

memorialized. After years of research, petitions, and advocacy, it is now engraved at the East Pathway of Remembrance at section 25, line 31.

Sergeant Gorman's family was here this week for the candlelight vigil held Monday on The Mall, and thanks to Christopher Gorman's determination, his dad's name is finally where he belongs.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 15, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 15, 2019, at 9:39 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1231.

That the Senate passed S. 1436.

Appointment:

The Senate National Security Working Group.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, EQUALITY ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 312, MASHPEE WAMPANOAG TRIBE RESERVATION REAFFIRMATION ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 987, MARKETING AND OUTREACH RESTORATION TO EMPOWER HEALTH EDUCATION ACT OF 2019

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 377 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 377

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

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 312) to reaffirm the Mashpee

Wampanoag Tribe reservation, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 987) to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for Federal Exchange outreach and educational activities. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed 90 minutes, with 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed

in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-14 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered 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, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), pending which I yield myself such time

as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 377, providing for consideration of H.R. 5 under a closed rule, with 90 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The resolution also provides for consideration of H.R. 312 under a closed rule, with 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Lastly, this resolution provides for consideration of H.R. 987 under a structured rule, with 90 minutes of general debate, 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. Twenty-seven amendments are made in order.

Madam Speaker, we are here today to debate the rule for three important pieces of legislation: H.R. 987, H.R. 312, and H.R. 5.

H.R. 987 is the Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drug Costs Act, a package of several bills, many of them bipartisan, that went through the House Energy and Commerce Committee under regular order. This bill combines three key bills to lower drug costs by promoting generic competition and four key bills to strengthen healthcare, reverse the sabotage of the ACA by this administration with respect to marketing and outreach, and rescind the Trump administration's efforts to promote junk plans that lack the protections of the Affordable Care Act.

The American people are justifiably demanding action by Congress to make prescription drugs more affordable. Prices are so high that recent data show 24 percent of Americans didn't fill a prescription in the past year due to high costs.

My constituents have been vocal in demanding action on drug pricing, patients like Bill, a senior with diabetes who attends my church, parents like Sarah with children who have special health needs. Folks like these need help now.

This package would lower costs by banning anticompetitive practices that large drug companies employ to keep generics off the market.

This bill will also tackle many of the reasons we have seen enrollment

through the Affordable Care Act decline in recent years.

Since coming into office, President Trump has cut paid advertising and outreach efforts for healthcare exchanges by 90 percent. This wanton political decision to cut these efforts is but one part of the administration's attempts to dismantle the Affordable Care Act.

Furthermore, lack of transparency on the part of Health and Human Services around funding levels for outreach plan enrollment rates and other vital statistics has created an information vacuum on the performance of the ACA.

Greater transparency is required in order for Congress to hold the administration accountable for its efforts to defund education and outreach for the Affordable Care Act.

Second, we have H.R. 312, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act. This important bill recognizes and respects the Tribal sovereignty of the Mashpee Wampanoag, a Tribe that has inhabited New England for over 12,000 years and, in fact, welcomed the Pilgrims to the new world.

This legislation has strong bipartisan support in Massachusetts among other Tribal nations and with Tribal allies in Congress. Had President Trump not tweeted about this bill last week, it would have likely passed on suspension and been sent to the Senate for consideration. The members of this Tribe cannot wait any longer for recognition, and we need to pass this critical legislation without further delay.

Finally, Madam Speaker, this is a week that will be remembered in our history books because, at long last, this body is taking up consideration of the Equality Act. Forty-five years ago this week, the legendary Congresswoman Bella Abzug introduced the first version of the Equality Act, a bill that will give full legal protections to LGBTQ people all across our country.

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

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

The journey to this final version of the Equality Act was led by a man who is a history maker in his own right, co-chair of the LGBTQ Equality Caucus and my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, Congressman DAVID CICILLINE from Rhode Island.

□ 1230

Congressman CICILLINE worked with lawyers and advocates from the left

and the right, religious groups, and myriad civil rights groups to make sure that the language of the Equality Act achieved full legal equality while doing nothing to undermine existing civil rights protections for other marginalized groups.

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

Most importantly, it is supported by a clear and overwhelming majority of the American people. Seventy-one percent of Americans support legislation like the Equality Act to protect LGBTQ people against discrimination in employment, housing, and public accommodations.

Rarely does Congress have the chance to take up legislation so clearly supported by our constituents. That is probably why, since the day that Congressman CICILLINE first introduced this version of the Equality Act in 2015, it has always earned bipartisan support and currently has Republican cosponsors in both the House and the Senate.

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

This is a personal issue for me. It has been personal since my baby sister came out to me about 40 years ago.

For many people in this country, that is when the fight hits home. It gets personal when someone you love says, "This is who I am," and you know and value that person, and you will do whatever you can to make sure that your loved one can live life to the fullest, free from hate and discrimination.

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

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

It is also important to note what the Equality Act does not do. The Equality Act does not impinge on religious liberty. Religious liberty is a cornerstone value of our Constitution and our country. Religious organizations are able to prefer their own members and their version of morality in hiring for religious positions such as ministers, rabbis, or schoolteachers. The Equality Act does nothing to change that.

The Equality Act clarifies what has long been held, though, that religious freedom laws do not create an exemption to civil rights laws. Just like a person can't use a claim of religious freedom to refuse to sell a house to an interracial couple, under the Equality Act, LGBTQ families will be protected from discrimination, regardless of its motivation.

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

This kind of insecurity and humiliation occurs on a daily basis across this country. In 30 States, the couple would have no legal recourse. Often, humiliation is just the tip of the iceberg.

Same-sex couples are far more likely to be denied housing. Qualified and high-performing transgender people are more likely to be fired from their jobs. LGBTQ young people face rejection, homelessness, and discrimination in school, denying them an education. These injuries compound and lead to poverty, homelessness, and violence.

The impact is felt hardest by transgender women of color, who confront racial discrimination, sex discrimination, and gender-identity discrimination. The intersection of these forms of discrimination can even be deadly, as it was for Shante Tucker, a transgender woman of color from Philadelphia who was murdered last fall.

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

In Pennsylvania, Dr. Rachel Levine, a transgender woman, serves in the Governor's cabinet as secretary for health. Mara Keisling, a Pennsylvania native, is the founder and executive director of the National Center for Transgender Equality and a pioneer for civil rights protections. Danica Roem, the first transgender State legislator, serves in the Virginia House of Delegates. LaLa Zannell is fighting violence in New York City. Raffi Freedman-Gurspan was the first openly transgender White House staffer. Miss Major Griffin-Gracy, who was at Stonewall, has spent her life fighting to end

the over-incarceration of transgender people. The list goes on and on.

I am proud that the House will finally act to provide Federal protections to LGBTQ people with passage of the Equality Act. The fight for equal rights is far from over, but I am proud to be part of a majority that prioritizes equal treatment for all of its citizens, regardless of whom they love.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), my good friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

We, Madam Speaker, are here today on three very different pieces of legislation, which, unfortunately, makes this a complicated rule. One of our bills concerns civil rights, one concerns healthcare, and one concerns Native Americans. I will move through each of these bills relatively quickly, and then I want to address the process we followed to get here today.

The first bill, Madam Speaker, H.R. 5, is a complicated and complex piece of legislation that would make sweeping changes to our Nation's civil rights laws, if enacted. In general, the bill adds the terms "sexual orientation" and "gender identity" to the list of protected classes under the Civil Rights Act, joining classes like race, gender, religion, and national origin.

As I noted in our hearing yesterday, most Republicans in the House will oppose this bill not because we do not believe that all people should receive equal treatment under the law but because we have real concerns about how this bill will work in practice. A term like "gender identity" has such a vague definition that even proponents of the bill do not agree on exactly what the term means.

That should cause legislators to be especially thoughtful and provide clarity about what the term means and how the law will be applied. But we have not done so here.

Republicans have raised numerous questions about how this bill will work in practice. Will female athletes in junior high, high school, and college be forced to compete in women's athletics against competitors who were born biologically male? Will female sexual assault victims be forced to share vulnerable same-sex spaces like locker rooms and dressing rooms with other individuals who were born biologically male? And since the legislation appears to allow people to define their own gender identity, will it allow people to shift back and forth between gender as it suits them?

These are not rhetorical questions. They are real concerns that we have raised, with good reason, throughout the process.

H.R. 5 is known as the Equality Act, and I know every Member of the House, Republican and Democrat, agrees with

the principle that all people should be treated equally under the law. But even as we strive toward that goal, when we are dealing with legislation of this magnitude, we must consider how the bill will work in practice.

Unfortunately, I don't think my friends in the majority have clear answers to very legitimate questions. Last night, during debate at the Rules Committee, our concerns were dismissed as we were told that the courts and administrative bureaucrats would sort out these unanswered issues. That is simply unacceptable.

Why would we want any ambiguity when it comes to a person's civil rights? We should be very clear about congressional intent, and the only way to do that is to write a law the way you intend for it to be carried out. Sadly, this bill falls well short of that certainty.

The second bill, H.R. 987, is actually seven bills: three genuinely bipartisan bills addressing prescription drug costs and four partisan and controversial bills addressing ObamaCare.

As I pointed out last night in our hearing, I don't particularly understand what the majority is trying to accomplish here. There are three bills that are all bipartisan that could easily progress to becoming law. I am even a cosponsor of one of those bills. Yet, I have to vote against the entire package because I do not support the partisan and controversial bills attached by Democrats.

Madam Speaker, at some point, the majority needs to decide if they are here to score political points or if they are here to govern. If they want to continue scoring rhetorical victories, then by all means, they should keep doing what they are doing, keep putting up partisan bills that won't go anywhere in the Senate and won't be signed into law, keep putting up messaging bills for the purpose of signaling to their primary voters, and keep spending their days engaged in show votes that won't ever improve the lives of those they were elected to represent.

If they want to govern for the American people, then the majority must move forward with real legislation that can get real support here, in the Senate, and at the White House.

We had the chance to do that with this package. The majority chose not to do so. I think that is a real missed opportunity for us, both as an institution and as a country.

Finally, the third bill, H.R. 312, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act, is a matter I want to discuss at some length because I think there has been, frankly, a lot of misinformation put out about this particular piece of legislation.

The Mashpee Wampanoag is a federally recognized Tribe based in Mashpee, Massachusetts. H.R. 312 would simply reaffirm the taking of land into trust for the benefit of this Tribe.

When the Federal Government takes land into trust for a Tribe, it is reserv-

ing that land for the benefit of the Tribe and Tribal members both now and into the future. It ensures that the Tribes have a home, that they have a stable place to build communities and to marshal their resources and conduct business. It ensures that the land that was promised to Tribes, and that was held by those Tribes, in many cases for many centuries, remains in Tribal hands.

Holding land in trust is a commitment made to Tribes by the Federal Government. It affirms Tribes will continue to be able to exercise sovereignty over their own land. That is really all this issue is about today, whether or not the Mashpee Wampanoag will be able to exercise their own sovereignty over their own land.

Unfortunately, some who oppose this bill are doing so because they are viewing this issue through a purely political lens rather than what our own Constitution says about Tribal sovereignty. This isn't a bill about a particular use for the land, and it isn't a bill about particular Members of this institution or the Senate. Instead, this is a bill about keeping Federal promises to Tribes.

Our country hasn't always kept those promises, and we have an opportunity today to step up and make clear that regardless of what happened in the past, today, the Federal Government keeps its promises to Tribes, no ifs, ands, or buts.

Before I close, I would like to make a couple of points about the process this week, particularly on the Equality Act and the healthcare issue.

On the Equality Act, 35 amendments were proposed. I thought that many, if not most, of these should have been considered on the floor. Yet, in the final rule, not one amendment was made in order, and we are considering this bill under a closed rule.

The majority is choosing not to make in order many amendments that deserve our consideration on the floor, like Ms. HOLMES NORTON's amendment to clarify that Washington, D.C., residents cannot be excluded or disqualified from jury service based on sexual orientation or gender identity, or the bipartisan amendment that would restore the application of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act to this bill, or Representative JOHNSON's common-sense amendment clarifying that nothing in the act should be construed as to deny parents the right to be involved in their minor child's medical care. These are all deserving amendments that should have been heard on the floor, and yet the majority chose to make precisely none in order.

On H.R. 987, the majority went in a different direction. In total, 51 amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee, and 15 of those were sponsored by Republicans. Yet with today's rule, 27 amendments were made in order, but just one amendment was made in order that was sponsored by a Republican, along with one bipartisan

manager's amendment—one out of 15. All the remaining amendments, 92 percent of those made in order, were sponsored solely by Democrats.

Madam Speaker, I think we can do better than that.

Last week, I reminded the House that when my party was in charge of the last Congress, we went out of our way to make minority and bipartisan amendments in order. Forty-five percent of all amendments made in order in the last Congress were sponsored solely by Democrats, while a further 17 percent were bipartisan.

As of today's rule, the stats are looking much worse for the current majority. Seventy-three percent of all amendments made in order were solely sponsored by Democrats through May 14. Thirteen percent are bipartisan. Just 14 percent were sponsored by Republicans.

We had an opportunity today, particularly on H.R. 5 and H.R. 987, to take steps toward remedying this issue.

I must continue to encourage my good friend, and he is my good friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, to work with us to make more bipartisan and minority amendments in order and to ensure that all Members, regardless of party, have an opportunity to be heard on the floor, as he has often promised.

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

□ 1245

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I would just note that, with respect to H.R. 5, we had regular order. H.R. 5, the Equality Act, went through the Committee on the Judiciary. It had a hearing, and then we also had a markup. This is a new process, apparently, since the last Congress. And then, of course, we had the Rules hearing last night.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania for her leadership and for the time.

Today is, indeed, a historic day. It is a day that we will say to the LGBTQ community across the land that you matter, that you count, that the Equality Act will be the new law of this country. It is a basic heralding of human decency.

America stands at a crucial crossroads in this generation's fight for civil rights. We should not have to remind our Republican colleagues that no one should ever be discriminated against because of who they are, yet here we are.

Without the explicit Federal protection provided in the Equality Act, the LGBTQ community is at risk of being marginalized, or worse, in the workplace, housing, education, and even in the military.

This administration is seeking to make our LGBTQ families and friends

not just second-class citizens, but to deny them the fundamental American rights etched into our Constitution.

Congress cannot erase hatred with legislation, but Congress has an obligation to lead, to stamp out discrimination wherever it exists.

We can and must all rise for the LGBTQ community.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself a few seconds to respond to my friend from Pennsylvania.

We don't consider the markup in committee a very good markup. Only four amendments were considered, none were accepted, and, frankly, a number of Members seeking recognition for amendments were not recognized. So to think that this was anything other a train moving through a station, I think, is to mischaracterize how that particular markup worked.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), my very good friend, fellow member of the Rules Committee, and also a leading member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Madam Speaker, you can imagine my surprise this morning checking the email and the Health 202, an email put out by The Washington Post—The Washington Post, for crying out loud—and here is the headline: "Democrats Are Putting a Political Pothole in the Way of Bipartisan Drug Pricing Bills." They go on to say: "ObamaCare battles threaten even the most bipartisan healthcare efforts on Capitol Hill."

What a strange turn of events.

So here we have a rule today that will allow a bill to be brought to the floor where the Democrats are using bipartisan drug pricing bills to pay for partisan politics.

Look, I am on the Energy and Commerce Committee as well as the Rules Committee, so I am on the oldest and second oldest committees in the United States House of Representatives. We worked in a bipartisan manner to ensure that the BLOKING Act, the CREATES Act, and the Protecting Consumer Access to Generic Drugs Act would deliver drug pricing solutions to Americans.

In the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment that keeps the three drug policies and uses the savings—some \$5 billion from those policies—to pay for bipartisan public health priorities.

I also introduced the standalone bill, H.R. 2700, if you are keeping score at home. This is the Lowering Prescription Drug Costs and Extending Community Health Centers and Other Public Health Priorities Act. H.R. 2700 couples the bipartisan drug pricing policies with reauthorization of programs such as community health centers, special diabetes programs, and the National Health Service Corps.

Every Republican member of the Energy and Commerce Committee is a co-sponsor of H.R. 2700, signifying the

broad Republican support for both the drug pricing and the public health priorities.

Look, it is pretty clear: You can say that it is more important to have a navigated program that would never pass any cost-benefit analysis; you can say it is more important to have an earmark for the State of New Jersey to set up an ObamaCare exchange; or you can say it is more important to reauthorize Community Health Centers.

Reauthorizations are tough. We did multiple reauthorizations in the last Congress, and they are difficult to get across the line because so many people have so many opinions.

All of these programs are going to expire in September, and we have taken no activity towards reauthorization in the Energy and Commerce Committee.

These reauthorizations, again, take a substantial amount of time. The clock is ticking, and we should act as soon as possible.

Again, unfortunately, that amendment was not made in order, but I do encourage Members to look at H.R. 2700, a good bill. For this morning, I think The Washington Post had it right.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) for yielding me the time.

So maybe it is just me. You know, I am still suffering from trauma, having served in the minority under my Republican friends for 8 years where, routinely, we were given a process where we were almost always shut out.

In the last Congress, we had a record-breaking 103 closed rules on major bills—completely closed. You can't amend it. And they talk about all the amendments they made in order, but they don't talk about the thousands they did not make in order.

Now, look, I don't want them to feel the same way that I did in the minority. I want them to not have to go through the trauma that so many of us went through where we were routinely shut out. And that is why, when we came up with the Rules package, we did things like required that bills had to have hearings in committees of jurisdiction before they came to the Rules Committee, that they had to have markups in the committee of jurisdiction before they came to the Rules Committee.

I mean, they routinely brought legislation to the floor where committees of jurisdiction never had a hearing, never had a markup. They mysteriously appeared. They would come to the Rules Committee; they would get a closed rule; and then we were forced to vote up or down on it.

So I don't really appreciate being lectured on process. Yes, we need to do better, and, yes, I understand that my

Republican friends want more amendments in order, but let's not forget why we are here today. We are here to pass a historic civil rights bill. We are here to pass the Equality Act.

When I look at the amendments that were brought to the Rules Committee, amendment after amendment would target trans Americans and carve out ways for discrimination to continue. This is on a bill that is meant to eliminate discrimination. They were trying to enshrine discrimination. They were trying to weaken the Civil Rights Act. And, quite frankly, I think most of us felt: You know what? We are not going to allow that to happen.

That is not an appropriate use of the rules of the House, to try to take away the rights of people in this country, to try to allow discrimination to continue.

We believe too strongly in the ideals of the Civil Rights Act to risk letting it be transformed into another weapon for division and discrimination. I mean, we listened to groups like the National Urban League, the National Action Network, the NAACP, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, and others that asked us to give this bill a straight up-or-down vote.

And let's be clear, Madam Speaker, a good process is about more than just amendments, as I mentioned. This bill had a hearing, and it had a markup.

On the healthcare bill that we are going to deal with, it is about lowering the cost of prescription drugs.

My friends on the other side of the aisle spent what seemed like an eternity trying to rip away healthcare protections for people, I mean, bringing up one bill after another after another to the floor that never went through regular order, that would literally take away protections from people with pre-existing conditions.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts an additional 1 minute.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, they did nothing to lower the cost of prescription drugs.

Then we had an election in November, and the big issue was healthcare. People didn't want to have their healthcare protections ripped away. And now, all of a sudden, they are converts, and they say they want to protect people's healthcare and expand healthcare protections.

The bottom line is this: We are not perfect all the time, and we need to do better, but I believe that we are improving the process. I look forward to working with the gentleman, the ranking member from Oklahoma, to try to find ways forward.

But on the legislation here today that we are going to consider, this is important legislation. This is historic legislation. Quite frankly, every Member of this House who wants to end discrimination in this country ought to

support the Equality Act, and every Member of this House who wants to deal with the high cost of prescription drugs ought to support that bill as well.

Madam Speaker, with that, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for just a few minutes to respond to my good friend, the chairman. I want to tell you, there is nobody I hold in higher regard in the House of Representatives than Chairman McGOVERN, nobody I consider a better personal friend, nobody I consider a more responsible Member.

On this, we disagree. The gentleman is right, neither side is perfect. In this case, we are going to bring attention to this amendment issue until we see results. That is precisely what my friend did when he was in the minority, and there are some times we should have listened to him and we did not.

In this case, I think the imbalance is so egregious that we are going to continue to make that case until we see a change. Maybe we won't. Hopefully we will, because I know my friend approaches this with good intentions.

Secondly, I would say this bill was so important, the Equality Act, it ought to have amendments. That is the point. That is how you build consensus. I think they are missing the opportunity to get a lot of people who would support the basic concept that they are trying to advance.

And, finally, on the drug bill, I have just got to be honest with you. When they had a chance to pass something that would work and chose to bundle it with something that they knew couldn't pass, that makes me wonder how serious they are about dealing with that problem.

But, hopefully, we will get an opportunity to deal with that again. And that is an area we know we can work together on. We have proved it in committee.

So, with that, I look forward to continuing to work with my good friend, the chairman. I know that we will occasionally have differences. That is what this is all about. We will work those differences out.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), my very good friend, who also is a distinguished member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule and to the underlying legislation, H.R. 5.

Contrary to what has just been said on the floor, this bill does not end discrimination. In fact, the Equality Act imposes top-down, government-led discrimination against all Americans who hold a differing view of human sexuality and gender.

This grossly misnamed bill punishes everyday citizens, silences free speech and viewpoint disagreements, and dis-

criminate against people of faith. In reality, this bill should be called the women's inequality act.

The policies of H.R. 5 have already been used to trample female athletics, eliminate safe spaces for women, harm children, terminate parental rights, and undermine the free exercise of religious freedom.

The legislation also provides for a universal right to abortion, compromises taxpayers' safeguards against funding abortion, and eliminates conscious protections for healthcare providers that do not want to participate in an abortion.

As a former track coach, I am deeply committed to providing women and girls with a level playing field. Title IX, however, becomes irrelevant under the women's inequality act.

Vulnerable women seeking haven in homeless women's shelters will be revictimized under H.R. 5. This is already happening.

In California, women who were sexually harassed in the shower by a biological male were threatened with expulsion from the women's shelter.

In Alaska, a women's shelter is being sued for sending a transitioning individual to the hospital instead of letting him sleep 3 feet away from rape victims.

This is absurd. Under H.R. 5, women only spaces will be a thing of the past.

This bill also places children at risk of medical experimentation and bleak futures when they are given the right to hormone blockers and sex change operations.

□ 1300

Most children, 98 percent of boys and 88 percent of girls, who question their gender identity will grow into their birth gender after passing through puberty.

Parents who dare to oppose doctors using off-label drugs that may sterilize their child, or performing life-altering surgical procedures, will be considered abusive and neglectful. This has already happened with an Ohio couple who lost custody of their daughter.

For the first time ever, H.R. 5 waives the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, enabling unhindered government discrimination against the faith community. It also actively prohibits the religious community from partnering with the Federal Government.

Catholic schools will no longer be able to participate in the National School Lunch Program. Jewish synagogues will lose Federal grant funding to protect against terror threats, and houses of worship will lose FEMA disaster aid unless—here is the catch—they abandon their core teachings on morality, marriage, and sexuality.

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, Members from both sides of the aisle,

especially those who claim to be pro-women and pro-children, need to stop this devastating legislation.

The future of women's rights, privacy, protection, and athletic potential depends on it.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN).

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to offer my strong support for the rule and for H.R. 5, the Equality Act.

Recent years have brought extraordinary progress in the fight for full equality for our LGBTQ community. Like millions of others across the country, I joined with friends and family to celebrate Supreme Court rulings paving the way for same-sex couples to marry. But in the midst of these joyful and historic victories, we knew that the work was just beginning.

Though LGBTQ people could now get married, in a majority of States they could still be fired for having a picture of their spouse on their desk or kicked out of their home just for being who they are. The fact is, LGBTQ people are still at risk of discrimination across key areas of life in huge swaths of our country.

Recent national surveys of LGBTQ people show that 42 percent of lesbian, gay, and bisexual people; and 78 percent of transgender people have experienced discrimination or harassment on the job because of who they are.

Only 21 States have explicit laws barring discrimination based on sexual orientation and employment, housing and public accommodations, and only 20 States have such protections for gender identity.

The time to end this patchwork of protections once and for all is now, and to do that, we must pass this important legislation.

The promotion of fairness and justice is a hallmark of who we are as Americans. Everyone should be afforded all of the rights provided for in our Constitution and outlined in our Declaration of Independence. These rights are fundamental to all human beings, and all Americans deserve the same civil rights regardless of gender, race, and sexual orientation. We don't need to amend that.

Let's pass the rule and let's pass the Equality Act.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to inform the House that if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately bring up H.R. 336, the Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East Act of 2019.

This bill includes four titles, three of which passed the House last Congress, and one of which has already passed the House this Congress on suspension.

My amendment will also include three additional provisions agreed to by the Senate when they considered their version of this bill, so that what we will debate will be identical to what

the Senate passed with an overwhelming majority vote in February.

The most critical title of H.R. 336, in my opinion, is the Combating BDS Act of 2019, which will allow a State or local government to adopt measures to divest assets from entities using boycotts, disbursements, or sanctions to influence Israel's policy.

Madam Speaker, yesterday was the 71st anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel. I can think of no better way to celebrate Israel's independence, reaffirm our support for Israel, and indicate our ongoing commitment to a peaceful and more secure Middle East than to consider and pass H.R. 336 immediately.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD four letters, first, a letter from the National Partnership for Women & Families urging support; second, a letter from the Human Rights Campaign, also urging support for H.R. 5; third, a letter from the American Federation of Government Employees; and finally, a letter from several civil rights groups, all urging support for H.R. 5.

NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP
FOR WOMEN & FAMILIES,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The National Partnership for Women & Families is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that has fought for decades to advance the rights and well-being of America's women and families. We work to foster a society in which workplaces are fair, equitable and family friendly; where everyone has access to quality, affordable health care, including reproductive health care; and where every person has the opportunity to achieve economic security and live with dignity.

We write to voice our strong support for the Equality Act (H.R. 5) and to urge you to vote YES on this groundbreaking legislation. We also urge you to vote NO on any motion to recommit that may be offered to undermine or alter the Equality Act or otherwise harm civil liberties.

Despite significant progress, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (LGBTQ) people still face considerable discrimination and lack necessary protections across the country. While some states have enacted laws that protect against discrimination, the patchwork nature of these protections means that millions of people continue to face harassment, exclusion and uncertainty that negatively impact their safety, their day-to-day lives, their families and their ability to participate fully in society.

Part of achieving our nation's promise of equality, dignity and fairness is ensuring that all people, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity, have equal opportunity to succeed. No one should have access to services or doors to opportunity closed because of outdated gender stereotypes about how people should act, look or behave. This requires stronger national nondiscrimination protections based on sex, sexual orientation and gender identity.

The Equality Act is historic civil rights legislation that would amend and supplement the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other key federal nondiscrimination laws that provide protection from discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin or religion. This legislation would strengthen protections from discrimination on the basis of sex, and add critical new protections from discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. Specifically, it would provide clear, explicit protection against discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in education, employment, housing, credit, federally funded programs and federal jury services. These protections are essential in ensuring that LGBTQ people have the right to live with dignity and equality.

While the primary focus of the Equality Act is on LGBTQ people, the Act would also close longstanding gaps in federal law and provide important new legal protections for all women by, for the first time, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sex in public spaces and services and in all federally-funded activities. This means that, for example, when women experience harassment as customers in restaurants, stores, hotels, taxis or airports, there will now be a remedy. The law will also ensure that breastfeeding parents aren't excluded from or treated less favorably in public places just for feeding their children, and it will make clear that pharmacies can't refuse to fill a woman's birth control prescription.

The bill's provisions that would ensure that sex does not stand as a barrier to full participation in federally funded programs or activities will mean, for example, that a developer with a federal grant couldn't discriminate against women-owned businesses in its contracting. Women would also have new tools to challenge a police department's systematically inadequate response to sexual violence and intimate partner violence, if the police department received federal funds; and would be able to challenge denials of reproductive health care where a federally-funded entity otherwise provides comparable or comprehensive health care.

These protections against sex discrimination are a critical step forward in advancing women's equality in this country.

As a leading national women's rights organization we also feel compelled to state emphatically that the Equality Act's protections for transgender and gender nonconforming people in no way undermine the rights or protections afforded to women and do not jeopardize women's safety or their ability to participate fully or equally in sport or in any other aspect of our society. Transgender women are women, and any attempt to mischaracterize their gender identity or suggest that they are trying to "take advantage" of protected class status fundamentally misunderstands the reality of transgender people's lives and experiences. Furthermore, it causes real harm to the more than one million Americans who identify as transgender, a population already subject to high rates of violence and abuse, negative mental and physical health outcomes, and experiences with discrimination and stigmatization.

The Equality Act is a long-overdue step forward in extending civil rights protections to millions of women and LGBTQ people. Establishing clear protections is critical at a time when vulnerable communities are

under attack. The Equality Act would provide a consistent, national standard and ensure that everyone has the opportunity to live safely and with dignity, to advance at work, to provide for one's family and to thrive economically.

Sincerely,
National Partnership for Women & Families.

HUMAN RIGHTS CAMPAIGN,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2019.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the Human Rights Campaign, the nation's largest civil rights organization working to achieve lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) equality, I write to urge you to vote in favor of H.R. 5, the Equality Act, and against any Motion to Recommit. We will consider both key votes.

Everyone—including LGBTQ people—should have an opportunity to earn a living and provide a home for their families without fear of constant harassment or discrimination. The Equality Act would update our nation's existing civil rights laws to explicitly include sexual orientation and gender identity, which would finally provide consistent non-discrimination protections for LGBTQ people across key areas of life, including employment, housing, credit, education, public spaces and services, federally funded programs, and jury service. This would ensure LGBTQ people have access to the exact same protections as are currently provided under federal law based on other protected characteristics.

Currently, 30 states lack non-discrimination protections for LGBTQ people. The patchwork nature of current laws leaves millions of people subject to uncertainty and potential discrimination that impacts their safety, their families, and their day-to-day lives. In fact, two-thirds of LGBTQ Americans report having experienced discrimination. The Equality Act would provide a nationwide standard for non-discrimination protections.

The Equality Act has unprecedented support. More than 200 major corporations have endorsed the legislation, as well as more than 40 trade associations including U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers. Recent polling finds that a growing majority of Americans—including Republicans, Democrats and Independents—support LGBTQ non-discrimination protections and LGBTQ equality. A recent survey by PRRI found that nearly seven in 10 Americans support laws like the Equality Act. More than 500 national, state, and local organizations have endorsed the legislation, including social justice, religious, medical, and child welfare organizations.

Again, I urge you to vote in favor of the Equality Act and against any Motion to Recommit.

Thank you for your consideration. If you have any questions or need more information, please do not hesitate to reach out to me.

Sincerely,
DAVID STACY,
Government Affairs Director,
Human Rights Campaign.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2019.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 700,000 federal and District of Columbia government employees represented by the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO (AFGE) I write to urge

you to vote yes on H.R. 5, the Equality Act. The Equality Act is long overdue legislation with bipartisan support that affirms in the United States all people should be treated equally.

Currently, it is not a violation of federal civil rights law for employers to fire, landlords to deny housing, or for schools to withhold educational opportunities from people solely because they are a member of the LGBTQ community. While some jurisdictions provide protections to the LGBTQ community, the federal government cannot remain silent in the face of continued discrimination. The Equality Act extends protections against discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity in employment, housing, access to public places, federal funding, credit education, and jury service. Federal workers provide services to all members of the public without discrimination and expect our nation's laws to protect all individuals in the same manner.

The Equality Act is endorsed by civil and human rights advocates, educators, the business community, and labor unions because the United States can only move forward together when all, including citizens who are LGBTQ, have full protection under the law from discrimination. Again, I urge you to vote in support of H.R. 5, the Equality Act.

Sincerely,
ALETHEA PREDEOUX,
Director, Legislative Department.

MARCH 12, 2019.

CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
Senate Minority Leader,
Washington, DC.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SCHUMER AND SPEAKER PELOSI: We write today to memorialize the shared agreement of African American civil rights groups regarding the importance of ensuring the protection of the provisions of core civil rights statutes e.g. the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Fair Housing Act, the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, etc., even as legislators pursue amendments to those statutes to add additional protections against discrimination. We stand in solidarity and support with our partners and colleagues in a shared commitment to ensuring that these protections are extended. But we have also collectively agreed that these efforts must not result in a weakening of the provisions and protections of our bedrock civil rights statutes, each of which represents the powerful and unrelenting demand of civil rights activists and leaders—often at risk to their own lives. While we have been gratified during our conversations with House and Senate committee leaders and bill sponsors, we regard this matter as one of such importance that we are memorializing by this letter the understanding we have shared in our conversations for efforts that may arise by individual legislators or groups during the process of advancing these bills.

The reasons for our caution and concern are, no doubt, evident to you. The current environment is one in which we have seen alarming animus and hostility to various ethnic and minority groups, as well as legal challenges to what were once regarded as unassailable civil rights legal standards. Without question we are confronting a concerted and unrelenting effort to chip away and eviscerate existing civil rights protections. This means that there are inherent dangers in opening any civil rights statutes to legislative debate and review. Thus, the efforts currently underway to extend anti-discrimination protection in our core civil rights statutes, must not be advanced without the clear and explicit agreement among sponsors,

committee leadership and party leadership that proposed amendments to our civil rights statutes will be withdrawn should efforts be introduced to weaken or diminish the existing provisions of those statutes.

Bills which are of immediate concern include, The Equality Act and the American Housing and Mobility Act; however, it is our understanding that there may be others. Below is a list of some of the safeguards/guardrails we feel must be in place if/when legislation proposing to amend civil rights statutes is introduced. Each of these have been discussed and agreed to by civil rights groups, as well as the current sponsors of the Equality Act. They include:

Establish a strong legislative record for any proposed changes to core Civil Rights statutes. This standard must be maintained; Hearings, reports, testimony, etc.

Written assurances from Party Leadership that existing protections will be preserved.

Written assurances from Sponsors that existing protections will be preserved.

Written assurances from Party Leadership that if an amendment(s) to existing protections or amendment(s) creating restrictions on any of the existing protections is advanced the bill will be pulled and no vote(s) will be taken.

Written assurances from Sponsors that if an amendment(s) to existing protections or amendment(s) creating restrictions on any of the existing protections is advanced* they will withdraw their introduction of the bill and work to have the bill pulled and no vote(s) will be taken.

A demonstrated and shared understanding from party leadership and legislative sponsors of the ability to impact the process once legislation is introduced given current political dynamics, including an explanation of the procedural path forward and the procedural path for withdrawal if that becomes necessary.

Inclusion of Congressional Findings section in every bill.

Rollout strategies which include explicit statement(s) about need to preserve existing protections and intent to withdraw the bill if existing protections are threatened in any manner.

Continue to explore standalone legislation that does not amend the existing statute(s), should this prove to be the safer course.

The history of civil rights in this country is one fraught with violence, hostility and long suffering. The fight to enforce those rights continues to this day with resistance and opposition morphing and growing. As stewards of these critical laws, we all have a responsibility and obligation to ensure that the protections they embody are preserved. We therefore want to be clear and direct in expressing our insistence that any legislation proposing to amend legacy civil rights statutes which is permitted to move forward, do so ONLY when there is a commitment and agreement to do no harm to the existing statutes and where the safeguards/guardrails outlined in this letter are put in place.

Sincerely,
SHERRILYN IFILL,
President and Director-Counsel, NAACP
Legal Defense and Educational Fund,
Inc.

HILLARY O. SHELTON,
Director, Washington
Bureau/SVP for Advocacy and Policy,
NAACP.

REVEREND AL SHARPTON,
President and Founder, National Action
Network.

MELANIE L. CAMPBELL,

*President and CEO,
National Coalition
on Black Civic Par-
ticipation.*

MARC H. MORIAL,
*President and Chief
Executive Officer,
National Urban
League.*

KRISTEN CLARKE,
*President & Executive
Director, Lawyers'
Committee for Civil
Rights Under the
Law.*

VANITA GUPTA,
*President and CEO,
Leadership Con-
ference for Civil and
Human Rights.*

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, for nearly a decade, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act has helped millions of Americans get the care that they need. It has allowed parents to keep their kids on their own insurance plans, and it has protected millions and millions of Americans who are living with preexisting conditions, and that piece is so important.

It means that Americans living with cancer, living with heart disease, and living with diabetes can no longer be thrown off their plans or denied coverage simply because of their medical history.

In my own State of Pennsylvania, more than 5.4 million people depend on these protections to treat their asthma, to afford their insulin, and to receive treatments for other preexisting illnesses.

Madam Speaker, I promise these families that I will keep fighting to keep them healthy, which is why this week I am voting for the Strengthening Health Care and Lowering Prescription Drugs Costs Act which will ban junk insurance plans that don't offer sufficient coverage, bring lower-priced generic prescription drugs to market more quickly, and invest in helping Americans sign up for healthcare.

That is what Democrats are focused on, moving forward, making sure seniors, veterans, and working families across our Nation have the healthcare they need. I hope the current administration will see this as an opportunity to work with our House majority in order to lower the cost of prescription medications, and I hope Republicans in Congress will join us in our mission to keep working for the people and to make sure that every American can afford their prescription medications and their healthcare.

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

Madam Speaker, in closing, I want to urge opposition to the rule. The majority has proposed three different measures today, and while I am a supporter of the bill concerning Tribal rights, I am opposed to H.R. 5 and H.R. 987, and I regret that.

Quite frankly, had the process on these bills been different, I think the vote that we would see in this Chamber would be very different today. I think, literally, a more fulsome and more open process and amendments on H.R. 5 might have unlocked dozens of additional votes for that legislation.

I think with H.R. 987 we don't have to speculate. We know three of those bills passed out of the Energy and Commerce Committee with unanimous, bipartisan support, all of them dealing with drug prices. That would have been an easy vote. We could have moved that through.

My friends could have still brought the other four matters that they cared about under a rule, brought it to the floor. They have got the votes to move it. It would have precisely the same prospects of success it is going to have in the United States Senate.

The President has already made it clear, since he issued a statement, that he is very likely to veto it if it were to make it to his desk. So why in the world we threw away an opportunity to do some good for the American people in an area where we agree, in order to advance something that we know cannot become law, is mystifying to me, to say the least.

Again, H.R. 5 is well-intentioned and designed to expand civil rights, but it also adds a term with no clear definition to our civil rights laws without regard for how it will work in practice.

H.R. 987 has four bills that are unacceptable, three bills that are eminently acceptable. I do want to close though on a positive note.

Madam Speaker, I do applaud my friends for bringing the Native American issue to fruition today. I am going to be opposing them on the rule but supporting them on that legislation. I think it was a very wise decision to put it under a rule, quite frankly, and I applaud my good friend Chairman GRIJALVA for working with my good friend Chairman McGOVERN and making sure that happened. This important piece of legislation, which, quite frankly, is important not just to the Tribe in question, but establishes the principle that we won't let land going into trust be taken out of trust, is very important.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, "no" on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a list of 364 organizations endorsing the Equality Act, as well as a list of companies supporting H.R. 5 who employ over 9.8 million workers in the United States.

EQUALITY ACT

364 ORGANIZATIONS ENDORSING THE EQUALITY ACT

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

9 to 5, National Association of Working Women; A Better Balance; ACRIA; ADAP

Advocacy Association; Advocates for Youth; AFL-CIO; African American Ministers In Action; AIDS United; Alan and Leslie Chambers Foundation; American Association for Access, Equity and Diversity; American Association of University Women (AAUW); American Atheists; American Bar Association; American Civil Liberties Union; American Conference of Cantors.

American Counseling Association; American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME); American Federation of Teachers; American Humanist Association; American Medical Association; American Psychological Association; American School Counselor Association; amfAR, Foundation for AIDS Research; Anti-Defamation League; Asian Americans Advancing Justice | AAJC; Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance (APALA); Association of Flight Attendants—CWA; Athlete Ally; Auburn Seminary; Autistic Self Advocacy Network.

BALM Ministries; Bend the Arc Jewish Action; Black and Pink; Campaign for Youth Justice; Caring Across Generations; Catholics for Choice; Center for American Progress; Center for Black Equity; Center for Inclusivity; Center for Inquiry; Center for LGBTQ and Gender Studies; CenterLink: The Community of LGBT Centers; Central Conference of American Rabbis; Child Welfare League of America; Coalition of Labor Union Women.

Communications Workers of America; Community Access National Network (CANN); Consortium for Children; Council for Global Equality; DignityUSA; Disciples Justice Action Network; Disciples LGBTQ+ Alliance; Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund (DREDF); Equal Rights Advocates; Equality Federation; Estuary Space; Faith in Public Life; Family Equality Council; Feminist Majority; The Fenway Institute.

FORGE, Inc.; Forward Together; Freedom Center for Social Justice; Freedom for All Americans; Freedom to Work; Gay Men's Health Crisis (GMHC); Gender Spectrum; Generation Progress; Georgetown University Law Center—Civil Rights Clinic; Girls Inc.; GLMA: Health Professionals Advancing LGBTQ Equality; Global Justice Institute, Metropolitan Community Churches; GLSEN; Guttmacher Institute; Hadassah, The Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc.

Harm Reduction Coalition; HealthHIV; Hindu American Foundation; Hispanic Federation; Hispanic Health Network; HIV Medicine Association; Human Rights Campaign; Human Rights Watch; Impact Fund; In Our Own Voice: National Black Women's Reproductive Justice Agenda; Indivisible; Integrity USA: Episcopal Rainbow; Interfaith Alliance; International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers; International Association of Providers of AIDS Care.

Japanese American Citizens League; Jewish Women International; Justice in Aging; Keshet; Labor Council for Latin American Advancement (LCLAA); Lambda Legal; Latino Commission on AIDS; LatinoJustice PRLDEF; League of United Latin American Citizens; Lesbian and Gay Veterinary Medical Association (LGVMA); LGBT Technology Partnership & Institute; Main Street Alliance; MANA, A National Latina Organization; MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger; Men of Reform Judaism.

Methodist Federation for Social Action; Metropolitan Community Churches; MomsRising; More Light Presbyterians; Movement Advancement Project; Muslim Advocates; Muslim Public Affairs Council; Muslims for Progressive Values; NAACP; NARAL Pro-Choice America; NASTAD (National Alliance of State & Territorial AIDS Directors); National AIDS Housing Coalition; National Alliance for Partnerships in

Equity (NAPE); National Alliance to End Sexual Violence; National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum (NAPAWF).

National Association for Female Executives; National Association of County and City Health Officials; National Association of School Psychologists; National Association of School Superintendents; National Association of Secondary School Principals; National Association of Social Workers; National Black Justice Coalition; National Center For Lesbian Rights; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Center on Adoption and Permanency; National Coalition for LGBT Health; National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs; National Council for Occupational Safety and Health (COSH); National Council of Jewish Women; National Crittenton.

National Education Association; National Employment Law Project; National Employment Lawyers Association; National Fair Housing Alliance; National Hispanic Media Coalition; National Hispanic Medical Association; National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health; National Latinx Psychological Association; National LGBT Chamber of Commerce; National LGBTQ Task Force Action Fund; National Organization for Women; National Partnership for Women & Families; National PTA; National Queer Asian Pacific Islander Alliance (NQAPIA); National Taskforce on Tradeswomen Issues.

National Trans Bar Association; National Urban League; National Women's Health Network; National Women's Law Center; NEAT—National Equality Action Team; NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; New Ways Ministry; NMAC; North American Council on Adoptable Children; Out & Equal Workplace Advocates; OutServe-SLDN; Oxfam America; Parity; People For the American Way; PFLAG National.

Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America; Physicians for Reproductive Health; Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Population Connection Action Fund; Positive Women's Network-USA; Pride at Work; Promundo-US; Public Justice; Rabbinical Assembly; Reconciling Ministries Network; ReconcilingWorks: Lutherans for Full Participation; Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice; Religious Institute; RootsAction; Ryan White Medical Providers Coalition.

SafeBAE; SAGE; Secular Coalition for America; Secular Policy Institute; SER Jobs for Progress National Inc.; Service Employees International Union; Sexuality Information and Education Council of the U.S. (SIECUS); Soulforce; Southern HIV/AIDS Strategy Initiative (SASI); Stop Sexual Assault in Schools (SSAIS); SurvJustice; T'rueah: The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights; The AIDS Institute; The Episcopal Church; The Inanna Project.

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs; The National LGBTQ Workers Center; The TransLatin@ Coalition; The Trevor Project; The Tyler Clementi Foundation; The Williams Institute; Transgender Law Center; Transgender Legal Defense & Education Fund; Treatment Action Group; True Colors United; UFCW OUTreach; Ultra Violet; UMForward; (un)common good collective; UnidosUS.

Unión = Fuerza Latinx Institute; Union for Reform Judaism; Union of Affirming Christians; Unitarian Universalist Association; Unitarian Universalist Women's Federation; United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries; United State of Women; United Synagogue of Conservative Judaism; URGE: Unite for Reproductive & Gender Equity; Voice for Adoption; Voices for Progress; Vote Common Good, Greater Things; Voto

Latino; Witness to Mass Incarceration; Women's Alliance for Theology, Ethics, and Ritual (WATER); Young Feminists & Allies: National Organization for Women's (NOW) Inaugural Virtual Chapter.

STATE AND LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

Alaskans Together For Equality, AK.
AIDS Alabama, AL.
Equality Alabama, AL.
Arizona Coalition to End Sexual & Domestic Violence, AZ.
Equality Arizona, AZ.
9to5 California, CA.
Bienestar Human Services, CA.
California Employment Lawyers Association, CA.
California LGBTQ Health and Human Services Network, CA.
Equality California, CA.
Hollywood NOW, CA.
Latino Equality Alliance, CA.
Legal Aid At Work, CA.
LGBT Center OC, CA.
LGBT Community Center of the Desert, CA.
Missiongathering Christian Church, CA.
Religious Coalition for Reproductive Right—California, CA.
Stonewall Democratic Club, CA.
The Diversity Center of Santa Cruz County, CA.
The Los Angeles LGBT Center, CA.
The Source LGBT+ Center, CA.
9to5 Colorado, CO.
One Colorado, CO.
Out Boulder County, CO.
Rocky Mountain CARES, CO.
Triangle Community Center Inc., CT.
Asian/Pacific Islander Domestic Violence Resource Project, DC.
GLAA, DC.
The DC Center for the LGBT Community, DC.
Trans-Latinx DMV (DC, Maryland and Virginia), DC.
Whitman-Walker Health, DC.
Compass LGBTQ Community Center, FL.
Equality Florida, FL.
QLatinx, FL.
The Pride Center at Equality Park, FL.
Visibility, Inc., FL.
9to5 Georgia, GA.
Georgia Equality, GA.
Lake Oconee Community Church, GA.
The Rush Center, GA.
One Iowa, IA.
AIDS Foundation of Chicago, IL.
Arab American Family Services, IL.
Association of Latinas & Latinos Motivating Action (ALMA), IL.
Chicago Alliance Against Sexual Exploitation, Chicago Metropolitan Battered Women's Network, Life Span, & Resilience, IL.
Equality Illinois, IL.
Illinois Accountability Initiative, IL.
Pride Action Tank, IL.
Resilience, formerly Rape Victim Advocates, IL.
United Latinx Pride, IL.
Women Employed, IL.
Indiana Youth Group, IN.
End Rape on Campus, LA.
Louisiana Progress Action, LA.
Louisiana Trans Advocates, LA.
MassEquality, MA.
FreeState Justice, MD.
Gender Rights Maryland, MD.
Public Justice Center, MD.
EqualityMaine, ME.
Affirmations, MI.
Equality Michigan, MI.
Kalamazoo Gay Lesbian Resource Center, MI.
Ruth Ellis Center, Inc., MI.
Gender Justice, MN.
OutFront MN, MN.
PROMO, MO.
St. Louis Effort for AIDS, MO.
Montana Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence, MT.
Charlotte Clergy Coalition for Justice, NC.
Equality North Carolina, NC.
Latinos in the Deep South, NC.
National Organization for Women Charlotte chapter, NC.
North Dakota Human Rights Coalition, ND.
OutNebraska, NE.
New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence, NH.
Garden State Equality, NJ.
Hudson Pride Center, NJ.
Equality New Mexico, NM.
KWH Law Center for Social Justice & Change, NM.
Southwest Women's Law Center, NM.
Tewa Women United, NM.
Association of Legal Aid Attorneys (ALAA) of UAW 2325, LGBTQ+ Caucus, NY.
Brooklyn Community Pride Center, NY.
Callen-Lorde Community Health Center, NY.
Empire State Pride Agenda, NY.
Equality New York, NY.
Foreground Church NYC, NY.
Gay & Lesbian Independent Democrats (GLID), NY.
Gender Equality Law Center, NY.
LGBT Bar Association of Greater New York, NY.
LGBT Bar Association of New York, NY.
Sakhi for South Asian Women, NY.
The Volunteer Lawyers Project of Onondaga County, Inc., NY.
Theatre of the Oppressed NYC, NY.
VillageCare, NY.
Equality Ohio, OH.
Ohio Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice, OH.
TransOhio, OH.
Freedom Oklahoma, OK.
Basic Rights Oregon, OR.
Cascade AIDS Project, OR.
Christ Church: Portland, OR.
Oregon Abuse Advocates & Survivors in Service, OR.
Mazzoni Center, PA.
Ni-ta-nee NOW (Centre County, PA), PA.
PA Religious Coalition for Reproductive Justice, PA.
The Montgomery County LGBT Business Council, PA.
PA Religious Coalition for Reproductive Justice, PA.
Washington County Gay Straight Alliance, Inc., PA.
Women's Law Project, PA.
New Voices for Reproductive Justice, PA and OH.
Women's Rights and Empowerment Network (WREN), SC.
Equality South Dakota, SD.
Tennessee Equality Project, TN.
American Association of University Women Texas (AAUW Texas), TX.
Cathedral of Hope United Church of Christ, TX.
Equality Texas, TX.
Esperanza Peace and Justice Center, TX.
Open Arms Rape Crisis Center & LGBT+ Services, TX.
Resource Center, TX.
Texas Freedom Network, TX.
The Afiya Center, TX.
Transgender Education Network of Texas (TENT), TX.
Equality Utah, UT.
Diversity Richmond, VA.
Equality Virginia, VA.
Entre Hermanos, WA.
Gay City: Seattle's LGBTQ Center, WA.
Gender Justice League, WA.
Legal Voice, WA.
Oasis Youth Center, WA.
Rainbow Center, WA.

9to5 Wisconsin, WI.
AIDS Resource Center of Wisconsin, WI.
FAIR Wisconsin, WI.
Wisconsin Coalition Against Sexual Assault, WI.

EQUALITY ACT

The Business Coalition for the Equality Act is a group of leading U.S. employers that support the Equality Act, which would finally guarantee explicit, permanent protections for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people under our existing civil rights laws.

The companies:

Employ over 9.8 million workers in the U.S.
Have combined revenue that exceeds \$4.2 trillion.

Have operations in all 50 States:

A.T. Kearney Inc., Chicago, IL.
Abercrombie & Fitch Co., New Albany, OH.
Accenture, New York, NY.
Adobe Systems Inc., San Jose, CA.
ADP, Roseland, NJ.
Advanced Micro Devices Inc., Sunnyvale, CA.
Airbnb Inc., San Francisco, CA.
Alaska Airlines, Seattle, WA.
Alcoa Corp., Pittsburgh, PA.
Ally Financial Inc., Detroit, MI.
Amalgamated Bank, New York, NY.
Amazon.com Inc., Seattle, WA.
American Airlines, Fort Worth, TX.
American Eagle Outfitters Inc., Pittsburgh, PA.
American Express Global Business Travel, Jersey City, NJ.
Apple Inc., Cupertino, CA.
Arconic, New York, NY.
Ascena Retail Group Inc., Mahwah, NJ.
Aspen Skiing Company LLC, Aspen, CO.
AT&T Inc., Dallas, TX.
Atlassian, San Francisco, CA.
Bain & Co. Inc./Bridgespan Group, Boston, MA.
Bank of America Corp., Charlotte, NC.
Bayer U.S. LLC, Whippany, NJ.
BD, Franklin Lakes, NJ.
Best Buy Co. Inc., Richfield, MN.
Biogen, Cambridge, MA.
Boehringer Ingelheim USA Corp., Ridgefield, CT.
Booz Allen Hamilton Inc., McLean, VA.
Boston Scientific Corp., Marlborough, MA.
Box Inc., Redwood City, CA.
Bristol-Myers Squibb Co., New York, NY.
Broadridge Financial Solutions Inc., Lake Success, NY.
Brown-Forman Corp., Louisville, KY.
Caesars Entertainment Corp., Las Vegas, NV.
Capital One Financial Corp., McLean, VA.
Cardinal Health Inc., Dublin, OH.
Cargill Inc., Wayzata, MN.
Chevron Corp., San Ramon, CA.
Chobani, Norwich, NY.
Choice Hotels International Inc., Rockville, MD.
Cisco Systems Inc., San Jose, CA.
Citigroup Inc., New York, NY.
Citrix Systems Inc., Fort Lauderdale, FL.
CME Group Inc., Chicago, IL.
CNA Financial Corporation, Chicago, IL.
Coca-Cola Co., The, Atlanta, GA.
Compass Bancshares Inc. (BBVA Compass), Birmingham, AL.
Corning, Corning, NY.
Converse Inc., Boston, MA.
Cox Enterprises Inc., Atlanta, GA.
CSAA Insurance Group, Walnut Creek, CA.
Cummins Inc., Columbus, IN.
CVS Health Corp., Woonsocket, RI.
Danone North America, White Plains, NY.
Darden Restaurants Inc., Orlando, FL.
Deloitte LLP, New York, NY.
Dell Technologies Inc., Round Rock, TX.
Depository Trust & Clearing Corp., The, New York, NY.

Diageo North America, Norwalk, CT.
Dow Chemical Co., The Midland, MI.
Dropbox Inc., San Francisco, CA.
E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Co. (DuPont), Wilmington, DE.
Eastern Bank Corp., Boston, MA.
Eaton Corp., Cleveland, OH.
eBay Inc., San Jose, CA.
Ecolab Inc., St. Paul, MN.
Edison International, Rosemead, CA.
Ernst & Young LLP, New York, NY.
Estee Lauder Companies Inc., The, New York, NY.
Evolent Health Inc., Arlington, VA.
Exelon Corp., Chicago, IL.
Expedia Group, Bellevue, WA.
Facebook Inc., Menlo Park, CA.
First Data Corp., Atlanta, GA.
Food Lion, Salisbury, NC.
Gap Inc., San Francisco, CA.
General Electric Co., Boston, MA.
General Mills Inc., Minneapolis, MN.
General Motors Co., Detroit, MI.
Giant of Maryland LLC, Landover, MD.
Gilead Sciences Inc., Foster City, CA.
Glassdoor Inc., Mill Valley, CA.
Google Inc., Mountain View, CA.
Guardian Life Insurance Co. of America, The, New York, NY.
Gusto, San Francisco, CA.
HERE North America LLC, Chicago, IL.
Hershey Co., The, Hershey, PA.
Hewlett Packard Enterprise Co., Palo Alto, CA.
Hilton Inc., McLean, VA.
HP Inc., Palo Alto, CA.
HSF Affiliates LLC, Irvine, CA.
HSN Inc. St., Petersburg, FL.
Hughes Hubbard & Reed LLP, New York, NY.
Hyatt Hotels Corp., Chicago, IL.
IBM Corp., Armonk, NY.
IHS Markit Ltd., New York, NY.
IKEA Holding US Inc., Conshohocken, PA.
Ingersoll-Rand Company, Davidson, NC.
Insight Enterprises Inc., Tempe, AZ.
Intel Corp., Santa Clara, CA.
Intercontinental Hotels Group Americas, Atlanta, GA.
Iron Mountain Inc., Boston, MA.
John Hancock Financial Services Inc., Boston, MA.
Johnson & Johnson, New Brunswick, NJ.
JPMorgan Chase & Co., New York, NY.
Juniper Networks Inc., Sunnyvale, CA.
Kaiser Permanente, Oakland, CA.
Kellogg Co., Battle Creek, MI.
Kenneth Cole Productions Inc., New York, NY.
KPMG LLP, New York, NY.
Lendlease Americas Inc., New York, NY.
Levi Strauss & Co., San Francisco, CA.
Linden Research Inc., Davis, CA.
Lush Fresh Handmade Cosmetics, Wilmington, NC.
Lyft Inc., San Francisco, CA.
Macy's Inc., Cincinnati, OH.
Marriott International Inc., Bethesda, MD.
Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co., Springfield, MA.
Mastercard, Purchase, NY.
Medtronic PLC, Minneapolis, MN.
Merck, Kenilworth, NJ.
Meredith Corp. Des Moines, IA.
MGM Resorts International, Las Vegas, NV.
Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA.
Mitchell Gold + Bob Williams, Taylorsville, NC.
Moody's Corp., New York, NY.
Morgan Stanley, New York, NY.
Nationwide, Columbus, OH.
Navient, Wilmington, DE.
Navigant Consulting Inc., Chicago, IL.
Netflix Inc., Los Gatos, CA.
Nike Inc., Beaverton, OR.
Northrop Grumman Corp., Falls Church, VA.
Nuance Communications, Burlington, MA.
Office Depot Inc., Boca Raton, FL.
Oracle Corp., Redwood City, CA.
Patreon Inc., San Francisco, CA.
Paul Hastings LLP, Los Angeles, CA.
PepsiCo Inc., Purchase, NY.
Pfizer Inc., New York, NY.
Pinterest Inc., San Francisco, CA.
PNC Financial Services Group Inc., The, Pittsburgh, PA.
PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, New York, NY.
Procter & Gamble Co., Cincinnati, OH.
Pure Storage Inc., Mountain View, CA.
QUALCOMM Inc., San Diego, CA.
Realogy Holdings Corp., Madison, NJ.
Replacements Ltd., McLeansville, NC.
Royal Bank of Canada, New York, NY.
S&P Global Inc., New York, NY.
Salesforce, San Francisco, CA.
SAP America Inc., Newtown Square, PA.
Seagate Technology plc, Cupertino, CA.
Shire PLC, Lexington, MA.
Shook, Hardy & Bacon LLP, Kansas City, MO.
Shutterstock Inc., New York, NY.
Siemens Corp., Washington, DC.
Sodexo Inc., Gaithersburg, MD.
Spotify USA Inc., New York, NY.
Square Inc., San Francisco, CA.
SurveyMonkey Inc., San Mateo, CA.
Symantec Corp., Mountain View, CA.
Syncrhony, Stamford, CT.
Takeda Pharmaceuticals USA Inc., Deerfield, IL.
Target Corp., Minneapolis, MN.
Tech Data Corp., Clearwater, FL.
TIAA, New York, NY.
T-Mobile USA Inc., Bellevue, WA.
TPG Global LLC, Fort Worth, TX.
TransUnion, Chicago, IL.
Turner Construction Co., New York, NY.
Twitter Inc., San Francisco, CA.
U.S. Bancorp, Minneapolis, MN.
Uber Technologies Inc., San Francisco, CA.
Ultimate Software, Weston, FL.
Under Armour Inc., Baltimore, MD.
Unilever, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
United Airlines, Chicago, IL.
United Parcel Service Inc., Atlanta, GA.
Univision Communications Inc., New York, NY.
Verizon Communications Inc., New York, NY.
Visa, Foster City, CA.
Warby Parker, New York, NY.
WeddingWire Inc., Chevy Chase, MD.
Wells Fargo & Co., San Francisco, CA.
Whirlpool Corp., Benton Harbor, MI.
Williams-Sonoma Inc., San Francisco, CA.
Workday Inc., Pleasanton, CA.
Wyndham Hotels & Resorts Inc., Parsippany, NJ.
Xerox Corp., Norwalk, CT.
Yelp Inc., San Francisco, CA.
Yext Inc., New York, NY.
Zillow Group, Seattle, WA.
Zimmer Biomet Holdings Inc., Warsaw, IN.
Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, today we will move forward on three pieces of legislation whose timely consideration is long overdue. We will move to protect Americans' access to health insurance; provide much-needed relief on prescription drug prices; provide Federal recognition to a Native American community; and at long last, pass the Equality Act, to remove the burden of discrimination and move us closer to a country where members of the LGBTQ community have an equal opportunity to achieve the American Dream.
The Equality Act will not be the end of our long journey towards full LGBTQ equality, but it will finally get

our laws in line with the values our country was founded upon. As was recognized in our founding documents, we must continually take steps to make our country more perfect.

Acknowledging in law the challenges facing LGBTQ people, and taking concrete action to correct them, brings us one step closer to that perfect union.

Madam Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the rule and the previous question.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule governing debate of H.R. 5, the Equality Act, and the underlying legislation.

I am proud to be an original co-sponsor of this legislation and I commend once more the tireless work of my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. CICILLINE.

I was proud to stand by him at its introduction, and championed it during our hearing on the matter in this committee, the first such hearing on the matter, for which I would also like to commend the Judiciary Committee Chairman, JERRY NADLER.

Much has changed in recent years about Americans’ attitude towards members of the LGBTQ community.

While Americans can be happy that we as a society have made strides in marriage equality, there is much work to do.

Despite significant legal advances over the past several years—including marriage equality, LGBTQ Americans remain vulnerable to discrimination on a daily basis and too often have little recourse.

Fifty percent of the national LGBTQ community live in states where, though they have the right to marry, they have no explicit non-discrimination protections in other areas of daily life.

In most states, a same-sex couple can get married one day and legally denied service at a restaurant, be fired from their jobs or evicted from their apartment the next.

The Equality Act is historic legislation that says, unequivocally, that LGBTQ Americans deserve the full protections guaranteed by the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The Equality Act extends anti-discrimination protections to LGBTQ Americans with regard to employment, education, access to credit, jury service, federal funding, housing, and public accommodations.

No American should ever be treated as less than equal in the eyes of the law.

The Equality Act will guarantee that LGBTQ Americans in Texas and across the country cannot be discriminated against because of who they are or whom they love.

It is long past time for this legislation to become law and that is why I proudly joined my colleagues today to get the job done.

In some areas, federal law prohibiting sex discrimination has already been properly interpreted by federal courts and administrative agencies to include discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

The Equality Act affirms these interpretations of existing law and makes the prohibition against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity explicit, in order to provide greater clarity to members of the public, employers, schools, businesses and others.

In areas where sex discrimination is not already prohibited, the bill amends existing law to bar discrimination on the basis of sex, as well as sexual orientation and gender identity.

The need for this legislation is all the more urgent following recent news that the Supreme Court has granted a writ of Certiorari to a trio of three cases to test the reach of the Civil Rights act to determine if they cover gay and transgendered individuals.

With the political reality on the Court as it is, this body—the House of Representatives—owes it to our constituents to ensure that critical issues related to the civil rights of our fellow citizens are handled by their elected representatives, and not left to the whims of a reconstituted Trump Court demonstrably antagonistic towards the interests of minorities.

This is why the Equality Act has the bipartisan support of Members of Congress, the strong support of the business community, and the overwhelming support of the American people—with more than 7 in 10 supporting the Equality Act.

On behalf of LGBTQ Texans and all Americans, I am proud to be one of the original co-sponsors of H.R. 5, the Equality Act.

I look forward to voting YES when it comes to the House Floor, tomorrow and working towards full enactment.

With this critical legislation, we will finally, fully end discrimination against LGBTQ Americans, and move our nation closer to fulfilling the promise of equality, opportunity and justice for every American.

In the meanwhile, I support the rule governing debate of H.R. 5 and the underlying legislation.

The text of the material previously referred to by Mr. COLE is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 377

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 336) to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment described in section 5 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 5. The amendment referred to in Section 4 is an amendment to H.R. 336 to add at the end of the bill the following:

SEC. 406. CLARIFICATION OF DEADLINE FOR REPORT ON ESTABLISHING AN ENTERPRISE FUND FOR JORDAN

“For purposes of section 205(a), the term ‘establishment of the United States Development Finance Corporation’ means the end of the transition period, as defined in section 1461 of the Better Utilization of Investments Leading to Development Act of 2018 (division F of Public Law 115-254).

SEC. 407. FORM OF REPORT ON THE COOPERATION OF THE UNITED STATES AND ISRAEL WITH RESPECT TO COUNTERING UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS

“The report required under section 123(d) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

“SEC. 408. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON WITHDRAWALS OF UNITED STATES FORCES FROM SYRIA AND AFGHANISTAN

“(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

“(1) The foreign terrorist organization al Qaeda, responsible for the attacks of September 11, 2001, maintains a presence in Afghanistan.

“(2) The Islamic State of Iraq and al Sham, better known by its acronym ISIS, flourished in the chaos unleashed by the civil war in Syria and at one point controlled extensive territory in Iraq and Syria.

“(3) Al Qaeda, ISIS, and their affiliates have murdered thousands of innocent civilians.

“(4) Al Qaeda, ISIS, and their affiliates have proven resilient and have regrouped when the United States and its partners have withdrawn from the fight against them.

“(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

“(1) acknowledges that the United States military and our partners have made significant progress in the campaign against al Qaeda and the Islamic State of Iraq and al Sham (ISIS), and honors the contributions and sacrifice of the members of the United States Armed Forces who have served on the front lines of this fight;

“(2) recognizes the continuing threat to the homeland and our allies posed by al Qaeda and ISIS, which maintain an ability to operate in Syria and Afghanistan;

“(3) expresses concern that Iran has supported the Taliban in Afghanistan and Hizballah and the Assad regime in Syria, and has sought to frustrate diplomatic efforts to resolve conflicts in these two countries;

“(4) recognizes the positive role the United States and its partners have played in Syria and Afghanistan fighting terrorist groups, countering Iranian aggression, deterring the further use of chemical weapons, and protecting human rights;

“(5) warns that a precipitous withdrawal of United States forces from the ongoing fight against these groups, without effective, countervailing efforts to secure gains in Syria and Afghanistan, could allow terrorists to regroup, destabilize critical regions, and create vacuums that could be filled by Iran or Russia, to the detriment of United States interests and those of our allies;

“(6) recognizes that al Qaeda and ISIS pose a global threat, which merits increased international contributions to the counterterrorism, diplomatic, and stabilization efforts underway in Syria and Afghanistan;

“(7) recognizes that diplomatic efforts to secure peaceful, negotiated solutions to the conflicts in Syria and Afghanistan are necessary to long-term stability and counterterrorism efforts in the Middle East and South Asia;

“(8) acknowledges the progress made by Special Representative Khalilzad in his efforts to promote reconciliation in Afghanistan;

“(9) calls upon the Administration to conduct a thorough review of the military and diplomatic strategies in Syria and Afghanistan, including an assessment of the risk that withdrawal from those countries could strengthen the power and influence of Russia and Iran in the Middle East and South Asia and undermine diplomatic efforts toward negotiated, peaceful solutions;

“(10) requests that the Administration, as part of this review, solicit the views of Israel, our regional partners, and other key troop-contributing nations in the fight against al Qaeda and ISIS;

“(11) reiterates support for international diplomatic efforts to facilitate peaceful, negotiated resolutions to the ongoing conflicts in Syria and Afghanistan on terms that respect the rights of innocent civilians and deny safe havens to terrorists;

“(12) calls upon the Administration to pursue a strategy that sets the conditions for the long-term defeat of al Qaeda and ISIS, as well as the protection of regional partners and allies, while ensuring that Iran cannot dominate the region or threaten Israel;

“(13) encourages close collaboration between the Executive Branch and the Legislative Branch to ensure continuing strong, bipartisan support for United States military operations in Syria and Afghanistan; and

“(14) calls upon the Administration to certify that conditions have been met for the enduring defeat of al Qaeda and ISIS before initiating any significant withdrawal of United States forces from Syria or Afghanistan.

“(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as a declaration of war or an authorization of the use of military force.”.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 336.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 189, answered “present” 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

YEAS—228

Adams	Courtney	Gottheimer
Aguilar	Cox (CA)	Green (TX)
Allred	Craig	Grijalva
Axne	Crist	Haaland
Barragán	Crow	Harder (CA)
Bass	Cuellar	Hastings
Beatty	Cunningham	Hayes
Bera	Davids (KS)	Heck
Beyer	Davis (CA)	Higgins (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Davis, Danny K.	Hill (CA)
Blumenauer	Dean	Himes
Blunt Rochester	DeFazio	Horn, Kendra S.
Bonamici	DeGette	Horsford
Boyle, Brendan F.	DeLauro	Houlahan
Brindisi	DelBene	Hoyer
Brown (MD)	Delgado	Huffman
Brownley (CA)	Demings	Jackson Lee
Bustos	DeSaulnier	Jayapal
Butterfield	Deutch	Jeffries
Carbajal	Dingell	Johnson (GA)
Cárdenas	Doggett	Johnson (TX)
Castor (FL)	Doyle, Michael F.	Kaptur
Castro (TX)	Evans	Kind
Chu, Judy	Finkenauer	Kirkpatrick
Cicilline	Engel	Lawrence
Cisneros	Fletcher	Lewandowski
Clark (MA)	Foster	Lipinski
Clarke (NY)	Frankel	Lofgren
Clay	Fudge	Long
Cleaver	Gabbard	Loeb
Clyburn	Gallego	Long
Cohen	Garamendi	Loescher
Connolly	Garcia (IL)	Lynch
Cooper	Garcia (TX)	Malinowski
Correa	Golden	Maloney
Costa	Gomez	McAuliffe
	Gonzalez (TX)	McGovern

Levin (MI)	Panetta	Sires	Williams
Lewis	Pappas	Slotkin	Wilson (SC)
Lieu, Ted	Pascrell	Smith (WA)	Wittman
Lipinski	Payne	Soto	
Loeb	Perlmuter	Spanberger	
Lofgren	Peters	Speier	
Lowenthal	Peterson	Stanton	
Lowey	Phillips	Stevens	
Luján	Pingree	Suozzi	
Luria	Pocan	Takano	
Lynch	Porter	Thompson (CA)	
Malinowski	Pressley	Thompson (MS)	
Maloney, Carolyn B.	Price (NC)	Titus	
Maloney, Sean	Quigley	Tlaib	
McAdams	Raskin	Tonko	
McBath	Rice (NY)	Torres (CA)	
McCollum	Rouda	Torres Small (NM)	
McEachin	Royal-Allard	Trahan	
McGovern	Ruiz	Trone	
McNerney	Ruppersberger	Underwood	
Meeks	Rush	Van Drew	
Meng	Sánchez	Vargas	
Moore	Scalise	Veasey	
Morelle	Schakowsky	Velázquez	
Moulton	Schiff	Visclosky	
Mucarsel-Powell	Schneider	Wasserman	
Murphy	Schrader	Schultz	
Nadler	Schrier	Waters	
Napolitano	Scott (VA)	Watson Coleman	
Neal	Scott, David	Weich	
Neguse	Serrano	Wexton	
O’Halleran	Sewell (AL)	Wild	
Ocasio-Cortez	Shalala	Wilson (FL)	
Omar	Sherman	Yarmuth	
Pallone	Sherill		

NAYS—189

Allen	Gohmert	Moolenaar
Amash	Gonzalez (OH)	Mooney (WV)
Amodei	Gooden	Mullin
Armstrong	Gosar	Newhouse
Arrington	Granger	Norman
Babin	Graves (GA)	Nunes
Bacon	Graves (LA)	Olson
Baird	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Balderson	Green (TN)	Palmer
Banks	Griffith	Perry
Barr	Grothman	Posey
Bergman	Guest	Ratcliffe
Biggs	Guthrie	Reed
Bilirakis	Hagedorn	Reschenthaler
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Rice (SC)
Bost	Hartzler	Riggleman
Brady	Hern, Kevin	Riggleman
Brooks (AL)	Herrera Beutler	Rose, John W.
Buchanan	Hick	Rogers (AL)
Buck	Hill (AR)	Rogers (KY)
Bushon	Holding	Rooney (FL)
Burgess	Hollingsworth	Rose, John W.
Burgess	Hudson	Rouzer
Burgess	Huizinga	Roy
Byrne	Hunter	Rutherford
Calvert	Hurd (TX)	Scalise
Carter (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Schweikert
Carter (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Scott, Austin
Chabot	Jordan	Sensenbrenner
Cheney	Joyce (OH)	Shimkus
Cline	Joyce (PA)	Simpson
Cloud	Katko	Smith (MO)
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NE)
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Collins (NY)	King (IA)	Smith (PA)
Comer	King (NY)	Spano
Conaway	Kinzinger	Stauber
Cook	Kustoff (TN)	Stefanik
Crawford	LaHood	Steil
Crenshaw	LaMalfa	Steube
Curtis	Lamborn	Stewart
Latta	Lamborn	Stivers
DesJarlais	Lesko	Taylor
Diaz-Balart	Long	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	Loudermilk	Thornberry
Dunn	Duncan	Timmons
Emmer	Emmer	Tipton
Estes	Marshall	Turner
Fitzpatrick	Ferguson	Upton
Fuster	Massie	Wagner
Gaster	Fitzpatrick	Mast
Gaster	Fleischmann	McCarthy
Gaster	Flores	McCaughan
Gaster	Fortenberry	McClintock
Gaster	Fox (NC)	McHenry
Gaster	Fulcher	McKinley
Gaster	Gaetz	Meadows
Gaster	Gallagher	Weber (TX)
Gaster	Meuser	Webster (FL)
Gaster	Gianforte	Westerman
Gaster	Gibbs	Witmer

Williams	Womack
Wilson (SC)	Woodall
Wittman	Young
	Zeldin

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Richmond

NOT VOTING—13

Abraham	Higgins (LA)
Aderholt	Johnson (LA)
Brooks (IN)	Keating
Cummings	Norcross
Davis, Rodney	Pence

□ 1341

Messrs. TURNER, PALAZZO, MULLIN, and DIAZ-BALART changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut, SCOTT of Virginia, and Mrs. BUSTOS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Mr. RICHMOND changed his vote from “nay” to “present.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 188, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 206]

YEAS—229

Adams	David (KS)	Hoyer
Aguilar	Davis (CA)	Huffman
Allred	Davis, Danny K.	Jackson Lee
Axne	DeFazio	Jeffries
Barragán	Bass	Johnson (GA)
Bass	DeGette	Johnson (TX)
Beatty	DeLauro	Kilmer
Bera	DelBene	Kaptur
Beyer	Demings	Kelly (IL)
Bishop (GA)	DeSaulnier	Kennedy
Blumenauer	Dingell	Khanna
Blunt Rochester	DeLauro	Kildee
Bonamici	Doyle, Michael F.	Kilmer
Boyle, Brendan F.	Engel	Kind
Brindisi	Escobar	Kirkpatrick
Brown (MD)	Espsaillat	Krishnamoorthi
Brownley (CA)	Foster	Lawrence
Bustos	Frankel	Lee (CA)
Butterfield	Franklin	Lee (NV)
Carbajal	Gabbiard	Levin (CA)
Cárdenas	Gardner	Lewis
Castor (FL)	Gilligan	Lipinski
Castro (TX)	Goode	Lofgren
Chu, Judy	Gutierrez	Lynch
Cicilline	Hagan	Lofgren
Cisneros	Hawkins	Loeb
Clark (MA)	Herrera Beutler	Loeb
Clarke (NY)	Hicks	Long
Clay	Hicks	Long
Cleaver	Hicks	Long
Clyburn	Hicks	Long
Cohen	Hicks	Long
Connolly	Hicks	Long
Cooper	Hicks	Long
Correa	Hicks	Long
Costa	Hicks	Long

Meeks	Raskin	Stanton	Johnson (LA)	Ryan	Walker
Meng	Rice (NY)	Stevens	Pence	Swalwell (CA)	Weber (TX)
Moore	Richmond	Suozzi	Roby	Thompson (PA)	
Morelle	Rose (NY)	Takano			
Moulton	Rouda	Thompson (CA)			
Mucarsel-Powell	Royal-Allard	Thompson (MS)			
Murphy	Ruiz	Titus		□ 1350	
Nadler	Ruppersberger	Tlaib			
Napolitano	Rush	Tonko			
Neal	Sánchez	Torres (CA)			
Neguse	Sarbanes	Torres Small (NM)			
Norcross	Scanlon	Trahan			
O'Halleran	Schakowsky	Trone			
Ocasio-Cortez	Schiff	Underwood			
Omar	Schneider	Van Drew			
Pallone	Schrader	Vargas			
Panetta	Schrier	Scott (VA)			
Pappas	Scott, David	Watson Coleman			
Pascarel	Serrano	Velázquez			
Payne	Sewell (AL)	Visclosky			
Perlmutter	Shalala	Wasserman			
Peters	Sherman	Schultz			
Peterson	Sherrill	Waters			
Phillips	Sires	Watson Coleman			
Pingree	Slotkin	Welch			
Pocan	Smith (WA)	Wexton			
Porter	Soto	Wild			
Pressley	Spanberger	Wilson (FL)			
Price (NC)	Speier	Yarmuth			

NAYS—188

Allen	Gosar	Norman	Johnson (OH)	Long	Long
Amash	Granger	Nunes	Long (NY)	Long (PA)	Long (VA)
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Olson	Long (TX)	Long (WI)	Long (WV)
Armstrong	Graves (LA)	Palazzo	Loudermilk	Loudermilk	Loudermilk
Arrington	Graves (MO)	Palmer	Luetkemeyer	Luetkemeyer	Luetkemeyer
Babin	Green (TN)	Perry	McAdams	McAdams	McAdams
Bacon	Griffith	Posey	McCarthy	McCarthy	McCarthy
Baird	Grothman	Ratcliffe	McCaull	McCaull	McCaull
Balderson	Guest	Reed	McClintock	McClintock	McClintock
Banks	Guthrie	Reschenthaler	McHenry	McHenry	McHenry
Barr	Hagedorn	Rice (SC)	McKinley	McKinley	McKinley
Bergman	Harris	Riggleman	Meadows	Meadows	Meadows
Biggs	Hartzler	Rodgers (WA)	Meuser	Meuser	Meuser
Bilirakis	Hern, Kevin	Roe, David P.	Miller	Miller	Miller
Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)	Mitchell	Mitchell	Mitchell
Bost	Hice (GA)	Rogers (KY)	Moolenaar	Moolenaar	Moolenaar
Brady	Hill (AR)	Rooney (FL)	Moohey (WV)	Moohey (WV)	Moohey (WV)
Brooks (AL)	Holding	Rose, John W.	Mullin	Mullin	Mullin
Buchanan	Hollingsworth	Rouzer	Young	Young	Young
Buck	Hudson	Roy	Newhouse	Zeldin	
Bucshon	Huizenga	Rutherford			
Budd	Hunter	Scalise			
Burchett	Hurd (TX)	Schweikert			
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Scott, Austin			
Byrne	Johnson (SD)	Sensenbrenner			
Calvert	Jordan	Shimkus			
Carter (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Simpson			
Carter (TX)	Joyce (PA)	Smith (MO)			
Chabot	Katko	Smith (NE)			
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NJ)			
Cline	Kelly (PA)	Smucker			
Cloud	King (IA)	Spano			
Cole	King (NY)	Stauber			
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger	Stefanik			
Collins (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Steil			
Comer	LaHood	Steube			
Conaway	LaMalfa	Stewart			
Cook	Lamborn	Stivers			
Crawford	Langevin	Taylor			
Crenshaw	Latta	Thornberry			
Curtis	Lesko	Timmons			
Davidson (OH)	Long	Tipton			
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Turner			
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Upton			
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Wagner			
Duncan	Marchant	Walberg			
Dunn	Marshall	Walden			
Emmer	Massie	Walorski			
Estes	Mast	Waltz			
Ferguson	McAdams	Watkins			
Fitzpatrick	McCarthy	Webster (FL)			
Fleischmann	McCaull	Wenstrup			
Flores	McClintock	Westerman			
Fortenberry	McHenry	Williams			
Foxx (NC)	McKinley	Wilson (SC)			
Fulcher	Meadows	Wittman			
Gaetz	Meuser	Womack			
Gallagher	Miller	Woodall			
Gianforте	Mitchell	Wright			
Gibbs	Moolenaar	Yoho			
Gohmert	Moohey (WV)	Young			
Gonzalez (OH)	Mullin	Zeldin			
Gooden	Young				

NOT VOTING—14

Abraham	Brooks (IN)	Davis, Rodney
Aderholt	Cummings	Higgins (LA)

Johnson (LA)	Ryan	Walker
Pence	Swalwell (CA)	Weber (TX)
Roby	Thompson (PA)	

□ 1350

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON H.R. 2740, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2020

Ms. DELAUR, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-62) on the bill (H.R. 2740) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, lives are literally hanging in the balance. I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not been recognized for debate.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

REAFFIRMING AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF INTERIOR TO TAKE LAND INTO TRUST FOR INDIAN TRIBES

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (H.R. 375) to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian Tribes, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 375

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY REAFFIRMED.

(a) REAFFIRMATION.—Section 19 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (commonly known as the “Indian Reorganization Act”; 25 U.S.C. 5129), is amended—

(1) in the first sentence—

(A) by striking “The term” and inserting “Effective beginning on June 18, 1934, the term”; and

(B) by striking “any recognized Indian tribe now under Federal jurisdiction” and inserting “any federally recognized Indian Tribe”; and

(2) by striking the third sentence and inserting the following: “In said sections, the term ‘Indian tribe’ means any Indian or Alaska Native tribe, band, nation, pueblo, village, or community that the Secretary of the Interior acknowledges to exist as an Indian tribe.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the Act of June 18, 1934 (commonly known as the ‘Indian Reorganization Act’; 25 U.S.C. 5129), on the date of the enactment of that Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, 10 years ago, the Supreme Court handed down what is known as the Carcieri decision. In that decision, the Court determined that trust land acquisition under the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 only applies to Tribes that were under Federal jurisdiction in 1934.

Mr. Speaker, up until 2009, the Department of the Interior, under both Republican and Democratic administrations, had consistently construed that the IRA authorizes the placement of land into trust for any Tribe so long as the Tribe is federally recognized at the time of the trust application.

The decision overturned 75 years of agency practice, both Democratic and Republican administrations, and created a two-tiered system for trust land acquisition. This also opened up the Tribes to frivolous lawsuits on land