. CLOUD:

H.R. 5687.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 12

''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. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 5688.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution grants Congress the power to ''lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common defense and general Welfare of the United States'' and Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has 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 any Department or Officer thereof''.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 5689.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 5690.

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. GALLAGHER:
H.R. 5691.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Interstate Commerce Clause: Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I.
By Mr. GARAMENDI:
H.R. 5692.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. GARBARINO:
H.R. 5693.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, which states the 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. GROTHMAN:
H.R. 5694.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution
By Mr. ISSA:
H.R. 5695.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution confers on Congress the authority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. This legislation makes technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 25, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current and make technical corrections and improvements. Making revisions to the United States Code is a necessary role of Congress with respect to executing the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States.
By Mr. JACOBS of New York:
H.R. 5696.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution: The 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 Ms. KUSTER:
H.R. 5697.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause: ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States . . .''
By Mr. LAMB:
H.R. 5698.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. O'HALLERAN:
H.R. 5699.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 18, section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution
By Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ:
H.R. 5700.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.
By Mr. PERRY:
H.R. 5701.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution
By Mr. PERRY:
H.R. 5702.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section VIII of the United States Constitution
By Ms. PRESSLEY:
H.R. 5703.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution
By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:
H.R. 5704.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause)

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 151: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 263: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 322: Mr. FEENSTRA.
H.R. 421: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 623: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 653: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 815: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 944: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 971: Mr. COHEN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 994: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1012: Mr. TIMMONS and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1057: Mr. FEENSTRA, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and MR. KIND.
H.R. 1115: Mr. KUSTOFF and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 1140: Mrs. LAWRENCE and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1217: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 1259: Mr. BERGMAN, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.
H.R. 1273: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 1282: Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 1384: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 1453: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1569: Ms. DEAN.
H.R. 1582: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 1593: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 1834: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 1945: Mr. EVANS, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 1984: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 2067: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2111: Mr. RYAN and Ms. WILD.
H.R. 2127: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BACON, and Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 2137: Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 2184: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 2192: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.
H.R. 2230: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 2274: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 2347: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2436: Ms. SCANLON.
H.R. 2565: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 2589: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2654: Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 2759: Ms. SEWELL.
H.R. 2803: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 2811: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2828: Mr. CLYDE.
H.R. 2840: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 2900: Mr. GIMENEZ.
H.R. 2930: Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. CRAIG, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2974: Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas.
H.R. 3076: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. CAWTHORN.
H.R. 3173: Mr. BOST, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Ms. STANSBURY, and Mr. KAHELE.
H.R. 3183: Mrs. FISCHBACH and Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 3277: Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 3294: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3297: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 3312: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 3321: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3400: Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 3424: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.
H.R. 3482: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 3512: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 3529: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 3577: Mr. POSEY and Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 3602: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 3617: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. CRIST.
H.R. 3648: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 3670: Mr. CROW.
H.R. 3710: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. CAMMACK, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.
H.R. 3761: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.
H.R. 3811: Mrs. CAMMACK.
H.R. 3816: Ms. NEWMAN.
H.R. 3860: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 3890: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 3988: Mr. RUSH, Ms. WILD, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4043: Ms. WILD and Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 4118: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. JONES, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MALINOWSKI, and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 4146: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 4157: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 4165: Mr. DAVIDSON.
H.R. 4176: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 4287: Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.
H.R. 4297: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 4315: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 4385: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 4390: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 4429: Mr. CROW.
H.R. 4457: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 4769: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 4785: Mr. KELLER.
H.R. 4828: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 4877: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H.R. 4977: Mr. RICE of South Carolina and Mr. ALLRED.
H.R. 4996: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 4999: Mr. COLE and Mr. HAGEDORN.
H.R. 5016: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 5017: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Ms. SCANLON.
H.R. 5029: Mr. MANN.
H.R. 5043: Ms. MENG and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 5058: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 5073: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DEMINGS, and Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 5141: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 5162: Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, and Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 5178: Mrs. CAMMACK.

H.R. 5294: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. ROSENDALE.
H.R. 5332: Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 5335: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 5342: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 5421: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.
H.R. 5429: Ms. CRAIG, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. García of Illinois.
H.R. 5441: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 5445: Ms. CRAIG and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 5450: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 5451: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 5453: Mr. CRIST.
H.R. 5482: Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 5496: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.
H.R. 5533: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 5537: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5538: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5539: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5540: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5549: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 5567: Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and MR. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 5577: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. WELCH, Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. WATERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MFUME, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. DELGADO.
H.R. 5579: Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 5586: Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. SPARTZ, Mr. LONG, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, and Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H.R. 5590: Mrs. CAMMACK.
H.R. 5605: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 5606: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5628: Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 5630: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 5639: Mr. GUEST and Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 5662: Mrs. GREENE of Georgia.
H.R. 5663: Mr. MOORE of Alabama.
H.R. 5665: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H. J. Res. 58: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. BEYER.
H. Res. 118: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H. Res. 445: Mr. KILMER, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KIND, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H. Res. 558: Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Res. 566: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.
H. Res. 574: Mr. NEGUSE.
H. Res. 644: Mr. BROOKS.
H. Res. 690: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H. Res. 735: Mr. BIGGS.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 2 by Mr. ROY on House Resolution 216: Mr. Diaz-Balart.

Petition 3 by Mr. ROY on House Resolution 292: Mr. Rouzer.

Petition 6 by Mr. BIGGS on House Resolution 673: Ms. Herrell, Mr. Budd, Mr. Roy, Mr. Mann, Mr. Pfluger, Mr. McClintock, Mrs. Lesko, Mr. Good of Virginia, Mr. Burchett, Ms. Tenney, Mrs. Harshbarger, Mr. Webster of Florida, Mr. Bishop of North Carolina, Mr. Gimenez, Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois, Mr. Ferguson, Mr. Rutherford, Mr. Steube, Mr. Murphy of North Carolina, Mr. Palazzo, Mr. Gooden of Texas, Mr. Higgins of Louisiana, Mr. Rouzer, Mr. Hagedorn, Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania, Mr. Amodei, Mr. Balderson, Mr. Fulcher, Mr. Schweikert, Mr. Perry, Mrs. Greene of Georgia, Mr. Brooks, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Clyde, Mr. Moore of Alabama, Mr. Hudson, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Owens, Mr. Womack, Mr. Buck, Mr. Newhouse, Mr. Gohmert, Mr. Gibbs, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Kelly of Mississippi, Mr. Carl, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Fallon, Mrs. Boebert, Ms. Stefanik, Mr. Griffith, Mrs. McClain, Mr. Fleischmann, Mr. C. Scott Franklin of Florida, Mr. Bentz, Mr. Obernolte, Mr. Babin, Mr. Bergman, Mr. Cloud, Mr. Luetkemeyer, Ms. Van Duyne, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Norman, Mr. LaMalfa, Mrs. Miller of Illinois, Mrs. Miller-Meeks, Mr. Feenstra, Mr. McKinley, Mr. Upton, Mr. Johnson of South Dakota, Mr. Mullin, Mr. Cline, Mr. Davidson, Mr. Fitzgerald, Mr. Posey, Mr. Loudermilk, and Mr. Johnson of Louisiana.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF COLLEEN K. PHILLIPS UPON HER ELECTION AS PRESIDENT OF THE OHIO AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 2021

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Colleen K. Phillips of Hamler, Ohio, upon her election as President of the Ohio American Legion Auxiliary. Colleen Phillips's work has had a lasting influence on the American Legion Auxiliary and her community. She has proven herself as a leader and an advocate for countless veterans and their families across the state of Ohio.

Colleen has been a member of the Warren L. McIntire, Hamler American Legion Post 262 for forty-three years. Her hard work and dedication helped establish the junior auxiliary at Hamler. Over the course of her career, she has held almost every office for the Auxiliary at the local, county, district, and state levels. Prior to this position, Colleen served as the Auxiliary's First Vice President for the past two years.

The mission of the American Legion Auxiliary of Ohio is to ''honor the sacrifice of those who serve by enhancing the lives of our veterans, military, and their families''. Members of the Auxiliary strive to advocate for veterans, educate citizens, mentor youth, and promote patriotism and peace. As President, Colleen will engage in monthly meetings, prepare newsletters, perform outreach for the community, and support the annual Buckeye Girls State program. Colleen has established challenging goals for the organization she plans to work towards during her year-long presidency.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Colleen Phillips on her assumption of duties as President of the Ohio American Legion Auxiliary and thanking her for service to our state. On behalf of the people of the Fifth District of Ohio, I wish Colleen all the best as president and in her future endeavors.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MR. THEODORE ROOSEVELT LILLY, JR.

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 2021

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Mr. Theodore ''Ted'' Roosevelt Lilly, Jr. A beloved member of our community, Mr. Lilly's life was marked by an unwavering commitment to spreading kindness and goodwill in the town of Oakboro, North Carolina.

A lifelong resident of Oakboro, Mr. Lilly took a unique and selfless approach to serving his community. Aside from his brief work with Stanly Knitting Mills, Mr. Lilly never maintained formal or paid employment. Instead, he chose to serve the members of his community by spreading joy and benevolence. Every day for at least the last 30 years, Mr. Lilly walked through town to visit every business and talk with customers and employees. If he happened to miss an employee, he would return to the same business later that day to speak with the individual. While walking, he made it a goal to extend a friendly welcome to any passersby he encountered. Such dedication earned Mr. Lilly the title ''Ambassador of Oakboro'' and made him a household name among residents.

Mr. Lilly's steadfast commitment to building relationships with those in his community was undeterred. He extended great personal sacrifice by risking his own health and safety to complete his daily rounds. His family members often had to prevent him from walking in inclement weather, and he consistently ignored any pain associated with his kidney failure or diabetes in the process of completing his walks.

Mr. Lilly passed away on October 19, 2021, and my thoughts and prayers are with his family and all who knew and loved him. I join our entire community in gratitude as we honor his extraordinary life.

Madam Speaker, please join me today in honoring the life and legacy of Mr. Ted Lilly.

IN RECOGNITION OF TINA BALLARD

HON. JENNIFER WEXTON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 2021

Ms. WEXTON. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate Ms. Tina Ballard on her retirement and thank her for 30 years of dedicated federal service. Most recently, she served as the Executive Director of the Commission, an independent federal agency responsible for directing and managing the AbilityOne® Program through which federal activities purchase products and services from nonprofit agencies associated with National Industries for the Blind (NIB) and SourceAmerica®. AbilityOne Program procurements provide high quality products and services needed for the operation of the Federal Government while providing employment and training opportunities for tens of thousands of people who are blind or have other significant disabilities.

She served as the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Policy and Procurement) as the Army's principal acquisition and procurement policy authority for all Army acquisition programs, responsible for the management and execution of the Army's contracting function worldwide

As Functional Chiefs Representative for the Army Contracting and Acquisition Career Program, Ms. Ballard was responsible for the recruitment, training, education, and professional development of the contracting professionals who are part of the Army's acquisition workforce and industrial base policy.

As Director of Combat Support Operations and the Deputy Executive Director of Contract Management Operations in the Defense Contract Management Agency, she managed agency policy in multiple theatres of military operations.

Ballard joined the Federal service as a Stay-in-School and continued her service as a college Cooperative (Co-op) Education student. Upon graduation, she began as Contract Specialist and Procuring Contracting Officer with the Aeronautical Systems Division, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base She later transferred to Air Force Plant Representative Office, Boeing Military Airplanes, Wichita, Kansas where she was the Principal Administrative Contracting Officer and the Director of Contract Operations.

In 1994, Tina Ballard became the Director of Pacific/Caribbean Contract Operations in DCMA International, where she served as a liaison to the Air force Materiel Command for four years with responsibility for more than 200 personnel located in six countries. In January 1999, she accepted an assignment in the Office of the Secretary of Defense where she led several projects for the Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Ballard received her B.A. in English (1980), a M.S. in Management (1989), and a M.S. in National Resource Strategy (2001). She has completed the Industrial College of the Armed Forces Senior Acquisition Course and Leadership for a Democratic Society at the Federal Executive Institute. Ballard has received the Office of the Secretary of Defense Award for Excellence, two DLA Meritorious Civilian Service Awards, and Department of the Army Decoration for Exceptional Civilian Service (2008), Department of the Army Outstanding Civilian Service Medal (2003) and named the Federal Executive Association Unsung Heroine.

Madam Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in recognizing the outstanding contributions Ms. Tina Ballard has made over the course of her career to the military, the commonwealth, and the country. On behalf of a grateful Nation, we wish her continued success in her future endeavors.

STOP THE SPREAD OF INVASIVE MUSSELS ACT

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 2021

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, today I reintroduced the ''Stop the Spread of Invasive Mussels Act,'' along with my colleague, Congressman MARK AMODEI (R–NV). Our bipartisan bill would authorize federal land management agencies to take proven, commonsense

measures to prevent the proliferation of invasive species in our nation's waterways and surface water infrastructure like reservoirs.

Specifically, our bipartisan bill targets the inadvertent introduction by recreational boating of invasive species from one federal reservoir to another. I thank former Congressman Ben McAdams (D–UT) for sponsoring this bill last Congress, which I have now taken over and improved. I also want to thank the following organizations for endorsing our bill: Western Governors' Association, National Wildlife Federation, National Marine Manufacturers Association, American Sportfishing Association, Backcountry Hunters & Anglers, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, and Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies.

Invasive species not only crowd out native wildlife but also cause billions of dollars in avoidable damage to our nation's critical water infrastructure, particularly in western states like California. In the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, I have seen the damage caused by invasive water hyacinth so dense you can literally walk on water. Proliferate quagga and zebra mussels clog water pipelines, reduce the capacity of canals, and damage dam operations for hydropower, water storage, and flood control. In 2007, California's Department of Water Resources detected invasive quagga mussels in the State Water Project and the Colorado River Aqueduct, which supply water for communities in southern California. All it takes for these mussels to invade a new lake or waterway is a cup of contaminated water containing their microscopic larvae carried inadvertently by a motorboat or recreational watercraft that has not been decontaminated properly.

The best defense against spreading invasive aquatic species is simple: inspection and dry-docking or similarly effective treatment of contaminated watercraft for a few days until they are no longer a threat. Mandatory inspections by state wildlife agencies have proven effective at keeping these invasive mussels out of Lake Tahoe, one of the most popular recreational areas in the American West. Under current law, federal agencies lack a similar inspection authority to state wildlife agencies, which cannot conduct inspections on federal land such as National Parks and National Forests.

Our bipartisan "Stop the Spread of Invasive Mussels Act" would ensure that federal land management agencies like the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, and U.S. Forest Service have the authority to conduct these inspections. In addition, our bill would establish a new U.S. Bureau of Reclamation grant program for inspection stations at federally managed reservoirs.

Madam Speaker, Congress can help to limit the spread of aquatic invasive species, protect our native wildlife, and reduce the need for more expensive remediation efforts. I urge all Members of the House to join us in cosponsoring the "Stop the Spread of Invasive Mussels Act."

CELEBRATING TEXAS SOUTHMOST COLLEGE'S 95TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 2021

Mr. VELA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Texas Southmost College (TSC) as they celebrate their 95th anniversary, making it the oldest institution of higher learning in the Rio Grande Valley.

Texas Southmost College is the first accredited community college in the State of Texas. Originally named The Junior College of the Rio Grande Valley, TSC was established on August 9, 1926, with 84 students attending classes. In 1931 it was renamed the Brownsville Junior College, before its final renaming to Texas Southmost College in 1949. After a 20-year partnership with University of Texas at Brownsville, TSC's Board of Trustees voted to reestablish the college as an independent institution in 2011 and it was operating independently by 2013. The campus, spanning over 48 acres, is located in Brownsville, Texas on the historic site of Fort Brown, the first United States military post in Texas.

TSC was selected as a "Bright Spot" by the White House Initiative on Educational Excellence for Hispanics in 2015 for its efforts to bridge the achievement gap and expand access to quality higher education. In addition to offering high-quality programs that lead to careers that are in demand, TSC is the most affordable institution of higher learning in the Rio Grande Valley, thanks to TSC's Board of Trustees decision in 2013 to reduce tuition by 40 percent. TSC currently offers two-year academic credential progression in over 50 programs of study for students pursuing bachelor's degrees, and career and technical education leading to industry certifications and associate degrees. They also offer dual-credit academic, career, and technical courses at no cost to students, saving families in the Lower Grande Valley $28 million in tuition and related fees since 2017.

With a growth rate of 72 percent in the past four years, TSC is the fastest-growing community college in the state of Texas, and their graduation rate outpaces the Texas state average by more than three percent. The Board of Trustees, along with TSC President Jesus Roberto Rodriguez, Ph.D., continue to set goals to ensure the long-term viability of the institution with a focus on fostering student success, leading regional workforce development, enriching student experiences, enhancing community connections, and investing in each other.

Texas Southmost College prides itself on fostering a welcoming environment and a sense of belonging for all. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating TSC on 95 years of invaluable service to the Lower Rio Grande Valley. Through education, community outreach and the promotion of individual success, Texas Southmost College continues to strengthen the state of Texas' prosperity and talent.

HONORING STEVE KLINSKY'S LEADERSHIP

HON. LEE M. ZELDIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 2021

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Steve Klinsky for his commitment to our Nation's prosperity and the education of our youth. Steve has served as Chairman of the Board of the American Investment Council for four years. Upon the conclusion of his term of leadership of the Council, we recognize Steve for his service, his philanthropy to his community, and his tremendous commitment to education reform.

Steve founded New Mountain Capital in 1999 and continues to lead the organization to help build better businesses, create jobs, and strengthen pensions. In fact, New Mountain's responsible management strategy has led to the creation of over 49,500 jobs

Additionally, for nearly 30 years, Mr Klinsky has served children in New York City and beyond by supporting afterschool programs and advocating for charter schools. Most notably, he founded the "Modern States" program which makes college educations accessible and free. Mr. Klinsky's understanding of the importance of education to achieve the American Dream fuels his commitment to ensuring enrollment in Modern States' courses are open to all people without regard to age, location, family income, nationality, prior education or other barriers. Thanks to Mr. Klinsky's passion for access to a college education, Modern States has helped more than 280,000 students take free courses and work toward college degrees.

Madam Speaker, please join me in thanking Steve Klinsky for his leadership.

RECOGNIZING MRS. CAROL CHANDLER

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 2021

Mr. VALADAO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Carol Chandler for her contributions to the agricultural community.

Carol Chandler was called to give back to her community from an early age. After receiving degrees from the University of California at Davis and California State University at Fresno, she began teaching in the Central Valley, including at Fresno City College. She continued her passion for agriculture and community as a partner of Chandler Farms, a fourth-generation family farming operation in Selma, California.

Chandler has continued her philanthropic work throughout her life. She belongs to the La Feliz Guild of Valley Children's Hospital and received the Tapestry Award by Common Threads for her outstanding achievements in agriculture.

Chandler has earned several awards and recognitions during her career. She was named Woman of the Year by the California State Legislature in 1992 and 2002, Agriculturist of the Year by the Fresno Chamber of Commerce in 2004, and Agriculturist of the

Year by the California State Fair Board of Directors in 2020.

This year, Chandler was recognized by Western Growers with the 2021 Award of Honor.

I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Mrs. Carol Chandler on this award and recognizing her contributions to the Central Valley community.

RECOMMENDING THAT THE HOUSE FIND STEPHEN K. BANNON IN CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Committees on the Judiciary, on Homeland Security, and on the Budget, I rise in support of the rule governing debate for H. Res. 730, ''Resolution Recommending that the House of Representatives Find Stephen K. Bannon in Contempt of Congress for Refusal to Comply with a Subpoena Duly Issued by the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol.''

On January 6th the domestic terrorists who beat law enforcement officers and breached the Citadel of democracy of the United States wore insignias of White supremacist groups, waved Confederate flags, hung a noose on the lawn, and they were shouting racial epithets.

According to published reports and his own public statements, Mr. Bannon had specific knowledge about the events planned for January 6th before they occurred: just before the day of the attack, Mr. Bannon told his listeners:

> All hell is going to break loose tomorrow. . . . It's not going to happen like you think it's going to happen. OK, it's going to be quite extraordinarily different. All I can say is, strap in . . . You made this happen and tomorrow it's game day. So strap in. Let's get ready. So many people said, 'Man, if I was in a revolution, I would be in Washington.' Well this is your time in history.

At 12:15 p.m. on January 6th he said to the assembled multitude on the Ellipse: ''You will never take back our country with weakness.''

Less than an hour later, at 1:10 p.m., he admonished the crowd: ''We fight like hell, and if you don't fight like hell you will not have a country anymore.''

At 2:11 p.m. the Trump-incited mob breached police lines on the west side of the Capitol.

Madam Speaker, the assault on the U.S. Capitol by domestic terrorists and insurrectionists rightly takes its place as one of the darkest moments in our Nation's history since the Civil War.

Madam Speaker, the January 6th insurrection caused tragic loss of life and many injuries, while leaving behind widespread physical damage to the Capitol Complex and emotional trauma for Members, Congressional employees, and the Capitol Police.

It bears repeating often that the Congress and the Nation owe undying gratitude to the men and women who answered the call of constitutional duty and heroically won the day on that bloody and deadly afternoon.

Madam Speaker, the domestic terrorists and seditionists who attacked the Capitol Building on January 6, 2021 were not, as some of their ardent defenders and apologists across the aisle have stated falsely, on a ''normal tour visit''; nor was their effort to lay siege to the Capitol and disrupt the processes of government an act of persons who love their country.

And it is absurd to suggest that it was a celebration of the United States and what it stands for when the leading edge of terrorists desecrated the Capitol by offensively parading the treasonous Confederate flag through the building and when, because of their insurrection, several members of law enforcement made the supreme sacrifice and scores more were seriously injured.

Madam Speaker, we owe it not just to those who lost their lives during that day, but to all Americans to figure out exactly what happened and how that day came to be.

We must understand that day in order to prevent the intended purpose of the January 6th insurrection—to disrupt the Joint Meeting of Congress to tally the votes of presidential electors and announce the results to the Nation and the world—from ever occurring again, because it was the greatest threat to the American Experiment since the Civil War when the pro-slavery forces decided to make war rather than let the Nation survive and the pro-freedom forces would accept war rather than let the Nation perish.

The Select Committee has diligently continued in their duty to determine the causes and events that transpired during the insurrectionist attack.

Specifically, the Select Committee's purposes include:

To investigate and report upon the facts, circumstances, and causes ''relating to the January 6, 2021 domestic terrorist attack upon the United States Capitol Complex;''

To investigate and report upon the facts, circumstances, and causes ''relating to the interference with the peaceful transfer of power;'' and

To investigate and report upon the facts, circumstances, and causes relating to ''the influencing factors that fomented such an attack on American representative democracy while engaged in a constitutional process.''

In line with these purposes, the Select Committee requested information from Mr. Bannon central to its legislative purpose:

On September 23, 2021, Chairman THOMPSON signed and transmitted a subpoena to Mr. Bannon, ordering the production of both documents and testimony relevant to the January 6th attack on the Capitol.

The subpoena required Mr. Bannon to produce the documents on October 7 and required his presence for deposition testimony on October 14.

Mr. Bannon simply defied the subpoena—failing to produce the documents on October 7 and failing to show up for the deposition on October 14.

In a letter to Mr. Bannon's counsel on October 15, Chairman THOMPSON noted that Mr. Bannon had not even attempted to provide the Select Committee any explanation for refusing to comply with the Select Committee's demand for documents and testimony on a range of subjects that do not involve communications with the former President.

An individual who fails or refuses to comply with a House subpoena may be cited for contempt of Congress, and in his October 8th letter to Mr. Bannon's counsel, Chairman THOMPSON warned Mr. Bannon that his continued non-compliance would put him in jeopardy of a vote to refer him to the House to consider a criminal contempt referral.

Mr. Bannon's failure to appear for deposition or produce responsive documents in the face of this clear advisement and warning by the Chairman constitutes willful failure to comply with the subpoena.

The purpose behind seeking this information is because Mr. Bannon played a central role in organizing the January 6th attack on the Capitol, and understanding this role is essential to understanding the context in which the January 6th attack occurred.

Mr. Bannon constructed and participated in the ''stop the steal'' public relations effort that motivated the January 6th attack.

Mr. Bannon planned political and other activities in advance of January 6th.

Mr. Bannon participated in a ''war room'' of promoters and prominent supporters of the ''stop the steal'' movement that met on January 5th.

Mr. Bannon communicated with President Trump several times in advance of the January 6th attack, urging him to take measures to interfere with the count of electoral votes and to make January 6th a day of reckoning.

In fact, according to published reports and his own public statements, Mr. Bannon had specific knowledge about the events planned for January 6th before they occurred: just before the day of the attack, Mr. Bannon urged his listeners:

> All hell is going to break loose tomorrow. . . . It's not going to happen like you think it's going to happen. OK, it's going to be quite extraordinarily different. All I can say is, strap in . . . You made this happen and tomorrow it's game day. So strap in. Let's get ready. So many people said, 'Man, if I was in a revolution, I would be in Washington.' Well this is your time in history.

In sum, Mr. Bannon appears to have played a multi-faceted role in the events of the January 6th attack and the American people are entitled to hear his first-hand testimony regarding his actions.

As recognized by the Supreme Court, ''The power of the Congress to conduct investigations is inherent in the legislative process,'' and that the subpoena power is a ''public duty, which every person within the jurisdiction of the Government is bound to perform when properly summoned.''

The contempt of Congress statute makes clear that a witness summoned before Congress must appear or be ''deemed guilty of a misdemeanor'' punishable by a fine of up to $100,000 and imprisonment for up to one year.

Further, the Supreme Court has emphasized that the subpoena power is a ''public duty, which every person within the jurisdiction of the Government is bound to perform when properly summoned.''

The Supreme Court also recently reinforced this clear obligation by stating that ''when Congress seeks information needed for intelligent legislative action, it unquestionably remains the duty of all citizens to cooperate.''

Mr. Bannon has relied on no legal authority to support his refusal to comply in any fashion with the subpoena.

Mr. Bannon's refusal to comply with the subpoena is ostensibly based on his decision to ''honor [former President Trump's] invocation of executive privilege.''

However, not only has former President Trump had no direct communication with the Select Committee, but also the Select Committee has not received any formal invocation of executive privilege from former President Trump as to Mr. Bannon.

The Select Committee is seeking information from Mr. Bannon on a wide range of subjects that clearly cannot be covered by an assertion of executive privilege.

Mr. Bannon was a private citizen during the relevant period and the testimony and documents the Select Committee is demanding do not concern discussion of official government matters with the President and his immediate advisors.

In sum, there is no reasonable argument that Mr. Bannon's communications with the President regarding January 6th are the type of matters on which executive privilege can be asserted.

Finally, there is no conceivable assertion that executive privilege could apply to other information sought that does not constitute communications with Mr. Trump during his presidency.

Beyond communications between Mr. Bannon and Mr. Trump, the Select Committee seeks documents and testimony from Mr. Bannon regarding his own actions and interactions with other private citizens relating to the events of January 6th.

In light of this, rather than comply with Congress' inherent powers, and help heal the trauma this Nation witnessed on January 6th, Mr. Bannon has simply refused to comply with the Select Committee's subpoena.

Madam Speaker, this should not be a partisan issue; it is the very power of Congress to investigate matters of issue that is at stake.

For this reason, I rise in support of the rule governing debate for H. Res. 730, ''Resolution Recommending that the House of Representatives Find Stephen K. Bannon in Contempt of Congress for Refusal to Comply with a Subpoena Duly Issued by the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol,'' and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

RECOGNIZING HOWARD UNIVERSITY MEDICAL ALUMNI ASSOCIATION'S 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 2021

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to congratulate the Howard University Medical Alumni Association (HUMAA) on its 150th anniversary.

Founded in 1871, HUMAA is one of the oldest medical alumni associations in the country and consists of more than 5,000 alumni.

In the 1957–58 school year, it granted its first scholarship, $550. In recent years, HUMAA has been awarding $200,000 annually in scholarships.

Today, HUMAA's mission is to promote the mutual professional interests of the graduates of the Howard University College of Medicine (HUCM), assist in the development of HUCM's programs and support the welfare of HUCM's students.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing HUMAA for 150 years of providing education and networking opportunities for the alumni and students of HUCM. I wish them many more years of success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JODEY C. ARRINGTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 2021

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, unfortunately, I was unable to be present for one of Wednesday's votes. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 319.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF ANDREW G. URAM

HON. GUY RESCHENTHALER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 2021

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of Andrew G. Uram, who passed away on October 3, 2021 at the age of 100.

Growing up during the Great Depression, Andrew displayed an incredible work ethic and selflessness at a young age. His widowed mother, despite the privation of the times, instilled in him the belief that it was better to give than to receive—a belief that would come to define Andrew's life. He graduated from Butler High School in 1937 and went to work for Armco Steel, clocking in as much as possible. Following America's entrance into World War II, Andrew put his career on hold and joined the U.S. Navy, serving as an Aviation Cadet.

After returning from service in 1945, Andrew went to work for Metropolitan Life as an agent. In just a few years, he was promoted to the company's field training division in New York City. In 1955, the company sent Andrew to Washington County, Pennsylvania to serve as a district manager in charge of 35 agents and 10 clerks. At the time, he was the company's youngest manager. In 1969, Andrew was hired as vice president at Mellon Bank's Washington branch. At 65, he retired from banking and transitioned to commercial real estate.

While he had a distinguished and successful professional life, Andrew would be the first to tell you his true passion was giving. Andrew became deeply involved with the Washington County Community Chest in 1956. By the mid-1960s, following their transition to the United Way, he was already bringing in $1 million for the organization. Andrew was also Chairman of the Catawba District of the Boy Scouts of America, President and Paul Harris Fellow of the Washington Rotary Club, Director of the Greater Washington Area Chamber of Commerce, and District Governor of Rotary,

Andrew truly left his mark on southwestern Pennsylvania. He was instrumental in securing the donation of Heritage Reservation, where local Boy Scouts have camped for generations. Andrew also helped build the current home of the Citizen's Library in Washington.

The community consistently honored Andrew for his generosity and leadership. The Jaycees gave him and his late wife, Julie, the Distinguished Service Award. The Boy Scouts named Andrew a Silver Beaver, their highest local honor. The Rotary Club of Washington not only gave him an international service award, but it also named the award in his honor. Notably, Andrew was named Philanthropist of the Year in 2016.

Madam Speaker, Andrew Uram was an incredibly accomplished community leader, philanthropist, and one of the kindest people in Washington County. It was a privilege to have known him. Andrew is survived by his sons James, Paul, Thomas, and Matthew, as well as his grandchildren, Brooke and Andrew. Please join me and the Uram family in celebrating his life.

IN SUPPORT OF RULE GOVERNING DEBATE OF H.R. 3110, PUMP FOR NURSING MOTHERS ACT

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support H.R. 3110, the ''Pump for Nursing Mothers Act,'' which will close an unintentional loophole in the 2010 Break Time for Nursing Mothers Act.

The 2010 law requires employers to provide break time and a place for hourly wage-earning and some salaried employees to express breast milk at work for one year after the birth of the employee's child.

Unfortunately, this law unintentionally excluded a quarter of all working women—nearly nine million employees—from protection.

H.R. 3110 closes this coverage gap by extending the law's protections to cover salaried employees as well as other categories of employees currently exempted from protections, such as teachers, nurses, and farmworkers.

H.R. 3110 would also provide employers clarity on paid and unpaid pumping time.

The bill leaves in place existing law protecting many salaried workers from having their pay docked and clarifies that employers must pay an hourly employee for any time spent pumping if the employee is also working.

Lastly, the bill would ensure that nursing mothers have access to remedies that are available for other violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

According to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, women with children are the fastest-growing segment of the workforce, and balancing work and family is an important priority for all employees.

More than 80 percent of new mothers in the United States begin breastfeeding, 1 and 6 in every 10 new mothers are in the workforce.

New parents face an incredible amount of increased difficulties while juggling work, family and mental and emotional tolls that are exacerbated as a new parent.

According to a study published in Reviews in Obstetrics and Gynecology, breastfeeding provides health benefits for not only infants, but also for mothers.

For mothers, abstaining from breastfeeding has been associated with an increase in developing various types of cancers, type 2 diabetes, heart attacks, retained gestational

weight gain and metabolic syndrome in adult women.

For infants, not being breastfed is associated with infectious illnesses such as pneumonia, ear infections, gastroenteritis, and can increase the risk of developing childhood-onset obesity, type 1 and 2 diabetes, leukemia and SIDS.

This bill will ensure that mothers will no longer be forced to choose between their own health, their infant's health, and their income.

This includes individuals like Melissa Hodgkins, who has had to bring suit against her employer simply to provide workers with a clean, private place and breaks to breast pump at work.

Her coworkers were often of losing their paychecks to ask the airline to accommodate them; in fact, when some of her coworkers did ask for breaks and a place to pump, her employer actually prohibited them from pumping at work, and even forced them off the job without a paycheck.

The PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act will stop such bad actions by employers and alleviate the disparities that currently exist between breastfeeding employees and their coworkers, sending a clear message that the workforce will protect and support women who opt to balance a career and motherhood.

For these reasons, I encourage all Members to support H.R. 3110, the ''Pump for Nursing Mothers Act.''

HONORING CHARLOTTE WINKKY IN CELEBRATION OF HER EIGHTIETH BIRTHDAY

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 2021

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor Charlotte Winkky in celebration of her eightieth birthday.

Charlotte, daughter of Max and Gertrud Sommerfeld, was born on October 24, 1941 in Hamburg, Germany and came to the United States with her parents in 1949 as a ''displaced person''. Charlotte's father was a Holocaust survivor, and the family was given the opportunity to start a new life in America. Charlotte and her family arrived in Boston, Massachusetts in August of 1949 and then relocated to Newburgh, New York.

Charlotte graduated from Newburg Free Academy and received a Bachelor of Science Degree from New York State College at Cortland where she met her husband, Bill Winkky. Charlotte went on to earn her Master of Science Degree from Elmira College and thereafter, in 1960, Charlotte became a proud Naturalized Citizen.

On June 23, 1963, Charlotte and Bill were married in New Windsor, New York and have spent fifty-eight joyful years together. Bill and Charlotte have a son and daughter who have gifted them with six wonderful grandchildren.

Charlotte taught school for thirty-two years in Horseheads, New York and is active in numerous organizations including as a charter and sustaining member of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. She was a Chemung County Election Inspector for fourteen years and volunteers for the Cancer Society and local nature center. She is also a member of B'nai B'rith International and League of Women Voters.

In her eighty years of life, Charlotte has been a teacher, a friend, a volunteer, a loving and dedicated wife, mother, and grandmother who is deserving of recognition.

It has been my utmost pleasure to personally know Charlotte for decades and to see her dedication to her community, but even more importantly, the love and dedication she has for her family and friends.

Given the above, I ask that this Legislative Body pause in its deliberations and join me to honor Charlotte Winkky on her eightieth birthday.

HONORING THE JEWISH WAR VETERANS (JWV) DEPARTMENT OF MINNESOTA

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 2021

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Jewish War Veterans (JWV) Department of Minnesota as members celebrate their 75th anniversary year. For three quarters of a century, the Minnesota JWV has been the premier voice for Jewish uniformed service members and veterans in Minnesota, upholding the national organization's mission to affirm the heroic and honorable service of Jewish veterans and fight against anti-Semitism.

The national organization, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, was founded by a group of 63 Jewish veterans of the Civil War in 1896 in response to a series of anti-Semitic comments made about Jewish service in the war. JWV is the oldest congressionally chartered veterans' organization and has grown to include over 15,000 members across the country. Saint Paul Post 162 is led by Commander Jim Hassing and was founded in 1938 by World War I veterans as the first Jewish War Veteran Post in Minnesota. In the following years, the official Jewish War Veterans Department of Minnesota was created and today is home to two other posts; the Nilva-Dansky-Neff Post 331, led by Commander Ben Weisbuch, and the Abrahamson-Biglow-Spector Post 354, led by Commander Stewart Mednick.

Throughout its history, the JWV has gone above and beyond fighting anti-Semitism through their many avenues of service to veterans and their families. They helped to establish the Jewish chaplaincy within the military and fought for the inclusion of grave markers, including the Star of David, in veteran's cemeteries. They have stood up against the rise of Nazi Germany, campaigned for religious and racial protections in the 1944 GI Bill, and helped pass multiple bills that awarded Medals of Honor to Jewish service members. The JWV has also supported active duty servicemembers by sending care packages to troops during World War II, the Vietnam War, and after 9/11, during the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. They also established the National Museum of American Jewish Military History in Washington, D.C. to serve as a tribute to the long and proud history of Jewish American military service. More recently, the JWV has been an active supporter for the Global War on Terrorism Memorial Foundation which would honor the sacrifices made by all those who have served in the nation's longest conflict.

As a congressionally chartered veterans service organization, the Jewish War Veterans Department of Minnesota is one of nine organizations that make up the Minnesota Commanders' Task Force, a group created in 1988 that meets regularly to discuss issues affecting veterans and their families across the state. The Minnesota JWV provides an important voice to this group as they act as advisory board to the Minnesota Commissioner of Veterans Affairs and work to develop a unified Minnesota Veterans Legislative Agenda and establish Veterans programs throughout the state. It has been my distinct pleasure to work with this great organization over the years as a lifetime Auxiliary member of the VFW and the American Legion, and as a State Representative and now as a Member of Congress.

Led today by Commander Lou Michaels, the Jewish War Veterans Department of Minnesota continues to be a valuable advocate for Jewish servicemembers and their families in the state of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, please join me in recognizing all members of the Jewish War Veterans Department of Minnesota as they celebrate their 75th year of service to the community.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF ROBERT JULIANO

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 2021

Mr. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the life and legacy of Robert Juliano. My heart breaks over the passing of Robert Juliano, my dear friend that many of us affectionately knew as Cool Bobby J. A longtime labor representative and an unmatched champion of workers, Bob's efforts in Washington, D.C., were guided by his work in the 1960s and 1970s as an elevator operator on the West Side of Chicago.

Bob believed deeply in the power of bipartisanship to protect workers. He came to Washington to serve as a legislative representative for the Hotel and Restaurant Employees International Union. He served as chairman and vice chairman of the U.S. Government's Travel and Tourism Advisory Board in the 1980s and 1990s.

A fierce advocate in the labor movement and a friend to all—Bob shook hands and became close with some of our nation's top leaders in the fight for labor equality. He worked with UNITE HERE to protect the health care benefits of retired miners and worked on nearly every major piece of labor legislation over the last four decades.

Bob loved telling the story of an event he hosted at his house—'a pizza competition.' I brought the best pizza in the country from New Haven, CT, and he brought a deep-dish pizza from Chicago. The way he tells it, deep dish pizza won, but everyone in attendance knows New Haven pizza won by a landslide. Our pizza preferences may have differed, but as children of Italian immigrants, we created an unwavering bond.

I am praying for Bob and send my deepest condolences to his family. May the memory of his legacy and good humor live on, and may he rest in peace.

OPENING OF THE JOSEPH H. VICARI SENSORY SPACE

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 2021

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, earlier this week in my district in Ocean County, New Jersey, family members, friends, and service providers for children with autism marked the official opening of the Joseph H. Vicari Sensory Space inside the Toms River Branch of the Ocean County Library system.

Like so many worthwhile endeavors across our country, this project had been slowed—but not stopped—by the impact of COVID–19. Originally due to open earlier this year, this Sensory Space is now fully operational and providing a new hub to boost learning experiences for children with autism.

Housed within the heart of the main branch of the county library system, the Joseph H. Vicari Sensory Space has been carefully designed and supplied with special learning tools to help develop the senses, encourage communication and social interactions, relieve stress and anxiety, and promote calmness and well-being in children with autism. The Sensory Space offers a comfortable place and sends a positive message to people with varying degrees of sensory processing abilities who might feel inhibited in social environments.

Having toured the new facility this spring with Ocean County Commissioner Joseph Vicari, Ocean County Library Director Susan Quinn and Ocean County Library Commission Chair Ruthanne Scaturro and several dedicated library officials, I am confident that this space will not only serve those who visit exceptionally well, but will also inspire and serve as a model of how a community can expand learning opportunities and accommodate children on the autism spectrum.

The Sensory Space includes such innovative features as:

A touching wall that uses musical sounds, shapes, numbers and colors for visual and auditory stimulation.

A sensory canopy of billowing, magnetic fabrics that create an impression of clouds overhead.

LED illuminators for aid in color recognition, sensory stimulation and visual attention.

An ocean wave ceiling projector, which combines ambient or customizable audio with colorful light effects to enhance relaxation.

A bubble tube calming device that cycles through hundreds of different shades of color.

An LED light table and colorful jigsaw play box, which illustrates the effects of colors and light on everyday objects and passively enhances creative ability.

A fiber optic color-changing light waterfall, providing tactile stimulation through touch and manipulation, and visual impressions of changing, bending lights.

A colorful mat with matching cubes to build color recognition, stimulate imagination, exercise gross motor skills and develop spatial reasoning.

In addition to County Commissioner Vicari, Library Director Quinn and Library Commission Chairwoman Scaturro, other key individuals who must be credited in the development and completion of the space include: Library Commissioner Susan Hutler; Assistant Library Director Sara Siegler; Facilities Manager Joe Cahill; Assistant Facilities Managers Michael Erickson and Barry DePaul; Toms River Branch Chief Librarian Rachel Lavoie-Dohn; Jackson Branch Librarian Wendi Smolowitz, Chair of the Library's Autism Resources Committee, and Administrative Clerk Kelly Nichols.

Nearly twenty-five years ago, Ocean County residents, Bobbie and Billy Gallagher, parents with two small children with autism, reached out to me looking for help and underscoring the fact that the federal government was doing next to nothing in providing support for research, early education intervention and treatments for children with autism. Armed with data and their own research, the Gallaghers helped me win approval of landmark federal legislation, the *ASSURE Act of 2000*—to create a comprehensive federal program to combat autism.

Since then, Congress has enacted three additional comprehensive laws I have written to provide significant federal resources for research, education, and early intervention for children with autism. My most recent law, known as the *Autism CARES Act of 2019*, authorized $1.8 billion through 2024 for research grants, awareness programs, surveillance, early detection and intervention, parental support and training for health care professionals. And for the first time, my new law will expand federal support to adults with autism.

Over the last two decades, the support systems for children and families with autism has grown nationwide, with many community organizations leading the way.

I am deeply grateful for the innovative, local grassroots efforts here in Ocean County—especially and including the Joseph H. Vicari Sensory Space, with its pioneering, state-of-the-art facility that will attract and support individuals with autism and his or her caregivers for many years to come.

SECRETARY OF STATE MIKE POMPEO FREE IRAN SPEECH

HON. DON BACON

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 2021

Mr. BACON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to include in the RECORD the following remarks by Michael R. Pompeo. former Secretary of State of the United States. Secretary Pompeo addressed the "Support Free Iran, U.S. To Hold Ebrahim Raisi Accountable for the 1988 Massacre" on Monday, September 20, 2021, in Washington, D.C. Below is Secretary Pompeo's speech.

"Thank you all so much. That's an amazing welcome I hope you are as happy after my remarks. I think you will.

Thank you, Amir, for that kind introduction. It is such a blessing for me to be with you all today. It is a special gathering that we can all be together to talk about an enormous threat to the world and to freedom loving people. It's truly an honor.

Since I last spoke to you Ebrahim Raisi was formally installed as Iran's latest so-called President. You are rightly gathered at this conference with the theme of demanding that he be held accountable for what happened in 1988, the massacre of political prisoners inside of Iran. And I want each of you to know today that I join with you in your cause!

I came to know Raisi when I was the CIA Director. He should be prosecuted; not tomorrow; not next week; not next year. Prosecute him now.

And of course, I will talk more about this. But I support a free Iran! Bless you for staying in the fight.

Make no mistake, Make no mistake. Ebrahim Raisi, himself is personally responsible for the mass execution of thousands of Iranian political prisoners, names of over 5,000 have been published. The bodies of these brave men and women were dumped in unmarked graves. And Because Iran has never, and likely under this regime will never allow an investigation into these killings, we do not know the true number of Iranians who were murdered. But it is almost certainly more than the 5,000 list of names that we have.

Your actions, our actions supporting our love of the Iranian people must begin by holding Ebrahim Raisi accountable for his crimes against humanity. Remember he wasn't an advisor; he wasn't a foot soldier. He was an executioner.

I know there are those in the audience who have family that were killed in Raisi's massacre. Too, some of you have loved one and friends currently imprisoned, in Evin and elsewhere in Iran, and some, who have had loved ones simply disappeared or worse. We will never forget any of them and will pray for you and each of them.

You know this character Ebrahim Raisi is exactly who Khamenei wants as President—someone who will do his bidding. Someone willing to brutalize and slaughter the Iranian people at his command. This is not moving forward. It is moving backwards.

It is only those who are resisting, both inside and out, who provide the hope for Iran. That is why this gathering and the work you do today is so important.

The contrast between a government that serves its people rather than subjugates them is incredibly stark. We can see it. That should be all of our inspiration for freedom for the Iranian people.

It's has been almost eight months since I left office as the Secretary of State. When we left as Secretary of State, Iran was more isolated and the regime as weak than ever. However, I must say I've watched the events of the past weeks and months and I worry that events in Afghanistan and the posture of the current administration are allowing the regime to get "off the mat" and restrengthen. I know the Iranian people do not want that. That is why we must keep pressure on our representatives to forgo renegotiating the nuclear deal and avoid paying Iran ransom to either re-enter that deal or because they believe it would be a show of "good will." Good will is not something a terrorist regime understands. We must also ensure that advancements in the Iranian nuclear program are strictly monitored, and action taken whether that's by the United States, other western nations or by the IAEA to ensure that they don't just run out the clock on the path not only to a nuclear weapon but to a full nuclear program.

I must say, over the last year or so of the pandemic the Iranian regime has used the coronavirus to continue crackdown on its own citizens. Its actions are not only ignorant but malevolent. They have used the pandemic to extinguish uprisings and subdue the Iranian people. This is totally unacceptable.

As Americans, we know supporting the general welfare of our citizens is the duty of the government, and to subjugate them is horrific.

And while we know that the Iranian regime does not value freedom, we should at least expect the United States to value that freedom. You have all watched these last few weeks. Our credibility was called into question in our disgraceful exit from Afghanistan and again questioned this past week when our own Secretary of State took down a tweet of support for the people of Hong Kong who were asking for freedom in their struggle against the Chinese Communist Party.

These demonstrations of the absence of resolve and lack of support for freedom-loving people are the welcome by terrorists and those oppressing the people of Iran.

And yet we know that the more the government attempts to strengthen its hold over the people of Iran, the weaker it will become. This is certainly the case today. Protests spurred by water shortages erupted in over half of the country's provinces and protests have taken place in Ahvaz, in Tabriz, in Tehran, and in Isfahan, and other cities all across Iran. These protestors, these amazing freedom-loving people have shown considerable resilience and bravery in resisting the regime. And I know that in the end the Iranian people will have a secular, democratic, and nonnuclear republic.

The actions in 1979 were of course a key turning point. To understand Iran and its rightful place in history we must unpack what happened in 1979. I think this is why Iran will never return to rule by a dictatorial Shah or theocratic regime. This fight is the real fight and it began in those frightful first moments of the so-called revolution in 1979.

The central fight is the one in the streets, and in the mosques and in the minds of the Iranian people—it is the divide between the people and the organized opposition seeking freedom and democracy on one side, and the entirety of the regime on the other.

Look I have been at this, but not as long as some of you. But I have been in this fight on the right side for over a decade now, my entire life of decade of public service.

Back in 2010 I spoke with many of you. I spoke of the Iranian people and their history, their kindness and their respect for reason, knowledge and respect for human life. The Iranian people are tolerant people—They have been a homeland for Arabs and Jews, Christians and Muslims right on Iranian soil. This is the loveliness of the Iranian people.

The Iranians want to prosper in their faith and protect their families—this is as true in Tehran as it is in any place here in the United States and don't ever forget that.

There is a new leader, there's a new elected. I say that word cautiously. The regime headed by the puppet Raisi and the IRGC is no less radical than the one left by the previous president It continues to be revolutionary in its zeal. It is brutal. It is theocratic.

It is also craven and fearful of the Iranian people. It's kleptocratic. Its leaders will and have killed their own by the thousands and then choose those who committed these massive atrocities, like Raisi, to now lead their terror organization and their regime. Its leaders can shoot down a civilian airliner killing hundreds of civilians and think nothing of denying responsibility and hiding the black box that would unpack the clues and fingerprints of the regime's leaders who caused the death of civilians. The leaders in Iran seek not only to dominate their own country and their own people, hut capitals from Baghdad to Tehran and from Damascus to Beirut and to Sanaa. All for the petty desire to maintain their grip on power.

When I last spoke to you, I noted that we must dismiss the Western conceit. I hear it even in this city which we are sitting today. It's this western conceit commonly accepted in Brussels, in Paris, in Bonn and in too many places here in the United States that there are moderates inside of the regime. I never met one, nor read of one. This is important. The lie, that there are moderates inside of this regime. There are too many countries that play footsie with this terrorist regime. The elections of last month should provide evidence that this claim of moderation is even possible within this regime. We cannot have them fool us. These are but tiny actors occupying roles in the same show of force.

We know the characters. The Ayatollah plays the father, keeper of the so-called revolutionary faith and is the elder statesman ''protecting the revolution'' from every threat—including the threats from the heathen secular inside and outside of Iran. Soleimani played the warrior-hero-role. Deliverer of rights against made-up grievances from the near abroad and afar. The newly installed Foreign Minister, Hossein Amit-Abdollahian, was molded by Soleimani. This man, despite of the fact that he is a diplomat, a Foreign Minister, make no mistake who he is. He is a staunch supporter of the ''Axis of Resistance,'' the array of terrorists that Iran supports throughout the entire Middle East. He is a terrorist himself who would kill his own people to save the regime just as quickly as any other of the Ayatollah's henchmen Don't let that title of diplomat fool anyone.

Ebralum Raisi, a murderer of his own people, will now take on the role as heir apparent to the faith and determined negotiator who concurs America by getting the immoral sanctions placed upon the people lifted and improving life for all. This will be the theatre of Ebrahim Raisi. These actors—each of them, all of them will keep this show going despite the audience wanting their run to end and they are prepared to use every power, to use the IRGC, to use the Basij and any tool to keep their grip over the Iranian people.

There is nothing new about them. They are just the next generation of the regime, perhaps even more radical than their predecessors. Every one of them should be held accountable, all of them should be held accountable, for the tens of thousands of Iranians they have murdered.

And world leaders, I hope you are listening, should band together to reject Raisi; each of you, each of you should reject Raisi. You should refuse to engage with him, to acknowledge him as a democratically elected president by the people—since he was no such thing. A good place to start would be by this week at the United Nations General Assembly, not too far from where we are all sitting, holding Raisi accountable for his crimes against the people of Iran. It's possible to do.

Speaking of Raisi's actions, Kumi Naidoo, Secretary General of Amnesty International (2018–2020), said in his remarks to the Call for Justice: ''I served as the Secretary-General of Amnesty International during which time a report was brought out on this terrible tragedy and the tragedy of 1988 that we saw took place in Iran. Let us be very clear, what happened in 1988 was a totally brutal massacre of political prisoners, which is a crime against humanity.'' This former leader of Amnesty closed with this. ''And if you go with the definition, notwithstanding the technicalities, it amounts to genocide.'' We know a bit about this. We have to keep the Iranian regime in a box.

Contrast the current administration's posture toward the regime with the one that the Trump administration had. Our mission was really very simple. We laid down 12 very simple demands, twelve requirements that made clear that if the Iranian regime failed to do that we would apply every American power and indeed we would build a coalition around the world to deny the regime the power to kill its own people and to foment terror around region and indeed around the world. This seemed so straight forward to me. We formed alliances to achieve these ends and supported Israel's efforts to enhance our pressure campaign as well.

This administration is returning to the roots of its past, It's the Obama Policy 2.0. They are seeking to walk away from the support we had provided to the Iranian people just as they did in 2009, when the Iranian people demanded freedom and the administration walked away from them.

But here is the good news. The resistance forces in Iran, these noble Iranian patriots, are as strong as they have ever been, and they provide optimism for everyone around them who supports them. You do that too.

You can actually see the effects of the last years of our work in their recent elections. Every more effort had to be made. The regime became more desperate, the fraud had to be increased and the Iranian people could see it as plain as day. Since 1979, every election in Iran has served only to give an appearance of republicanism to a corrupt, brutal theocracy. The 2021 presidential election, however, was different. It is vastly different from those before it, primarily because it is taking place when the theocratic regime is at its most precarious state since it took power in 1979, and the people of Iran know this. Its prospects of survival are openly questioned by regime insiders and challenged by a restive, freedom-seeking nation. In short, you all know the math. Very few actually voted FOR Raisi. Turnout was the lowest since 1979 marking a total rejection of the regime and its candidate.

Even the regime admitted for the first time in 40 years that the majority of Iranian people stayed away from the ballot box. It was, in fact, a boycott of the regime—and the regime leader fear and know it.

This boycott is evidence that the Iranian people pin no hope on elections as a conduit for substantive change.

The program that we implemented also served to lay bare the regime's economic incompetence, systemic corruption, and outright plunder of the country's wealth that have pushed 80% of the population below the poverty line. They see the corrupt ruling theocracy as their true enemy and the first and foremost cause of the economic crises. One of the most dominant slogans in the recent uprisings has been, ''Our enemy is right here; they lie when they say it is America.'' History is replete with protest movements. As with all protest movements, flags were burned, right? This is what people do, but now, the most common flag being burned was not the Israeli or the American flag, but the flag of this evil regime.

So, what is ahead? So how do we all move forward together? What is the path that we move down to?

The regime is at its weakest point in its now 40 plus years of existence Iranians from every corner of the nation are seeing with their own eyes, the failure of the regime to deliver on the very promises that it made. The epic incompetence in handling COVID–19 is on-going—vaccination in Iran is at among the lowest rates in the entire world not because the vaccine is not available, but because the regime refuses to accept vaccines from those prepared to give them to them. Indeed, they rejected it from the Trump administration. This epic incompetence and quest for nuclear power has made it pariah,

has made Iran, the regime, pariah, even to its fellow Muslim countries in the region.

It's epic incompetence in simply ruining the nation has resulted in has made food and gas and the most basic staples unaffordable and the nation's ability to respond to natural disasters like floods and earthquakes virtually nonexistent. The Iranian people are wise. They can see that Iran is not working The people know it.

As for President Raisi, he is the not he President of the people of Iran. He is the President for the Ayatollah. His mission is clear. Inflict pain Frighten, continue to loot and plunder. Protect the clerics and protect the Republican Guards. He was chosen by the Ayatollah now because he is only 60 years old and thus could lead for the next two to three decades. I don't believe that's the fate of the Iranian people. These years will give him the time he needs to get his own people into place and demonstrate that the Supreme Leader wants him to have time to prepare for the next phase of the of the so-called revolution. He will use the IRGC and his Qods Force to generate conflict externally to deflect attention and to maintain the narrative of the oppressed.

The path forward calls This calls for a clear response—the United States must lead the world, starting today, on this occasion, to hold him accountable for crimes against humanity that he committed. Any dealings with Raisi, would he tantamount to dealing with a mass murderer. This is not only immoral but counterproductive. All of us should make this crystal clear to our allies in Europe and Asia as well and hold them accountable if they deal with this man that sent thousands of his country to execution in 1988.

It is worth noting that the apologists for the regime suggest that Raisi's election and the power now in the hands of ''hardliners'' is a result of the American pressure on the regime. This is nonsense. Utter nonsense. The latter notion that of hardliners versus reformers or moderates is not remotely reflective of the total control of the Ayatollah over everything that so that nothing moves without his blessing inside of that country. As for whether pressure drives Iran to continue it authoritarian ways, it is obvious that Iran's leadership has been static or trending right for two decades.

The world often overstates its influence on domestic politics. It is the people of Iran who have the power. The Ayatollah has been very intent. Raisi demonstrates that IRGC generation is replacing the Revolutionary generation. Moreover, while Raisi and others have criticized this nuclear deal, it touches none of their equities. Thus, they get to use the deal politically and reap the benefits from the resources received to protect the Ayatollah and his henchmen. So, he will complain about the deal, he will use it to gain more concessions from a deal-hungry U.S., but won't, in the end, block it.

I worry, too, that the situation on the Iranian border with Afghanistan will only strengthen the Iranian regime's hand. The Iranians watched as the United States projected weakness and chaos as it withdrew from Afghanistan. And we know that the Iranians thrive on weakness. We also know that it always emboldens our adversaries.

The truth is that the present administration inherited an orderly plan for a drawdown in Afghanistan based on firm conditions to keep our people safe. And the people of our allies who were fighting in Afghanistan and alongside of us as well.

The Administration ripped up that plan and turned it into a chaotic rush for exit. And thirteen brave Americans paid with their lives.

I worry that same weakness will enable a blood thirsty Iranian regime to be even more harsh on its own people who oppose the regime, and the American weakness will embolden the ''Axis of Resistance'' to spark increased terrorism in the Middle East and, indeed, all around the world.

In fact, in the wake of our Afghanistan withdrawal, here is what Raisi said, ''America's military defeat and its withdrawal must become an opportunity to restore life, security and durable peace in Afghanistan Iran backs efforts to restore stability in Afghanistan and, as a neighboring and brother nation, Iran invites all groups in Afghanistan to reach a national agreement'' Let me translate that for you. Iran welcomes Afghanistan as another tool in the terrorist hub of the ''Axis of Resistance.''

They don't want good things for the Afghan people any more than they want good things for their own people. They want the very power that they have so dearly clutched onto for these decades at the expense of the Iranian people. It is worth us all remembering today that this is not the first connection to external terror. The Ayatollah already hosts the most senior Al Qaeda leadership in his country. Let me say that again: Al Qaeda international, the headquarters for Al Qaeda's operational leaders that builds up plots across the world is not in Afghanistan is NOT in Afghanistan, it is not in the Afghan border, it is not Pakistan—we know they are being hosted, protected, and operating today from Iran.

And don't forget this. The Ayatollah did not truly conduct a revolution, although he will claim that. No, revolutions move their people towards modernity and reason and to light, this was not a revolution, but a devolution of the basic standards of human rights that the rich of history of Iran had promoted for decades and decades.

There is not far from here, think tanks and salons and some of the nicer parties where there is this idea that there is no solution if the regime is overthrown. The Ayatollah—and many will tell you that you are better off with the devil you know. The Iranian people don't believe that for a second because it is fundamentally untrue. There are many paths forward and all of them are better for the Iranian people than the status quo.

And preparing, as we are doing, preparing the transition to a New Iran is a task for today. We should start by securing the humanitarian well-being of the Iranian people as they make this transition. Over the years, it has been demonstrated that the Iranian culture makes toppling governments a part of the national spirit. You should know that nearly 100% of ordinary Iranians believe the regime's days are numbered. I believe that too.

I am also deeply heartened by the fact that the Iranian people have made it abundantly clear that they are increasingly unafraid of the regime. Rather than punish Iran for its continued aggression against us and our partners in the Middle East, sadly, the Biden Administration is trying to get back to the nuclear deal with a much weaker hand.

As was the case with the Trump Administration, human rights and counter terrorism should be at the forefront of our policy, not appeasing the Iranian regime.

We worked tirelessly to keep Iran from having a nuclear weapon and a nuclear program. We have to apply pressure until they change, or until reforms which move Iran toward a democratic form of government take place. We cannot shower the Ayatollah with money and economic benefits in the hopes that they won't be used to inflict terror and oppression. We have seen this sad story before. This thinking is foolish and backwards. The program of sanctions and pressure that was employed by the Trump Administration needs to remain the model if we want to ensure the security of the American people and the freedom of the people of Iran.

I pray that the United States will not increase the resources the Ayatollah has at his disposal to do empower the theocracy. Engagement with the regime will lengthen the time that Iran and the regime has to behave as it has for these past decades denying basic human dignity

Remember, the Ayatollah's power grab was not so much a revolution but a devolution. It's important to remember that. It was a lesson for me that I learned. And I must say I am hopeful. I am hopeful that the world has learned much about the theocracy in Iran these past few years. And it's not that we didn't know it before; you have all seen it before. Around the world, you can see that even in Europe the tide of tolerance for the regime is slipping. This is a good thing.

We must continue to support the Iranian people as they fight for a freer and more democratic Iran in any way that they can. There is so much good work to do, and you all are doing today.

In the end the Iranian people will have a secular, democratic, non-nuclear Republic. I pray that this day will come soon. It is a such a joy to be with you all today. I pray that these days will come soon with the Iranian people with the support of Iranians living all around the world—and those who resist from within, they are noble people—that day will come sooner. I am committed to this cause; I know you everyone in this room is as well. May your mission be blessed, and the Iranian people protected and provided for always. It is a hopeful time, a deeply hopeful time, and a time to redouble our efforts.

Thank you for having me here today. God bless you, and may God bless the Iranian people.''

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session and stands adjourned until 3:00 p.m., on Monday, October 25, 2021.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: ____ public bills, H.R. ____-____; ____ private bills, H.R. ____-____; and ____ resolutions, H.J. Res. ____-____; H. Con. Res. ____-____; and H.Res. ____-____ were introduced. **Page H**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Underwood to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H**

Providing Urgent Maternal Protections for Nursing Mothers Act: The House passed H.R. 3110, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to expand access to breastfeeding accommodations in the workplace, by a yea-and-nay vote of 276 yeas to 149 nays, Roll No. 331. **Page H**

Rejected the Van Duyne motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Education and Labor by a yea-and-nay vote of 200 yeas to 224 nays, Roll No. 330. **Page H**

Agreed to:

Ross amendment (No. 1 printed in part D of H. Rept. 117–137) that directs the GAO to conduct a study on compliance among covered employers, including employee awareness of their rights and proposals to improve compliance; and **Page H**

Strickland amendment (No. 2 printed in part D of H. Rept. 117–137) that directs the Comptroller General to conduct a study on what is known about the racial disparities that exist with respect to access to pumping breastmilk in the workplace and submit to Congress a report on the results of such study containing such recommendations as the Comptroller General determines appropriate to address those disparities. **Page H**

H. Res. 716, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2119), (H.R. 3110), and (H.R. 3992) and relating to consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the bill (S. 1301) was agreed to Tuesday, October 12th.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages ____.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 2:14 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MEMBER DAY

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Member Day''.

MEMBER DAY HEARING

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Member Day Hearing''. Testimony was heard from Chairman Deutch, and Representatives Jackson Lee, Bilirakis, Rosendale, Bourdeaux, Wagner, Schrier, Greene of Georgia, Dean, Miller, Carter of Georgia, Meijer, Mann, Burchett, Rice of South Carolina, and Keller.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY, OCTOBER 25, 2021

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, October 25

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Jia M. Cobb, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

At 5:30 p.m., Senate will vote on confirmation of the nominations of Douglas L. Parker, of West Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor, and Myrna Perez, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 p.m., Monday, October 25

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue.

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.