

A native of South Carolina towns Batesburg-Leesville and Lugoff, Payne and Master Sergeant Joshua L. Wheeler with fellow Army Rangers in 2015 helped rescue about 70 hostages set to be executed by the Islamic State terrorists in Iraq. The terrorists had dug mass graves to prepare for mass murder.

Sadly, Sergeant Wheeler lost his life, but Payne, with Kurdish commandos, continued their multiple courageous assaults to cut the locks, free the hostages, and helicopter the hostages to freedom.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

HONORING LEVESTER THOMPSON

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

Mr. ROSE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of my constituent Levester Thompson, who was taken from us far too soon after battling COVID-19.

Growing up in a small Virginia town of 300, LT aspired to move to the big city, inspired to work as a banker in Manhattan. He commuted 2½ hours every day from Staten Island to pursue that dream.

As he got older, he realized there is so much more to life, so he returned to his true passion, his true passion for sports, working as an equipment manager for NYU's athletics department and spending more time helping his children, Jade and Chase, realize their own passions.

LT was a larger-than-life character, a coach, a mentor, someone with a great sense of humor, and a smile that will be so dearly missed.

LT, you will forever live in our memory.

EXPAND MILK OPTIONS AVAILABLE THROUGH WIC PROGRAM

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to cosponsor the GIVE MILK Act with my Pennsylvania colleague FRED KELLER.

The GIVE MILK Act is an important piece of legislation that gives families who use the WIC program more control over the nutrition of their children.

The bill would make 2 percent and whole milk available through the WIC program to any child over the age of 2, reversing an Obama-era rule limiting WIC participants to low-fat or non-fat milk.

This legislation will give families who depend on WIC more options when considering nutritional options for their children. It will also help increase milk consumption, which is a win for our dairy farmers.

Whole milk has been wrongfully targeted as unhealthy in recent years, but

in reality, it provides a wealth of vital nutrients that are particularly important for growing children.

Including whole milk in the WIC program will provide a healthy option for those families who find themselves depending upon these benefits for essential nutrition.

□ 1015

DEFENDING AMERICAN VALUES

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the timeless American principles of freedom, equality, and opportunity. These principles are the foundation on which our Nation was built.

Unlike the nations and the empires that came before, the United States was founded on an idea, an idea that men are created equal and have certain inalienable rights given by our Creator. This idea turned into a dream, a dream that, no matter what circumstances you come from, you can come to America and be free to pursue your dreams and be equal to your peers in the eyes of the law.

There are some among us who think this system of self-government has failed. There are some who believe socialism is a better tool to achieve the American Dream, and they think, by tearing down our institutions, by tossing aside the Constitution, and by giving the government more control that they will somehow achieve utopia. Using history as a guide, we know this to be wrong.

Our Constitution is special because it limits the power of government while safeguarding our freedoms and our civil rights. I will do my best to follow their example and keep our America as the shining city on the hill.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2574, EQUITY AND INCLUSION ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2639, STRENGTH IN DIVERSITY ACT OF 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2694, PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 908, CONDEMNING ALL FORMS OF ANTI-ASIAN SENTIMENT AS RELATED TO COVID-19; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1107 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1107

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2574) to amend title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to restore the right to individual civil actions in cases involving disparate impact, 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 Education and Labor, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying 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 chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor; 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. 2639) to establish the Strength in Diversity Program, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-62 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 Education and Labor; (2) the further amendments described in section 3 of this resolution; (3) the amendments en bloc described in section 4 of this resolution; and (4) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. After debate pursuant to the second section of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 4 of this resolution shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time after debate pursuant to the second section of this resolution for the chair of the Committee on Education and Labor or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 5. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 4 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 6. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2694) to eliminate discrimination

and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. 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 Education and Labor; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 7. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 908) condemning all forms of anti-Asian sentiment as related to COVID-19. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

SEC. 8. House Resolution 967, agreed to May 15, 2020 (as most recently amended by House Resolution 1053, agreed to July 20, 2020), is amended—

(1) in section 4, by striking “September 21, 2020” and inserting “November 20, 2020”;

(2) in section 11, by striking “calendar day of September 20, 2020” and inserting “legislative day of November 20, 2020”; and

(3) in section 12, by striking “September 21, 2020” and inserting “November 20, 2020”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEVIN of Michigan). The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my distinguished colleague from the Rules Committee, 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. Mr. 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. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1107, providing for consideration of H.R. 2574, the Equity and Inclusion Enforcement Act, and H.R. 2694, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, under closed rules.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate for each of the two bills, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor. The rule also

self-executes a manager's amendment to H.R. 2574.

Additionally, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2639, the Strength in Diversity Act, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor and makes in order 12 amendments. The rule provides that the chair of the Committee on Education and Labor may offer amendments en bloc, debatable for 20 minutes.

The rule also provides for consideration of H. Res. 908, Condemning All Forms of Anti-Asian Sentiment As Related to COVID-19, under a closed rule.

Finally, the rule extends recess instructions, suspension and same-day authority through November 20, 2020.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to begin debate on four bills today that will protect workers, encourage diversity and inclusion in the workforce, and demonstrate Congress' support for our Asian-American communities in the face of anti-Asian rhetoric by the administration and right with respect to COVID-19.

COVID-19 has infected over 27 million people worldwide and claimed the lives of over 900,000, including almost 200,000 of our fellow Americans. This pandemic brought the world to a standstill economically and socially. Virtually everything in our daily lives has been affected in some form.

There was no coherent national strategy to deal with this deadly pandemic when it started, and now, 6-plus months in, Americans are still being left behind by an executive branch more focused on downplaying the virus' severity than getting it under control and our economy and way of life back on track.

In Congress, we find ourselves having to deal with a Senate majority that has even less interest in controlling the virus and helping American families than the President. The House has passed numerous pieces of legislation that would directly help American workers, small businesses, families, and children; but, in the midst of a pandemic, Leader MCCONNELL is more interested in packing the judiciary than he is in passing legislation to help the American people. The HEROES Act has sat on Leader MCCONNELL's desk collecting dust for exactly 4 months to the day.

In the absence of leadership by the White House and Senate, our cities and States are desperate for resources to combat the pandemic. The American people are calling out for relief, but Republicans are willfully ignoring them. Instead, they are trying to divert attention from their abject failure to take prompt or effective action earlier this year when tens of thousands of lives could have been saved. Instead, this administration is using the playbook of fear-mongering autocrats through the ages by demonizing a marginalized group.

In recent months, we have seen a marked rise in anti-Asian sentiment and rhetoric. Racist and xenophobic names for COVID-19 have been spouted by elected officials, and these terms have had damaging, far-reaching impact on Asians and Asian Americans.

As we have seen over the past 4 years, the endorsement of racist language by national leaders has led to well-documented increases in racist speech and hate crimes across the country. This harmful rhetoric has resulted in physical attacks, verbal assaults, workplace discrimination, and online harassment against our fellow citizens. These are our friends and neighbors, essential workers, nurses, law enforcement officers, and teachers.

The vitriol against our fellow Americans must be forcefully and overwhelmingly condemned, Mr. Speaker.

In the midst of this pandemic, reaffirming American values is more necessary than ever, whether it is condemning hate speech or making sure that our government is working for all Americans and not just Wall Street tycoons or real estate developers. Therefore, I would recommend to my colleagues that they encourage Senator MCCONNELL to quickly take up the HEROES Act or come to the table with good-faith negotiations to address COVID-19 in a thoughtful and people-focused way.

I thank my colleague, Congresswoman GRACE MENG from New York, for introducing this necessary resolution and the House Judiciary Committee for quickly getting this before the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, it has been more than 65 years since the Supreme Court made racial segregation in public education illegal, but over the past several decades, racial and socioeconomic segregation in our schools has dramatically increased. This didn't happen by accident.

In many counties across the U.S., children are assigned to schools based on where their home is located. If your parents can afford to live in a more affluent area and pay higher property taxes, the school you attend will reflect this.

□ 1030

The opposite, of course, is true for students in poorer areas, and centuries of systemic racism have relegated far too many students of color to poorer neighborhoods and school districts.

School districts that predominantly serve students of color receive \$23 billion less in funding than predominantly White school districts. The result of this undeniable gap in educational funding is that students of color have fewer resources, older equipment, and aging—if not crumbling—facilities that make learning more challenging compared to their peers in higher-income areas.

In a 2001 Supreme Court decision, *Alexander v. Sandoval*, a conservative majority stripped away four decades of

statutory protection against discrimination by disallowing victims of these unjust policies from bringing disparate impact claims under title VI of the Civil Rights Act. Fortunately, the bill we are considering this week will restore the rights of students, parents, and communities to address this systemic harm by allowing those impacted to seek enforcement in our courts.

The Equity and Inclusion Enforcement Act is critical to reforming how education is accessed in the United States. It is long past time for Congress to step in and ensure that the law can address discriminatory policies and practices, and that is exactly what this bill will do.

Similar to the Equity and Inclusion Enforcement Act, the Strength in Diversity Act addresses the importance of increasing diversity in education and eliminating socioeconomic and racial segregation. Once again, educational opportunities for our children largely depend on their home ZIP code.

Unsurprisingly, segregation has a detrimental impact on learning and educational outcomes. Research shows that students educated in integrated schools have higher test scores, are more likely to enroll in college and are less likely to drop out. Moreover, integrated classrooms have been found to encourage critical thinking, problem solving, and creativity.

Consistent with the primacy of local control of education, many school districts around the country have implemented innovative strategies to address school segregation. Strategies to support more diverse and inclusive learning include the development of state-of-the-art magnet schools, open enrollment policies, and changes in feeder patterns to promote diversity. Research suggests that diverse settings reduce stereotypes and promote cross-racial understanding which is especially important as our country moves towards a more ethnically and culturally diverse society.

The Strength in Diversity Act supports communities in developing, implementing, and expanding diversity initiatives to promote higher levels of social cohesion and reduce racial prejudice. There is no one solution to make education more equitable for our students, but different data clearly shows that increased diversity in classrooms is one of the best ways for all students to receive a quality education. This bill will promote those solutions.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we have the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

COVID-19 has exposed and exacerbated the hurdles women continue to face in the workplace, so let's start out by stating one obvious fact: women shouldn't be forced to choose between financial security and a healthy pregnancy.

It has been illegal to discriminate against pregnant women for decades, but we know that this damaging practice remains widespread.

Women make up nearly half of the labor force in this country, yet pregnancy discrimination persists, including losing a job, being denied reasonable accommodation, or not being hired in the first place. In fact, the number of pregnancy discrimination claims filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has been steadily rising for two decades and is hovering near an all-time high. These practices aren't new, and they must end.

This is an issue that spans the political spectrum and affects women in every corner of this country. Estimates indicate that over 20 percent of pregnant workers are employed in jobs that are both low wage and physically demanding. Women of color are heavily overrepresented in these estimates, with nearly one in three employed Black and Latina women working in low-wage jobs.

Though the Pregnancy Discrimination Act has been law since the seventies and despite a 2015 Supreme Court decision allowing for reasonable accommodation claims, an unreasonably high standard of proof is still allowing discrimination against many pregnant workers.

The bipartisan Pregnant Workers Fairness Act helps change this practice by strengthening Federal workplace protections and promoting the health and well-being of pregnant women and their families. This important legislation requires public-sector employers and private-sector employers with more than 15 employees to make reasonable accommodations for pregnant employees and individuals with known limitations related to pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions.

It is 2020. We should not have to have this debate or lay out an entire argument as to why we should protect pregnant workers. But here we are. It is past time that pregnant workers have fair and equal opportunity in employment. It is past time that the protections of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act become law.

When more women work, the better the economy performs. Women are not asking for special treatment or handouts, just the workplace protections they deserve so that they can do the jobs they need to do.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of my colleagues who helped craft these superb pieces of legislation. I look forward to supporting this rule, I urge my colleagues to do the same, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I want to thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for yielding me the time.

She and I have the pleasure of serving on the Congressional Modernization Committee together—a bipartisan committee—and it is not infrequent that we will have identified a problem and she will have identified a solution, and I will think: Why haven't we come

up with that before. And we will move forward in partnership together.

I think that is the way the American people expect this House to run, and doggone it, we are close to getting there today, Mr. Speaker.

But I listened to my colleague as she laid the mantle of blame at the feet of our friends in the Senate and our friends in the White House, for why can't they get more things done?

The truth is we have opportunities here to get things done, and I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, the mantle of responsibility sits with us, and we are missing some of those opportunities today to come together and do things in a partnership way.

Over the weekend, Mr. Speaker, I was with our colleague, DENNY HECK from Washington State. We were in a forum on polarization in Congress, and we were talking about what that has meant, how that has come to be, and how legislation is affected by that. Mr. HECK said something that I thought was very profound and not really understood outside of the Halls of Congress. Folks often talk about their partisan achievements, but, he said that—and I will paraphrase him—there is really a special sense of pride that Members take in sorting out those really thorny issues, those issues that you had to come together and work on, those issues where you had to give a little to get a little, and those issues that not just anybody could have solved but that we came together with a unique mix of people at a unique time and that Members take special pride in cracking those hardest of nuts.

I think that is exactly right. The media doesn't cover those successes, I think, with the same glee that partisan bickering is covered, but, absolutely, men and women of conscience in this body take special pride in solving particularly hard problems.

We have an opportunity today, Mr. Speaker, to solve some problems, and I am not sure that we are taking full advantage of that. Principled compromise, Mr. Speaker, does not mean finding the lowest common denominator. It means finding those things that all of our constituents are asking us to do and figuring out how in 435 different districts and different sets of ideas we can meld those things together.

We have in this rule today, Mr. Speaker, a whole host of bills. I miss the days where we did one rule and one bill. I recognize the pandemic has caused some time crunch problems, but I hope that when these masks come off—as I am absolutely certain one day they will—we will return to being a body that can handle one idea at a time and have a full-throated debate on each idea, but this bill makes in order a number of bills.

I will start with H.R. 2639, the Strength in Diversity Act, Mr. Speaker. It must have been said by every Member who spoke yesterday that discrimination is wrong, that it is immoral, that it is unlawful, and that we

have to do absolutely everything we can to ensure that American school children are treated equally in our schools. H.R. 2639 purports to do that.

Again, this is an idea that has great bipartisan support. It has moral right on its side. Separate is not equal, and learning from diversity is part of the strength that our Nation provides. I am glad, even though we offered a motion for an open rule so that all Members could have their voices heard, my friends in the majority on the Rules Committee saw fit to make 12 separate amendments in order, including one from my colleague from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN) that I believe will make this bill better.

The Allen amendment is an opportunity for us to work together and move forward, not just on something that goes to the Senate, Mr. Speaker, but something that goes to the Senate and moves beyond. I have been there, and so I understand the need to say: I have sent my idea to the Senate and the Senate isn't moving it, and shame on the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, if you talk to your friends in this Senate, whether it is a Democratic-led Senate or a Republican-led Senate, they will tell you that if you send them bad ideas they are not going to move them.

We can send good ideas to the United States Senate, Mr. Speaker, good ideas that will move across the floor, ideas that will move to the President's desk and thus ideas that will make a difference. We all grow weary on this floor of talking about things we would like to do, and we often mistake passing something using a very partisan majority in the House as getting something done. It is not. It is absolutely making a statement, but it is getting absolutely nothing done. Only when the Senate acts and only when the President acts are we able to get something done. We have that opportunity with the Allen amendment today, Mr. Speaker, and I hope folks will take advantage of that.

Mr. Speaker, another bill that the rule makes in order is the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, H.R. 2694.

Again, there is not a single Member in this body who believes that discrimination is appropriate. This is another opportunity that we had to work in a partnership way to move a bill forward. We all believe it is important for employers to provide reasonable accommodations to pregnant workers. We all want what is best for these workers; and, in fact, we heard from the ranking member of the Education and Labor Committee yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that Chairman SCOTT, the chairman of that committee, had worked to try to make this bill better. The bill is different today than it was when it was introduced because of that partnership effort. Again, any good thing that comes out of this institution comes out in a partnership way.

One more step that, of course, the minority was hoping we could make

would be one to protect religious freedoms in this bill, the rights of religious institutions, Mr. Speaker. This is not a radical idea. This is something we have been doing for 50 years when we have talked about nondiscrimination statutes. It is my hope that Chairman SCOTT, having heard the arguments yesterday in the Rules Committee and having heard from our ranking member, the gentlewoman from North Carolina, Dr. FOXX, that he will take yes for an answer. There is still time to come back and improve this bill and get it across the floor in a very bipartisan, again, partnership way that not just makes it to the Senate but makes it through the Senate on to the President's desk to effect the law as we all desire. I think the American people will thank us if we seize this opportunity to find common ground.

Mr. Speaker, we see this, again, in H. Res. 908 that this rule makes in order today. It condemns all forms of anti-Asian sentiment and bias as it relates to COVID-19. Mr. Speaker, I would encourage you to go and read this resolution. As you know from House resolutions, you have a series of "and whereas", and then you have what it is that we want to do.

If you read this series of whereases, you will find it to be as stridently partisan as you often find House resolutions to be, and it is not necessary that it be that way. We all condemn and denounce anti-Asian sentiment, Mr. Speaker, all manifestations of racism, of xenophobia, of scapegoating, and of intolerance. We all condemn those ideas, and we all want Federal law enforcement to play a strong role in ensuring that Asian-American communities across this country are protected and that crimes against them are investigated and properly prosecuted.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, in July of this year I joined, again, in a partnership, bipartisan way Mr. LIEU and Ms. CHU on the Democratic side of the aisle and Mr. OLSON and myself on the Republican side of the aisle. We led a letter to Attorney General Barr that included signatories like my friend from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) asking that the Justice Department bolster its work in this area and to send an unambiguous message to the American people that anti-Asian bias and discrimination will not be tolerated at any level of our government.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, because I do want to highlight those things that we do together not in a partisan way but in a "let's-get-something-done-together way", I include in the RECORD the letter.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, July 20, 2020.

Hon. WILLIAM P. BARR,
Attorney General, Department of Justice,
Washington, DC.

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL BARR: Thank you for featuring the quote "Coronavirus is no excuse for hate" on the Department of Justice's hate crimes website. The COVID-19 pandemic affects all Americans and has wrought enormous pain in the United States.

Some Americans are facing increased discrimination as a result of the pandemic. We write to draw particular attention to an increase in verbal and physical attacks as well as discrimination towards Asian Americans who have been wrongly blamed for the virus' spread. We respectfully request that you publicly condemn acts of anti-Asian bias, and provide us with regular status updates regarding the steps the Department of Justice is taking and will take going forward to combat this behavior.

Asian Americans are not responsible for the spread of coronavirus in the United States; yet, since the start of the pandemic they have experienced continued harassment, violence, and discrimination. As of June 3, the Asian Pacific Policy and Planning Council reported 2,066 incidents of coronavirus-related discrimination. These and numerous news reports have documented cases ranging from the denial of services at stores to verbal harassment on the subway to physical assaults.

In one particularly egregious instance, an individual in Texas stabbed three Asian Americans, two of whom were children, because he thought they were infecting others with COVID-19. In March, the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Houston field office acknowledged the likelihood of a surge in hate crime incidents against Asian Americans. And most recently, a new Ipsos survey conducted for the Center for Public Integrity found that more than 30 percent of Americans have witnessed someone blaming Asian people for the coronavirus pandemic.

We appreciate the op-ed the Department placed in the Washington Examiner generally stating that hate crimes will be investigated and prosecuted. However, the dangers faced by the Asian American community today are very real and deserve a strong and specific response by our government. In fact, on May 8, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights acknowledged its concerns "over the increase in xenophobic animosity toward Asian Americans (and perceived Asian Americans) as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic" and unanimously issued recommendations urging federal agencies reduce this sentiment.

We note that in the early 2000s during the severe acute respiratory syndrome outbreak, the Bush Administration immediately took steps to prevent discrimination against Asian Americans by creating a community outreach team to monitor and document acts of anti-Asian bias and engage with the community.

Two years earlier following the September 11 terrorist attacks, the Administration had similarly sought to prevent attacks against Arab, Muslim, Sikh, and South Asian American communities by engaging with community leaders, conducting coordinated civil rights enforcement, and speaking out forcefully. While these prior responses were not perfect, they represented an important effort to acknowledge and address the specific discrimination.

Despite the fear present within the community, each and every day Asian Americans help to combat COVID-19. While Asian Americans comprise 7 percent of the U.S. population, 17.1 percent of active medical physicians are Asian American. Similarly, Asian Americans are serving our country by working as nurses, health aides, and in many other essential occupations. Asian Americans are just as American as any other group of people in our country.

We respectfully request that you, as head of the Department of Justice, forcefully condemn anti-Asian bias to send an unambiguous message to all Americans that discrimination against this community is un-American and will not be tolerated. Further, we

would ask that you update us regularly as to what steps the Department has taken to address our concerns. Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Ted W. Lieu, Member of Congress; Rob Woodall, Member of Congress; Judy Chu, Member of Congress; Pete Olson, Member of Congress.

Jerrold Nadler, Ted S. Yoho, Adam Smith, Derek Kilmer, Frank Pallone, Jr., John Yarmuth, Nydia M. Velázquez, Karen Bass, Adam B. Schiff, Dan Crenshaw, Eddie Bernice Johnson, James P. McGovern, Kathy Castor, Peter A. DeFazio, Joaquin Castro, Brian Fitzpatrick, Carolyn B. Maloney, Eliot L. Engel, Zoe Lofgren, Mark Takano, Ted Deutch.

Abigail D. Spanberger, Alan Lowenthal, Alma S. Adams, Ph.D., Andy Kim, Ann McLane Kuster, Ayanna Pressley, Bill Foster, Bonnie Watson Coleman, Brenda L. Lawrence, Chellie Pingree, Danny K. Davis, Adriano Espaillat, Alcee L. Hastings, Ami Bera, M.D., Andy Levin, Anna G. Eshoo, Barbara Lee, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Brad Sherman, Brendan F. Boyle, Cheri Bustos, Darren Soto, Al Green, Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, André Carson, Angie Craig, Anthony G. Brown, Betty McCollum, Bobby L. Rush, Bradley S. Schneider, Cedric L. Richmond, Colin Z. Allred, David N. Cicilline.

David Trone, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Donald M. Payne, Jr., Doris Matsui, Ed Case, Eric Swalwell, Grace F. Napolitano, Gwen Moore, Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr., Jackie Speier, Jan Schakowsky, Dean Phillips, Denny Heck, Donald S. Beyer Jr., Dwight Evans, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Gerald E. Connolly, Grace Meng, Hakeem Jeffries, Ilhan Omar, Jahana Hayes, Jared Huffman, Debbie Mucarsel-Powell, Dina Titus, Donna E. Shalala, Earl Blumenauer, Emanuel Cleaver, II, Gilbert R. Cisneros, Jr., Gregory W. Meeks, Harley Rouda, J. Luis Correa, Jamie Raskin, Jason Crow.

Jennifer Wexton, Jimmy Gomez, John B. Larson, Juan Vargas, Kim Schrier, M.D., Lisa Blunt Rochester, Madeleine Dean, Mark DeSaulnier, Max Rose, Pramila Jayapal, Ro Khanna, Jerry McNerney, Jimmy Panetta, Joseph P. Kennedy, III, Katherine M. Clark, Lauren Underwood, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Marc Veasey, Mark Pocan, Mike Thompson, Raja Krishnamoorthi, Ron Kind, Jesús G. "Chuy" García, Joe Neguse, Josh Gottheimer, Katie Porter, Linda T. Sánchez, Lucy McBath, Marcia L. Fudge, Mary Gay Scanlon, Peter Welch, Rick Larsen, Rosa L. DeLauro.

Ruben Gallego, Scott H. Peters, Seth Moulton, Stephanie Murphy, Susan A. Davis, Suzanne Bonamici, TJ Cox, Veronica Escobar, Yvette D. Clarke, Salud O. Carbajal, Sean Casten, Sharice L. Davids, Steve Cohen, Susie Lee, Sylvia R. Garcia, Tony Cardenas, Vicente Gonzalez, Nanette Diaz Barragan, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Sean Patrick Maloney, Sheila Jackson Lee, Steven Horsford, Suzan K. DelBene, Thomas R. Suozzi, Tulsi Gabbard, William R. Keating, Members of Congress.

□ 1045

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General, I have no doubt, feels exactly the same way about this as Ms. SCANLON and I do, as Mr. LIEU and Ms. CHU do. And that is why I am saddened that we have a resolution before us today that includes these "whereases" that make it difficult to take "yes" for an answer.

Mr. Speaker, I want you to remember that we had a very similar conversation with H. Res. 576 last year. That

was the resolution asking that the whistleblower's complaint be provided to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I went up to the Rules Committee on that afternoon last spring, and the conversation was the Trump administration is derelict, it is full of scoundrels, all of these bad things are going on, and we demand the whistleblower's report.

Mr. Speaker, well, what are we supposed to do with that? As Article I says, we are entitled to the whistleblower's report, and we made a recommendation to the chairman of the Rules Committee at that time and to the House leadership to give us an opportunity to speak with one Article I voice on whether or not the House is entitled to see a whistleblower's report.

We said, "Please, take out these partisan jabs and let's just get to the heart of the matter and get access to those documents that we want. In the chairman's wisdom, and in the Speaker's wisdom, they took that advice. A resolution that had been on its way to being whipped "no" from the Republican side of the aisle, came back and passed with absolutely no dissent when we decided to spend less time poking one another and more time trying to make progress together.

Mr. Speaker, we have that opportunity again today, and I hope we will take "yes" for an answer. This is obviously an election year, an opportunity to get off the rails on partisan rhetoric from time to time, but we all know that we speak with a stronger voice when we speak with one voice here in this institution, and we have that opportunity to find that space in H. Res. 908.

Mr. Speaker, finally, the last bill in this very long rule, is H.R. 2574, a measure that purports to strengthen Federal civil rights laws in educational settings, creating a private right of action on the theory of disparate impact.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope it surprises you, as it surprises me, that we are talking about a fundamental change in American civil jurisprudence, and this bill didn't go through the Committee on the Judiciary at all. Now, again, it purports to change the laws it relates to educational settings, but, of course, in fact, changes the law across the entire spectrum of civil litigation and not one opportunity for the Committee on the Judiciary to be heard.

Now, I talked about principle compromise and not seeking the lowest common denominator. I don't want to pretend that it will be an easy thing to find that common ground on disparate impact litigation. Litigation is something that divides this House time and time again, and it takes serious people, which is why serious men and women, like my friend from Pennsylvania, find themselves on the Committee on the Judiciary. It is not an easy path to find. But for not one opportunity—and we asked the Judiciary chairman about that yesterday, Mr. Speaker—and he

said he looked at the Committee on Education's work product and he thought it was appropriate. Well, I am glad that he does not feel undermined by being completely left out of changes in judicial procedure in the United States of America. I would feel that way if I were chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. But even if he doesn't feel left out, even if he thinks that is good enough, I have got dozens and dozens of Members who are on the Committee on the Judiciary who were placed on that committee because of their expertise in that area, who have been placed on the Committee on the Judiciary because of their thoughtfulness in this area. And I think America would benefit, not be burdened, by having an opportunity for those voices to be heard.

Again, if your position is "let's pass bills in the House and thank ourselves, congratulate ourselves for passing something in the House," we have got exactly the right bill before us today.

If our position is, we want to make a difference for the men and women that we serve—and I say, "if our position is"—Mr. Speaker, I take that back. I shouldn't have even said that, because I am certain, knowing each one of my colleagues as I do, that it is their position that they didn't come here to make a statement, that they did come here to make a difference. I want it to come to fruition that we can make that partnership progress together.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat this rule, we are going to have that opportunity. I am not talking about an opportunity to quash any of these bills. I am talking about an opportunity to perfect these bills in those ways that I have mentioned, not so that they go to the Senate and die, not so that they receive a veto threat from the White House, but so that they go to the Senate and pass, so that they receive the President's signature, and so that they make the difference that each one of the men and women in this Chamber were sent here to do.

Mr. Speaker, we are close to that today, and I believe if we defeat the rule, we can get that.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my learned colleague for his input. It certainly would be refreshing to see anything pass the Senate these days.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished member of the Rules Committee, Ms. SCANLON, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of good things included in this rule. I want to discuss one in particular today: H. Res. 908—condemning all forms of anti-Asian sentiment as related to COVID-19.

This resolution is about our values; not our Democratic values, not our Republican values, it is about our American values.

Look, I understand that politics can be contentious. The rhetoric can get heated. But what we are talking about here is something else altogether. Anti-Asian rhetoric crosses a line that should never be crossed.

The Asian-American community is an integral part of our society. It is an important part of my community in Massachusetts. These are our neighbors, our friends, and our family. And the hateful rhetoric that we are hearing directed towards them during this pandemic is unacceptable. It has led to an uptick in physical attacks, verbal assaults, and online harassment. Hate crimes against Asian Americans are on the rise.

Mr. Speaker, this is the antithesis of what the United States of America stands for. During difficult times, our Nation comes together. We don't allow offensive rhetoric to tear us apart, no matter who says it. We are nearing 200,000 lives lost in this country because of the coronavirus. Countless more are sick. Businesses have closed, our economy is struggling.

Mr. Speaker, the world has changed. But one thing that is not and will not change is our obligation to be there for each other, to treat others as we would want to be treated. To show those around us the dignity and respect and the basic human decency that we would want them to show us—pandemic or no pandemic.

To pretend that these hateful words about Asian Americans don't matter is to kid yourself. Just ask those who have been on the receiving end. Or ask the groups that monitor hate-inspired discrimination. They tell us that there were more than 2,100 anti-Asian-American hate incidents in this country related to this pandemic between March and June. I shudder to think what the number has grown to today.

No one should be forced to endure such hate and violence. Asian Americans are struggling under the weight of this pandemic, just like everyone else. They are doctors and nurses and first responders—just like everyone else. I know that in politics our values don't always align, but on this, Democrats and Republicans should agree. Some things go beyond partisanship. They speak to who we are as a Nation and what we are willing to tolerate.

Mr. Speaker, I am hoping for a strong bipartisan vote on this resolution because this country should always stand as an inclusive and just society. And as elected officials, that starts with us. We must lead by example.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues on both sides to support this rule and the underlying measures.

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

Mr. Speaker, I don't disagree with a word my friend from Massachusetts had to say, and, in fact, I want to

thank him for joining the letter that we led on this very topic in a bipartisan way earlier this year. And I do not believe I am speaking out of turn. If the gentleman will partner with me for stripping out the political "whereases" in this resolution, I am certain not only will we get a bipartisan vote, we will get a huge bipartisan vote in the same way that we did when you followed that same good advice that I gave about this time last year.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will amend the rule to make in order H.R. 1325, the Protect and Serve Act, and H.R. 8251.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, these measures before us today are critically important.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD), a gentleman who can speak to these critically important issues with not just his words, but with a lifetime of service.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and neighbor from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand up for the lives of our Nation's law enforcement officers. I spent over 40 years of my life in law enforcement, including 12 as sheriff. I dedicated my life to protecting minorities in Florida communities and doing my absolute best to ensure that all of my officers went home safely to their families.

Sadly, we still lost good men and women in the line of duty. And there is no doubt that law enforcement is a dangerous profession, and every officer that puts on that badge knows the risk that they take. But one thing is certain, these risks are growing significantly—increased, thanks to the growing anti-police rhetoric we are seeing across the country, making their jobs more dangerous now than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, I urge defeat of the previous question so that we can consider H.R. 1325, the Protect and Serve Act. The lead cosponsor of my legislation is Congresswoman VAL DEMINGS, a career police officer and former Orlando police chief. It is not a controversial bill, and it is one that many, many, of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle support. In fact, last Congress, this bill overwhelming passed the House by a vote of 382–35.

Like Congresswoman DEMINGS, I know what officers go through every day when they put on their uniform, say goodbye to their families, and head out to do the important work of protecting our communities.

Recently, we have seen an undeniable increase in violent attacks against po-

lice officers, especially using ambush-style attacks. Just this weekend, we saw two Los Angeles police officers shot in cold blood while simply sitting in their vehicle. But then, when being transported to the hospital for life-saving treatment, the doors to that hospital were blocked—blocked by protesters chanting, "We hope they die. We hope they die."

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, in Gilchrist County, Florida, two deputies were assassinated while simply eating lunch. This year, 24 police officers have been ambushed, and 7 of them died because of the attacks.

This is why we must defeat the previous question and consider the Protect and Serve Act. This is bipartisan legislation that will enact the strongest penalties for anyone who decides to target and harm not only Federal officers, but also, in some cases, State and local officers.

Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have expressed shock over the recent police shootings. I now ask that you translate those statements of shock into action and show America that attacks on law enforcement will not be tolerated.

Please stand with Congresswoman DEMINGS and I in supporting the Protect and Serve Act.

□ 1100

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

Mr. Speaker, we have been talking about shared American values. Certainly, one of our strongest shared American values is that we condemn violence, particularly violence against our law enforcement officers. That is not open to question. What happened in California this past week is horrific, and we all condemn that.

But that is not what we are talking about here. What we are talking about is an attempt to hijack the rule that we are here to debate.

I mean, I have just listened to a very eloquent argument by the gentleman from Georgia about the need for bills to go through regular order and to follow the process. If these are the non-controversial items, as warranted by my colleagues, then they can go through the suspension process.

We just voted on two suspension bills last night. We can do more. We can be here longer than anticipated if the news I am reading is correct. So, let them go through the suspension process. Let them be marked up.

Let's get back to the business of why we are here today and the four bills that are under consideration as part of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), another distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a rule providing for consideration of several bills that will support pregnant women in the workplace and reaffirm our shared commitment to equity and diversity.

Of these important bills, one stands out as personal to me: the resolution condemning all forms of anti-Asian sentiment related to COVID-19.

For many Asian Americans across this country, the harmful rhetoric from the highest officials of our land is a painful reminder of our yet unrealized potential as a Nation. This pain is informed by our lived experiences.

For me, having been born in a Japanese-American internment camp, I learned from my parents and grandparents the dangers of governing with fear and hatred, not acceptance and unity.

If our country is to successfully contain the spread of this deadly virus, the Federal Government must demonstrate that every single American is valued and that their stories and lives matter. Americans of all backgrounds deserve to know that their government holds a fundamental dedication to their well-being.

However, when our leaders use language that undermines our collective resolve, it diminishes public trust, undercuts public health, and harms families. This rhetoric does not align with the values we work to instill in our children, and it has no place in America today.

This is an important statement for this Chamber to make, and I look forward to a vote on the House floor soon.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words of my friend from California. What makes this institution strong is so many of those experiences that each one of us brings from our lives.

Again, we have an opportunity to speak with exactly the one voice that my friend asks us to if we can simply remove the partisanship from this resolution and make it the condemning resolution that it should absolutely be.

Along those lines, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 4 minutes to my friend from Missouri to talk about, again, not hijacking the rule by defeating the previous question, but simply adding to what is already a very long rule, two additional bipartisan measures that won't just be statements, Mr. Speaker. They will be opportunities to move through the Senate and on to the President's desk.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, a ranking member of the Rules Committee, for his support and his friendship for so very many years and for his fight for this cause in this Chamber and for his constituents in Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on my colleagues to defeat the previous question and bring up my legislation, H.R. 8251, which would ensure that all Americans can access hospitals and urgent medical care without fear of life-threatening delays due to violence and extremism.

My legislation would prohibit intentionally blocking hospital entries or

exits by force, threat of force, or physical obstruction in order to injure, intimidate, or interfere with any person who is trying to obtain and provide lifesaving medical procedures or treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I am outraged that the irrational and unconscionable hatred directed at the brave men and women of our Nation's law enforcement resulted in the attempted assassination of two innocent deputies and the reckless endangerment of those in need of urgent medical care.

On September 12, a gunman attempted to execute two Los Angeles Sheriff's deputies, Claudia Apolinar, a 31-year-old single mother, and her 24-year-old partner, simply because they wore the uniform, simply because they were called to serve and to protect American neighborhoods.

This was a chilling and senseless act of brutality that we are seeing all over our country. Instead of turning to healing, protestors chose to endanger the lives of those in need of immediate medical care by actually blocking the entrance to the hospital where the deputies were receiving critical care and chanting, "We hope they die," and, "Death to police."

"We hope they die," and, "Death to police."

The courageous men and women of our law enforcement are selfless public servants, Mr. Speaker. Every day, they choose to risk their lives to protect us. It is unconscionable that their sacrifices are being repaid with targeted violence and hatred. It is equally unconscionable that protestors would prevent innocent Americans from receiving lifesaving care by blocking hospital entrances.

I call on my colleagues—I implore my colleagues—for us to come together to defeat the previous question. Stand with our men and women in blue. Stand for what is right and just in our country. Stand for humanity and support my legislation.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to close if the gentleman from Georgia has no further speakers.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers. I am prepared to close.

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

I can't say it any better than my friends from Missouri and Florida have just said it.

My colleague from Pennsylvania is absolutely right, Mr. Speaker. We have a regular order process. Here we are, halfway through September. We are back for our first day of session this month. I wish we were here more. I wish there was more work going on. I wish there was less campaigning and more working together, but there simply isn't.

The previous question is an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to add things to the rule. You can use it to hijack the rule. You can use it to take down the rule. That is not what we are doing

today. What we are asking, Mr. Speaker, is to add two commonsense, bipartisan bills.

Mr. Speaker, you heard the arguments from the gentleman from Florida and the gentlewoman from Missouri. Did you object to a single word that they had to say? Did you find one bit of partisanship or disagreement in their words? You did not.

The question isn't are we going to get some Democratic votes to defeat the previous question and add these two bills. We are. We absolutely are because these are bipartisan ideas. The question isn't if we are going to get them. The question is: Are we going to get enough?

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, the question isn't if their words ring true with you. The question is, knowing that their words rang true with you, will you add your vote to theirs? I am asking you to do that. I am asking my friend from Pennsylvania to do that. I am asking my friends from Massachusetts and California to do that.

I opened the debate today, Mr. Speaker, telling you we were so close to what I believe every man and woman in this Chamber come here to do, and that is work together, not to pick a fight, not to make an argument, but to make a difference. With some minor, minor tweaks, we can do that with every single piece of legislation that my friends in the majority want to bring forward today.

With just one vote to defeat the previous question, Mr. Speaker, and no tweaks at all, we can do that with the two measures that the gentlewoman from Missouri and the gentleman from Florida have put before us here today.

Mr. Speaker, vote with me. Defeat the previous question. Let's move forward to speak with one voice, not just to condemn anti-American sentiment, not just to protect pregnant women in the workplace, but to stand behind the public safety officers, the men and women in this country who show up every day of the week for us.

I ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question. In the absence of that, let's defeat the rule and follow exactly the advice my friend from Pennsylvania suggested, take all of these bills back to committee and bring them back out one more time. It doesn't have to be that way. We can move forward today.

Mr. Speaker, I do encourage my colleagues to defeat the previous question, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We are in the midst of some of our country's most challenging times. Millions of Americans are facing eviction. They are food insecure. They don't know where their next paycheck is going to come from. 200,000 Americans have died, and that number is likely to double by the end of this year. We have a President wholly indifferent to the pandemic, other than its impact on his

political future, and Senate leaders aiding him every step of the way.

Months ago, the House passed the HEROES Act, which would be a lifeline to the people we serve. However, that bill remains untouched on Senator MCCONNELL's desk, with hundreds of others.

Included in that bill are lifelines for small business and working Americans, critical aid to State and local governments just trying to keep the lights on and to defend our citizens against the pandemic when national leadership is so lacking, and much-needed money that would go a long way to developing a vaccine for COVID-19.

The HEROES Act is money for our healthcare providers, our schools, our caretakers, and essential workers. It is a dereliction of duty for the Senate to refuse to engage in good faith on this critical legislation, and the American people will remember.

But while this bill remains in Senator MCCONNELL's legislative graveyard, we will continue to push for the protections that Americans need, deserve, and are calling out for. Each of the four pieces of legislation in our rule today will help our country and Americans all over.

From the beginning of the 116th Congress, this House has shown that it is up to the task of legislating for the people while exercising oversight and other critical constitutional duties.

While we have passed critical COVID-19-related legislation, we will not stop passing the legislation necessary to make this country a more equitable place for all Americans. We won't stop working for the American people, despite attacks by those who would prefer to posture.

There is no place for violence against law enforcement. There is no place for violence against our fellow citizens, whether that violence comes from the left or the right. There is no place for discrimination. Most of all, there is no place for stoking division between Americans, and we will beat that back at every opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. WOODALL is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1107

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 9. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1325) to amend title 18, United States Code, to punish criminal offenses targeting law enforcement officers, and for other purposes. 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 shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House

with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 10. Immediately after disposition of H.R. 1325, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8251) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit preventing access to life-saving medical procedures and treatments, and for other purposes. 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 shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 11. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1325 and H.R. 8251.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 170, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 185]

YEAS—219

Adams	Bustos	Connolly
Aguilar	Butterfield	Cooper
Allred	Carbajal	Correa
Axne	Cárdenas	Costa
Barragán	Carson (IN)	Courtney
Bass	Cartwright	Cox (CA)
Beatty	Case	Craig
Bera	Casten (IL)	Crist
Beyer	Castor (FL)	Crow
Bishop (GA)	Chu, Judy	Cuellar
Blumenauer	Ciциline	Cunningham
Blunt Rochester	Cisneros	Davids (KS)
Bonamici	Clark (MA)	Davis (CA)
Boyle, Brendan	Clarke (NY)	Davis, Danny K.
F.	Clay	Dean
Brindisi	Cleaver	DeGette
Brown (MD)	Clyburn	DeLauro
Brownley (CA)	Cohen	DeBene

Delgado	Lawrence	Richmond
Demings	Lawson (FL)	Rose (NY)
DeSaulnier	Lee (CA)	Rouda
Dingell	Lee (NV)	Roybal-Allard
Doggett	Levin (CA)	Ruiz
Doyle, Michael	Levin (MI)	Ruppersberger
F.	Lieu, Ted	Rush
Escobar	Lipinski	Ryan
Eshoo	Loeb sack	Sánchez
Espallat	Lofgren	Sarbanes
Evans	Lowenthal	Scanlon
Finkenauer	Lowe y	Schakowsky
Fletcher	Luján	Schiff
Foster	Luria	Schrader
Frankel	Lynch	Schrier
Fudge	Malinowski	Scott (VA)
Gabbard	Maloney,	Scott, David
Gallego	Carolyn B.	Serrano
Garamendi	Maloney, Sean	Sewell (AL)
Garcia (IL)	Matsui	Shalala
Garcia (TX)	McAdams	Sherman
Gomez	McBath	Sherrill
Gottheimer	McCollum	Sires
Green, Al (TX)	McEachin	Slotkin
Grijalva	McGovern	Smith (WA)
Haaland	McNerney	Spanberger
Harder (CA)	Meeks	Speier
Hastings	Meng	Stanton
Hayes	Mfume	Stevens
Heck	Moore	Suozi
Higgins (NY)	Morelle	Swalwell (CA)
Himes	Moulton	Takano
Horn, Kendra S.	Mucarsel-Powell	Thompson (CA)
Horsford	Nadler	Thompson (MS)
Houlahan	Napolitano	Titus
Hoyer	Neal	Tlaib
Huffman	Neguse	Tonko
Jackson Lee	Norcross	Torres (CA)
Jayapal	O'Halleran	Torres Small
Jeffries	Ocasio-Cortez	(NM)
Johnson (GA)	Omar	Trahan
Johnson (TX)	Pallone	Underwood
Keating	Panetta	Vargas
Kelly (IL)	Pappas	Veasey
Kennedy	Pascrell	Vela
Khanna	Payne	Velázquez
Kildee	Perlmutter	Visclosky
Kilmer	Peters	Wasserman
Kim	Peterson	Schultz
Kind	Phillips	Waters
Kirkpatrick	Pingree	Watson Coleman
Krishnamoorthi	Pocan	Welch
Kuster (NH)	Porter	Wexton
Lamb	Pressley	Wild
Langevin	Price (NC)	Wilson (FL)
Larsen (WA)	Raskin	Yarmuth
Larson (CT)	Rice (NY)	

NAYS—170

Allen	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (LA)
Amash	Duncan	Johnson (OH)
Amodei	Dunn	Johnson (SD)
Armstrong	Emmer	Jordan
Arrington	Estes	Joyce (OH)
Babin	Ferguson	Joyce (PA)
Bacon	Fitzpatrick	Katko
Baird	Fleischmann	Keller
Balderson	Flores	Kelly (PA)
Barr	Fortenberry	King (IA)
Biggs	Foxx (NC)	King (NY)
Bilirakis	Fulcher	Kinzinger
Bishop (NC)	Gallagher	LaHood
Bishop (UT)	Garcia (CA)	LaMalfa
Bost	Gianforte	Latta
Brady	Gibbs	Lesko
Brooks (AL)	Gohmert	Long
Brooks (IN)	Golden	Loudermilk
Buchanan	Gonzalez (OH)	Lucas
Buck	Gooden	Luetkemeyer
Bucshon	Gosar	Marchant
Budd	Graves (LA)	Marshall
Burgess	Graves (MO)	Massie
Calvert	Griffith	Mast
Carter (GA)	Grothman	McCarthy
Carter (TX)	Guthrie	McCaul
Chabot	Hagedorn	McKinley
Cheney	Harris	Meuser
Cline	Hartzler	Miller
Cloud	Hern, Kevin	Mitchell
Cole	Herrera Beutler	Moolenaar
Collins (GA)	Hice (GA)	Mooney (WV)
Comer	Higgins (LA)	Mullin
Conaway	Hill (AR)	Murphy (NC)
Crawford	Holding	Newhouse
Crenshaw	Hollingsworth	Norman
Curtis	Hudson	Olson
Davidson (OH)	Huizenga	Palmer
Davis, Rodney	Hurd (TX)	Perry
DesJarlais	Jacobs	Posey

Reed	Smith (NE)	Wagner
Reschenthaler	Smucker	Walberg
Rice (SC)	Spano	Walden
Roby	Staubert	Walker
Rodgers (WA)	Stefanik	Walorski
Roe, David P.	Steil	Waltz
Rogers (AL)	Steube	Watkins
Rogers (KY)	Stewart	Weber (TX)
Rooney (FL)	Stivers	Webster (FL)
Rose, John W.	Taylor	Westerman
Rouzer	Thompson (PA)	Williams
Roy	Thornberry	Wittman
Rutherford	Tiffany	Womack
Scalise	Tipton	Woodall
Schweikert	Turner	Young
Shimkus	Upton	Zeldin
Smith (MO)	Van Drew	

NOT VOTING—41

Abraham	Graves (GA)	Riggleman
Aderholt	Green (TN)	Schneider
Banks	Guest	Scott, Austin
Bergman	Kaptur	Sensenbrenner
Burchett	Kelly (MS)	Simpson
Byrne	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (NJ)
Castro (TX)	Lamborn	Soto
Cook	McClintock	Timmons
DeFazio	McHenry	Trone
Deutch	Murphy (FL)	Wenstrup
Engel	Nunes	Wilson (SC)
Gaetz	Palazzo	Wright
Gonzalez (TX)	Pence	Yoho
Granger	Quigley	

□ 1210

Mr. SHIMKUS changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Beyer)	Kirkpatrick (Gallejo)	Pingree (Clark (MA))
Blumenauer (Beyer)	Langevin (Lynch)	Pocan (Raskin)
Butterfield (Kildee)	Lawrence (Kildee)	Porter (Wexton)
Chu, Judy (Takano)	Lawson (FL)	Rooney (FL)
Clay (Davids (KS))	(Evans)	(Beyer)
	Roybal-Allard (Aguilar)	
Cohen (Beyer)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Rush (Underwood)
Davis, Danny K. (Underwood)	Lipinski (Cooper)	Serrano (Jeffries)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Loftgren (Jeffries)	Sewell (AL) (Del Bene)
Frankel (Clark (MA))	Lowey (Tonko)	Thompson (MS) (Fudge)
	Meng (Clark (MA))	
García (IL)	Moore (Beyer)	Trahan
(Raskin)	Napolitano (McGovern)	
Grijalva (Raskin)	(Correa)	Watson Coleman
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)	Pascarell (Pallone)	Welch (McGovern)
	Payne (Wasserman)	Wilson (FL)
Jayapal (Raskin)	Schultz	(Hayes)
Khanna (Gomez)		

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1221

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SUOZZI) at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2574, EQUITY AND INCLUSION ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2639, STRENGTH IN DIVERSITY ACT OF 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2694, PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 908, CONDEMNING ALL FORMS OF ANTI-ASIAN SENTIMENT AS RELATED TO COVID-19; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 1107) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2574) to amend title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to restore the right to individual civil actions in cases involving disparate impact, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2639) to establish the Strength in Diversity Program, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2694) to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition; providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 908) condemning all forms of anti-Asian sentiment as related to COVID-19; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 157, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 186]

YEAS—216

Adams	Case	Davids (KS)
Aguilar	Casten (IL)	Davis (CA)
Allred	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny K.
Axne	Chu, Judy	Dean
Barragán	Cicilline	DeGette
Bass	Cisneros	DeLauro
Beatty	Clark (MA)	DelBene
Bera	Clarke (NY)	Delgado
Beyer	Clay	Demings
Bishop (GA)	Cleaver	DeSaulnier
Blumenauer	Clyburn	Dingell
Blunt Rochester	Cohen	Doggett
Bonamici	Connolly	Doyle, Michael F.
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cooper	Escobar
Brown (MD)	Correa	Eshoo
Brownley (CA)	Costa	Espallat
Bustos	Courtney	Evans
Butterfield	Cox (CA)	Finkenauer
Carbajal	Craig	Fletcher
Cárdenas	Crist	Foster
Carson (IN)	Crow	Frankel
Cartwright	Cuellar	Fudge
	Cunningham	

Gabbard	Lofgren	Ruppersberger
Gallejo	Lowenthal	Rush
Garamendi	Lowe	Ryan
García (IL)	Lujan	Sánchez
García (TX)	Lynch	Sarbanes
Golden	Malinowski	Scanlon
Gomez	Maloney	Schakowsky
Green, Al (TX)	Carolyn B.	Schiff
Grijalva	Maloney, Sean	Schrader
Haaland	Matsui	Schrier
Harder (CA)	McAdams	Scott (VA)
Hastings	McBath	Scott, David
Hayes	McCollum	Serrano
Heck	McEachin	Sewell (AL)
Higgins (NY)	McGovern	Shalala
Himes	McNerney	Sherman
Horn, Kendra S.	Meeks	Sherrill
Horsford	Meng	Sires
Houlahan	Mfume	Slotkin
Hoyer	Moore	Smith (WA)
Huffman	Morelle	Spanberger
Jackson Lee	Moulton	Speier
Jayapal	Mucarsel-Powell	Stanton
Jeffries	Nadler	Stevens
Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Suozy
Johnson (TX)	Neal	Swalwell (CA)
Kaptur	Neguse	Takano
Keating	O'Halleran	Thompson (CA)
Kelly (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez	Thompson (MS)
Kennedy	Omar	Titus
Khanna	Pallone	Tlaib
Kildee	Panetta	Tonko
Kilmer	Pappas	Torres (CA)
Kim	Pascarell	Trahan
Kind	Payne	Underwood
Kirkpatrick	Perlmutter	Vargas
Krishnamoorthi	Peters	Veasey
Kuster (NH)	Peterson	Vela
Lamb	Phillips	Velázquez
Langevin	Pingree	Visclosky
Larsen (WA)	Pocan	Wasserman
Larson (CT)	Porter	Schultz
Lawrence	Pressley	Waters
Lawson (FL)	Price (NC)	Watson Coleman
Lee (CA)	Raskin	Welch
Lee (NV)	Rice (NY)	Wexton
Levin (CA)	Richmond	Wild
Levin (MI)	Rose (NY)	Wilson (FL)
Lieu, Ted	Rouda	Yarmuth
Lipinski	Roybal-Allard	
Loeb sack	Ruiz	

NAYS—157

Allen	Fortenberry	Lucas
Amash	Fox (NC)	Luetkemeyer
Amodel	Fulcher	Marchant
Armstrong	Gallagher	Marshall
Arrington	García (CA)	Massie
Babin	Gianforte	Mast
Bacon	Gibbs	McKinley
Baird	Gohmert	Meuser
Balderson	Gonzalez (OH)	Miller
Barr	Gooden	Mitchell
Biggs	Gosar	Moolenaar
Bilirakis	Graves (LA)	Mooney (WV)
Bishop (NC)	Griffith	Mullin
Bishop (UT)	Grothman	Murphy (NC)
Bost	Guthrie	Newhouse
Brady	Hagedorn	Norman
Brooks (AL)	Harris	Olson
Brooks (IN)	Hartzer	Palmer
Buchanan	Hern, Kevin	Posey
Buck	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Bucshon	Hice (GA)	Reschenthaler
Budd	Higgins (LA)	Rice (SC)
Burgess	Holding	Roby
Calvert	Hollingsworth	Rodgers (WA)
Carter (GA)	Hudson	Roe, David P.
Carter (TX)	Huizenga	Rogers (AL)
Chabot	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (KY)
Cline	Jacobs	Rooney (FL)
Cloud	Johnson (LA)	Rose, John W.
Cole	Johnson (OH)	Rouzer
Collins (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Roy
Comer	Jordan	Rutherford
Conaway	Joyce (OH)	Schweikert
Crawford	Joyce (PA)	Shimkus
Crenshaw	Katko	Smith (MO)
Davidson (OH)	Keller	Smith (NE)
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (PA)	Smucker
Diaz-Balart	King (IA)	Spano
Duncan	King (NY)	Staubert
Dunn	Kinziger	Stefanik
Emmer	LaHood	Steil
Estes	LaMalfa	Steube
Ferguson	Latta	Stivers
Fitzpatrick	Lesko	Taylor
Fleischmann	Long	Thompson (PA)
Flores	Loudermilk	Thornberry