government Agencies and social media companies to restrict speech here in America.

Meta, the parent company of Facebook and Instagram, disclosed that it had communicated with more than 30 Federal officials about content moderation on its platform, including senior employees at the FDA, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, and the White House. YouTube, which is owned by Google, disclosed that it had such communications with 11 Federal officials.

The disturbing truth is that when the Biden administration officials don't like what Americans are saying, they simply reach out to their allies at unaccountable big tech companies to silence it.

Government using its power to coerce censorship of disfavored information is what the Chinese Communist Party or what the North Korean regime might do. It is not only fundamentally un-American, but often, it is unconstitutional. Government cannot use Big Tech as a tool to end-run the First Amendment.

The American people deserve to know when their government, which is supposed to work for them, is using Big Tech to censor their speech or manipulate the information they see. I introduced legislation in July of 2021 to require this transparency. Yet the Senate has failed to act on it.

The Disclose Government Censorship Act would require that government officials publicly disclose communications with Big Tech regarding their actions to restrict speech—actions that would plainly violate the First Amendment if the government did it itself. The act contains appropriate exceptions to protect legitimate law enforcement or national security activity.

It would also require a cooling-off period to address the revolving door that occurs between government and Big Tech. This Washington revolving door fuels politically driven censorship, as evidenced by the fact that the former FBI general counsel who resigned because of the Steele dossier scandal was then hired by Twitter and, unbelievably, was at the center of the decision to suppress the New York Post story in 2020.

Our Nation was founded on the ideal that protecting citizens' speech from government censorship—under the First Amendment—would protect the people's right to govern themselves by preventing the government from controlling information and ideas. Americans deserve to know when their government is covertly trying to accomplish what the First Amendment prohibits.

Now, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 2527 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I certainly fully appreciate Senator HAGERTY's interest in protecting the First Amendment and ensuring that legitimate speech is not unduly or unfairly restricted. I am also committed to holding big tech companies accountable. I held a series of bipartisan oversight hearings on social media this Congress, including bringing top executives in to testify and to answer tough questions.

The legislation, though, we are discussing today has not been considered by the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee. I certainly look forward to working with my colleague to explore these issues more fully, but given this bill has not been marked up by the committee, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, my Democratic colleague is objecting to legislation that simply allows Americans to see when the government is trying to censor them.

My colleague states that his objection is largely on procedural grounds, and he has concerns that my bill hasn't been marked up in committee, but the committee to which this bill was referred has had over a year to review the legislation, and no progress has been made.

I would ask that my colleague commit to working with me on my legislation to address this important First Amendment issue in the next Congress. This problem is simply too significant to ignore. Our government works for the American people. To ensure this continues, the First Amendment prohibits the government from controlling what Americans say or read. But now government is using Big Tech to accomplish that censorship. Without disclosure of such communications, Americans' free speech rights become a dead letter because there is no way to address improper government efforts to ban speech.

My legislation would preserve these rights by allowing Americans to see when government is trying to silence them. This is a basic element of self-government.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4431

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, which is a bill I first introduced in 2012 with Senator SHAHEEN of New Hampshire.

Senator CASSIDY from Louisiana has worked hard for years with me and with others to get this bill passed. I want to thank Senator CASSIDY, as well as the chair of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, Committee, Senator MURRAY; Ranking Member BURR of that same committee; and Majority Leader SCHUMER and others for all the work they have done to help us pass this bill.

This is a commonsense bill that has broad bipartisan, bicameral support. Everyone from the ACLU to the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce supports this legislation. These organizations didn't merely endorse the bill after reviewing it; they were actively involved in shaping the legislative text and finding agreement on the text that we are attempting to vote on, and they remain supportive today.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act simply closes a loophole in the 1978 Pregnancy Discrimination Act to allow pregnant workers to request reasonable accommodations—''reasonable accommodations''; you are going to hear that phrase a lot today—so that that worker can continue working safely during their pregnancy and upon returning to work after childbirth.

I am going to be coming back to that phrase in a moment, ''reasonable accommodations,'' but I want to cite just two examples among many. Just one from Pennsylvania—Janasia, a teaching assistant working at a childcare facility. She is from Bucks County, PA, in suburban Philadelphia. She suffered a miscarriage due to an infection during a previous pregnancy. When she got pregnant again, she asked for extra bathroom breaks, which were necessary to prevent contracting another infection. She was made to wait over an hour just to use the bathroom. Later that day, Janasia was fired.

This is just one example of a pregnant worker asking for a simple—simple—commonsense accommodation and being denied that accommodation.

What are other types of reasonable accommodations that pregnant workers might request? Light duty is a common example. Pregnant people are routinely advised by their doctors to limit how much they lift, whether it is 20 pounds or 25 pounds or 30 pounds.

Peggy Young was a UPS driver who requested light duty when she was pregnant. Other workers had received light duty, but she was denied because there was no requirement under the 1978 Pregnancy Discrimination Act to provide reasonable accommodations. That is the loophole we are trying to fix. Peggy Young was forced onto unpaid leave and eventually took her case all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Other common accommodations a pregnant worker might request are stools or water bottles. Cashiers and other retail workers are often denied these reasonable accommodations that can help them maintain a healthy pregnancy.

There have also been multiple cases where pregnant workers have been demoted or forced into lower paying jobs because their employer refused to provide uniforms that can accommodate

the worker's pregnancy even though the pregnancy did not affect the worker's ability to perform essential job functions.

These are all examples of simple changes employers can provide to a pregnant worker's job duties or requirements that would not substantially inconvenience the employer, while allowing pregnant workers to continue working through their pregnancies. Yet, all too often, pregnant workers are being denied these reasonable accommodations, leading to impossible choices for these workers.

Keep working in an unsafe environment. Is that a good choice? Taking leave early and running out before the baby is born? Or, No. 3, be let go or forced to quit and face the stress and financial strain that comes with losing their job.

There is no need for this to happen. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act sets up a simple framework that is easily understood and utilized by both employers and employees.

Under the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, a pregnant employee may request reasonable accommodations from their employer. The worker and the employer will then engage in an interactive process to determine how the employer can provide these reasonable accommodations to the worker. This protects both parties. The worker may not be forced to accept accommodations that are not needed and that do not address the original concern. The employer cannot be asked to provide an accommodation that would cause an undue burden on that employer.

If this process sounds familiar, that is because we have carefully crafted it to closely resemble the process under the Americans with Disabilities Act. The ADA is 30 years old—lots of case law in those years, testing and probing and examining this reasonable accommodations standard. So we have 30 years of evidence that reasonable accommodations is a way to protect workers who have a disability in the workplace, and it is also a great way to protect a pregnant worker. Reasonable accommodations.

Mr. President, at this time I will yield to my colleague, the Chair of the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Pensions, and Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The Senator from Washington.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Ms. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator BALDWIN be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4431—CONTINUED

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am here today because no one should have to choose between their job and a healthy pregnancy.

It is outrageous that pregnant women in our country have been pushed out of their jobs by their employers because, as you just heard, they asked for an additional bathroom break or because their doctors say they need to avoid heavy lifting or because their employer can't be bothered to simply provide them a stool to sit down on.

It is unconscionable that people who are looking forward to welcoming a new family member are having their lives upturned or losing the paychecks they depend on to make rent or buy groceries or pay for childcare, all because their employers refuse to provide basic, commonsense, low-cost and even no-cost accommodations. We have got to do better.

That is why I am here with Senator CASEY, who has been a relentless champion on this issue, to urge all of my colleagues to let us pass the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, which is a bipartisan bill that will make sure that no one is forced to choose between a job and a healthy pregnancy and everyone can get the reasonable workplace accommodations they need when they are pregnant.

Let me be clear: This is, fundamentally, a bipartisan bill that we have worked closely with our Republican colleagues on. Senator CASSIDY coleads this bill. He has been an amazing partner. It passed out of the HELP Committee overwhelmingly. It is supported by my ranking member Senator BURR, and it passed overwhelmingly on a bipartisan House vote.

There is no reason to stand in the way. We can send this to the President's desk right now.

We are really not here asking for much. This is very simple. Give pregnant workers a break, give them a seat, and give them a hand. Give them the dignity, the respect, and basic workplace accommodations that they need.

This is way overdue, and I can't think of a more commonsense, less controversial bill, and I hope that we can get it done today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I just want to add parenthetically before I offer the unanimous consent request—Senator MURRAY made reference to the overwhelming support. This bill, when it comes to a final vote, will have at least 60 votes in the Senate, if not more. I think it will be more than that.

But we should also note the passage in the House that Senator MURRAY made reference to, better than 3-to-1, 315 to 101, more than 75 percent of House Members support it—obviously bipartisan.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader, that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 425, S. 4431; further, that there be up to 2 hours of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, and that the only amendments in order be No. 1, LEE, and No. 2, BRAUN; further, that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the amendments in the order listed with a 60 affirmative vote threshold required for adoption; and that following the disposition of the amendments, the bill be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended, with a 60 vote affirmative threshold required for passage without further intervening action or debate. Finally, that there be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to each vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

I have to begin by thanking my friend and colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania, for his efforts to ensure that pregnant women have access to accommodations—reasonable accommodations at work. They need to have healthy pregnancies.

As the husband of a wife who had two children while she was working and a grandfather of two grandchildren with a daughter who is a nurse, I absolutely want to make sure that those reasonable accommodations are accounted for.

However, in its current form, this legislation before us would give Federal bureaucrats at the EEOC authority to mandate that employers nationwide provide accommodations such as leave to obtain abortions on demand under the guise of a pregnancy-related condition. Worse still, the legislation would subject pro-life organizations, including churches and religious organizations, to potentially crippling lawsuits if they refuse to facilitate abortions in direct violation of their religious beliefs and their moral convictions.

Unlike title VII and the Americans with Disabilities Act, this legislation contains no exemptions for religious organizations.

I and a number of other people do not believe that abortion is healthcare. I believe it is a brutal procedure that destroys an innocent child.

The Federal Government should not be promoting abortion, let alone mandating that pro-life employers and employers in States that protect life facilitate abortion-on-demand.

I hope that we can work together on this legislation and amend it to address those concerns so that all the reasonable accommodations they worked so hard to achieve can be passed and can gain my support and the support of other colleagues. But until such time, sir, I have to object; and on behalf of Senator LANKFORD, Senator DAINES, and myself, I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. I yield to my colleague from Louisiana.