

By passing this bill, Congress would finally grant the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo and the Alabama-Coushatta Tribes the rights, opportunities, and stability they have long been denied.

Therefore, I urge a "yes" vote on this important piece of legislation, and I am grateful to the leaders in the committee for their support.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the dean of the House.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, chairman, and the sponsor for this legislation.

It is a strange thing. If you hang around here long enough, you keep seeing the other end of your tail. We introduced these bills, and there was never any intention to exclude these two Tribes, never.

When Mo Udall and I started the gaming law, everybody thought we were nuts. It has worked. But never were these two Tribes to be excluded. In fact, this legislation rectifies that problem.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be a sponsor of the legislation, who worked with you to try to get this done. This will be justice served to all.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I support this bipartisan bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank both Representative ESCOBAR and Representative GONZALES for their leadership to right this wrong, this injustice.

I thank the dean of the House, Representative YOUNG, for his very informative history lesson on the legislation. I also thank Ranking Member WESTERMAN for his bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to support the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2208.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2547, COMPREHENSIVE DEBT COLLECTION IMPROVEMENT ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1065, PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 380 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 380

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2547) to expand and enhance consumer, student, servicemember, and small business protections with respect to debt collection practices, 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 Financial Services now printed in the bill, 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 Financial Services or their respective designees; (2) the further amendments described in section 2 of this resolution; (3) the amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution; and (4) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. After debate pursuant to the first 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 3 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. 3. It shall be in order at any time after debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution for the chair of the Committee on Financial Services or her 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 Financial Services or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 4. 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 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1065) 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 or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. (a) At any time through the legislative day of Friday, May 14, 2021, the Speaker may entertain motions offered by the Majority Leader or a designee that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV with respect to multiple measures described in subsection (b), and the Chair shall put the question on any such motion without debate or intervening motion.

(b) A measure referred to in subsection (a) includes any measure that was the object of a motion to suspend the rules on the legislative day of May 11, 2021, or May 12, 2021, in the form as so offered, on which the yeas and nays were ordered and further proceedings postponed pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX.

(c) Upon the offering of a motion pursuant to subsection (a) concerning multiple measures, the ordering of the yeas and nays on postponed motions to suspend the rules with respect to such measures is vacated to the end that all such motions are considered as withdrawn.

SEC. 7. House Resolution 379 is hereby adopted.

□ 1415

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERLMUTTER. 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 gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee met yesterday and reported a rule, House Resolution 380, providing for consideration of H.R. 2547, the Comprehensive Debt Collection Improvement 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 Financial Services or their designees. The rule self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairwoman WATERS, makes in order 14 amendments, provides en bloc authority for Chairwoman WATERS or her designee and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 1065, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, under a closed rule, which provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee

on Education and Labor or their designees, and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule deems as passed H. Res. 379, a resolution to dismiss the election contest in Illinois' 14th Congressional District.

Finally, the rule provides the majority leader or his designee the ability to en bloc requested roll call votes on suspension bills considered on May 11 or May 12. This authority lasts through May 14.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased we are here today to provide consideration of two important bills to protect and support our constituents. First is the Comprehensive Debt Collection Improvement Act, which will create protections for servicemembers, small businesses, students, and other consumers against mistreatment by debt collectors. Debt collection is consistently one of the top complaints made to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and the pandemic has further exposed weaknesses in current consumer protection laws.

In March, the Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Financial Institutions, which I chair, held a hearing on protecting consumers during the pandemic. We heard expert witnesses discuss how many debt collectors have seen record profits in the pandemic, despite many families and individuals continuing to struggle.

H.R. 2547 is comprehensive legislation to update consumer protections in debt collection across many different issues. For example, the bill codifies and expands protections for small and minority-owned businesses and prohibits debt collectors from threatening a servicemember with reduction in rank or other military disciplinary actions. Additionally, it protects private student loan borrowers with disabilities, would prohibit entities from collecting medical debt or reporting it to a credit reporting agency without giving the consumer notice about his or her rights, and clarifies that entities in nonjudicial foreclosure proceedings are covered by the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act.

This legislation is sponsored by Financial Services Committee Chairwoman MAXINE WATERS and incorporates bills from committee members, Representatives NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, MADELEINE DEAN, RASHIDA TLAIB, AYANNA PRESSLEY, EMANUEL CLEAVER, GREG MEEKS, and JAKE AUCHINCLOSS. The bill is supported by many consumer and civil rights organizations, including Americans for Financial Reform, Center for Responsible Lending, Color of Change, Consumer Federation of America, National Consumer Law Center, Public Citizen, U.S. PIRG, and others.

This legislation will update and improve debt collection consumer protection laws, and make sure that small businesses, families, and individuals are treated fairly as we all work to come out of this pandemic stronger.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 1065, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. Claims of pregnancy discrimination have been on the rise for two decades and affect all industries and regions across the country. This bipartisan bill will strengthen workplace protections and promote the well-being of pregnant workers by creating a new right to pregnancy accommodation in the workplace.

Temporary modifications at work, like regular breaks, a stool to sit on, or an exemption from heavy lifting, can be the difference between a healthy pregnancy and pregnancy complications. When pregnant workers are denied reasonable workplace accommodations, they are often left to choose between their financial stability and a healthy pregnancy.

Currently, only 30 States require employers to provide reasonable accommodations for pregnant workers, including, thankfully, my home State of Colorado. But this has created a confusing patchwork of local, State, and Federal laws, leaving many pregnant workers with few protections.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act enjoys support from both worker advocates and business groups because it is good for families, it is good for business, and it is good for the economy. The House passed this bill last Congress in a broad, bipartisan vote of 329–73, and I hope more of my colleagues join us in passing the bill this year.

I urge all my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bills. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman, my good friend from Colorado, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

The rule before us today provides for consideration of two pieces of legislation. The first bill, H.R. 1065, would create a stand-alone law requiring employers to provide accommodations to known limitations related to pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions.

Republicans have long supported antidiscrimination legislation, including protections for pregnant workers. We agree pregnant workers should be protected and accommodated in the workplace. However, it is disappointing that the Education and Labor Democrats absolutely refuse to work with committee Republicans to include a longstanding provision protecting religious organizations from being forced to make employment decisions that conflict with their faith. I really hope that moving forward, my colleagues across the aisle will actually work with Republicans and help protect religious liberty.

The rule also makes in order H.R. 2547, the Comprehensive Debt Collection Improvement Act, a collection of eight Financial Services bills that claim to address the debt collection practices and the problems thereof in

the U.S. economy. But in reality, this measure is just the latest step in House Democrats' socialist takeover of our country's financial system.

Under the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, consumers are already protected from harmful debt collection practices. While Democrats claim H.R. 2547 is necessary due to the economic effects of COVID–19, several of these partisan bills were introduced last Congress prior to the pandemic.

It is absolutely clear that my colleagues across the aisle are using the COVID–19 pandemic as an excuse to dismantle our free market system and force their radical, progressive agenda on the American people.

Instead of actually helping consumers, H.R. 2547 will increase healthcare costs and make credit more expensive for borrowers. In fact, under this legislation, the lowest income borrowers may be pushed out of the system entirely.

Further, H.R. 2547 will make it harder for small businesses, many of which have been devastated by this pandemic. It will make it harder for those small businesses to receive payments for services rendered.

Finally, H.R. 2547 undermines the CFPB's October 2020 final rule, intended to modernize debt collection practices. This rule was the result of more than 7 years of research and set forth guidelines for both consumers and debt collectors on acceptable communications.

During committee consideration of this bill, Ranking Member MCHENRY offered a substitute amendment to address bipartisan concerns with the current financial framework. This commonsense proposal included provisions to prevent debt collection harassment of servicemembers, provide protection for cosigners in cases of death or permanent disability, and prohibited the use of Social Security numbers by consumer reporting agencies.

The majority, however, refused to work with Republicans. This refusal is just the latest in the Democrats' disturbing "my way or the highway" approach on issues where there is actually room for bipartisan solutions.

House Republicans will continue to support policies that provide Americans with access to affordable credit, while ensuring that our financial system remains safe and sound.

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this rule. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I include in the RECORD a letter dated May 10, 2021, from about 85 different public interest and financial organizations supporting H.R. 2547.

MAY 10, 2021.

Re H.R. 2547, the "Comprehensive Debt Collection Improvement Act" (Waters), which includes:

HR 2540, the "Small Business Fairness Lending Act" (Velázquez).

HR 1491, the "Fair Debt Collection Practices for Servicemembers Act" (Dean).

HR 2498, the "Private Loan Disability Discharge Act" (Dean).

HR 2537, the "Consumer Protection for Medical Debt Collections Act" (Tlaib).

HR 1657, the "Ending Debt Collection Harassment Act" (Pressley).

HR 2572, the "Stop Debt Collection Abuse Act" (Cleaver).

HR 2628, the "Debt Collection Practices Harmonization Act" (Meeks).

HR 2458, the "Non-Judicial Foreclosure Debt Collection Clarification Act" (Auchincloss).

Representative NANCY PELOSI, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Representative KEVIN MCCARTHY, Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND MINORITY LEADER MCCARTHY: The 85 undersigned public interest, legal services, consumer, labor, and civil rights organizations write in support of HR 2547 and urge you to support this legislation when it comes up for a vote on May 13th.

Prior to the pandemic, the Urban Institute reported that more than 68 million adults in the U.S. had one or more debts in collection on their credit report, and consumer debt has continued to grow during the pandemic, reaching \$14.56 trillion at the end of 2020.

Debt in collection can wreak havoc on consumers, subjecting them to harassing debt collection calls and potential lawsuits. Despite the enactment of the federal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA") in 1977, debt collection remains a frequent source of complaints to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, Federal Trade Commission, and other state and federal agencies.

Data from the Urban Institute also show racial disparities in debt collection, with 39 percent of residents in communities of color with debt in collection compared to 24 percent of residents in white communities. These statistics highlight the fact that consumer protections for consumers with alleged debts in collection are also a racial justice issue.

Additionally, other groups may be particularly vulnerable to abusive debt collection practices including servicemembers, older consumers, and consumers with limited English proficiency.

To better protect vulnerable consumers, this bill would enact a wide variety of critical reforms, including:

Prohibiting the use of confessions of judgment as an unfair credit practice that eliminate notice and the right to be heard;

Prohibiting certain abusive collection practices directed at servicemembers, including threats to reduce rank or revoke security clearance;

Requiring discharge of private student loans due to total and permanent disability;

Prohibiting collection of medical debt for the first two years and credit reporting of debt arising from any medically necessary procedures;

Requiring debt collectors to obtain consent before using electronic communications and provide written validation notices;

Amending the FDCPA to expand and clarify coverage, including extending coverage for all federal, state, and local debts collected by debt collectors;

Adjusting statutory damages in the FDCPA for inflation and indexing them to index for inflation in the future; and

Clarifying FDCPA coverage for non-judicial foreclosures.

Enactment of H.R. 2547 will protect vulnerable consumers from abusive debt collection practices, and we thank the House of Representatives for considering legislation to address these important issues.

Please feel free to contact April Kuehnhoff at the National Consumer Law Center, regarding this legislation.

Very truly yours,

Alaska PIRG; Americans for Financial Reform; Arizona PIRG; California Low-Income Consumer Coalition (CLICC); CALPIRG; Center for Economic Integrity; Center for Responsible Lending; Color of Change; Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice; ConnPIRG; Consumer Action; Consumer Federation of America; Consumer Reports; CoPIRG.

Demos; Equal Justice Under Law; Every Texan; Fines and Fees Justice Center; Florida PIRG; Friendship of Women, Inc.; Georgia PIRG; Georgia Watch; GLOBAL GREEN INITIATIVE; Housing and Family Services of Greater New York; HPPCARES; Illinois PIRG; Insight Center for Community Economic Development; Institute for Constitutional Advocacy and Protection; Iowa PIRG; Kentucky Resources Council; Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area; Legal Action Chicago; Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, Inc.; Legal Aid Justice Center; Legal Aid Service of Broward County, Inc.; Legal Services Center of Harvard Law School; Long Island Housing Services, Inc.; Maryland Consumer Rights Coalition; Maryland PIRG; MASSPIRG.

Michigan League for Public Policy; Mississippi Center for Justice; Missouri Faith Voices; MontPIRG; MoPIRG; Mountain State Justice; National Association of Consumer Advocates; National Center for Access to Justice; National Center for Law and Economic Justice; National Consumer Law Center (on behalf of its low-income clients); National Fair Housing Alliance; NCIPIRG; New Jersey Citizen Action; New York Taxi Workers Alliance; NHPIRG; NJPIRG; NMPIRG; Ohio PIRG; Ohio Poverty Law Center; Oregon PIRG (OSPIRG).

PennPIRG; Pennsylvania Council of Churches; PIRG in Michigan (PIRGIM); Public Citizen; Public Counsel; Public Good Law Center; Public Justice; Public Justice Center; Public Law Center; RIPIRG; South Carolina Appleseed Legal Justice Center; Student Borrower Protection Center; Texas Appleseed; TexPIRG; The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; Tzedek DC; U.S. PIRG; United Way of Massachusetts Bay and Merrimack Valley; Virginia Citizens Consumer Council; Washoe Legal Services; WASHPIRG; Western Center on Law and Poverty; WISPIRG; Woodstock Institute; WV Citizen Action.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I appreciate my friend from Pennsylvania's comments, but, apparently, consumer protection is not high on the list of priorities for the other side of the aisle.

I would just say, this particular piece of legislation, H.R. 2547, has many good aspects, a number of which are bipartisan in nature:

It codifies the protections that currently exist under the FTC regulation for consumer loans prohibiting the use of confessions of judgment that waive due process protections, and extends those protections to commercial loans to protect small and minority-owned businesses.

It prohibits debt collectors from threatening a servicemember with re-

duction in their rank and revoking their security clearance or prosecuting them under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and requires a GAO study on the impact of debt collection on servicemembers.

It requires discharge of private student loans for both the borrower and cosigner in the case of permanent disability of the borrower, extending protections that currently exist for Federal student loans. So it assists people with serious disabilities.

It requires private lenders who are notified the Federal Government has discharged the Federal student loans of a borrower to discharge the private student loans of that same borrower.

It bars entities from collecting medical debt or reporting it to a consumer reporting agency without giving the consumer a notice about their rights.

These are so simple, and you would expect that there would be universal acceptance of this, but apparently not.

It provides a minimum 1-year delay from adverse information reported and a 2-year delay before collection attempts are made on these medical bills.

□ 1430

We heard last night in committee even Dr. BURGESS talking about the normal practices of medical professionals allowing people to have time to pay their bills, especially when we are in the middle of a pandemic or as we are coming out of a pandemic.

It bans the reporting of medical debts arising from medically necessary procedures. This was something that Ralph Hall, a Republican, championed for years.

It prohibits a debt collector from contacting a consumer by email or text message without a consumer's consent to be contacted electronically.

It requires the CFPB to analyze and annually report on the impact of electronic communications utilized by debt collectors.

The provisions of this bill are simple, consumer-oriented efforts to provide information to the consumer debtor and to take into consideration that we are in a pandemic and medical bills have piled up for so many people.

This is a very simple bill. It has bipartisan provisions in it. It should be passed, as should the rule.

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE).

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1065.

There is language that I find many Democrats use in a lot of Democrats' bills. It is called pregnancy rights. Pregnancy rights means abortion to them, and I really don't understand that because that is not pregnancy. Abortion is killing a baby in the womb. That is not pregnancy rights. That is one issue we have there.

Democrats are once again using identity politics—this identity is a pregnant woman—to overregulate businesses. Rather than giving mothers greater access to paid family leave or making healthcare affordable, Democrats want to double down on a government mandate that punishes businesses and religious organizations and provides more access to abortion. That is killing the baby in the womb. That is not pregnancy rights.

Passing this bill means a small business or religious organization could be forced to provide paid time off to an employee to have an abortion even if that violates the religious beliefs of the organization. On top of that, these groups can be sued for damages for not taking every step to accommodate pregnant workers. That means churches and small businesses, the backbone of America, will be tied up in court for years seeking to comply with a one-size-fits-all government agenda from Washington.

The solution to this problem is to reopen America, reduce government regulations on small businesses, and keep Trump tax cuts that allow companies to keep more of their money to pass on to employees.

I cannot support a bill that allows more abortion.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, as to H.R. 1065, there are at least 20, if not more, Republican cosponsors of that piece of legislation. I want the RECORD to reflect that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS), a member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, debt collectors often operate with impunity, threatening servicepeople, denying small business owners due process, and harassing customers and homeowners with repeated calls, texts, and emails.

Harassment by debt collectors negatively affects students' career decisions, small business growth, homeownership, and families' financial stability. It hurts the economy and amplifies racial, gender, and socioeconomic inequities across the Nation.

For example, rates of student loan distress are especially concentrated among low-income borrowers, borrowers in rural areas, and borrowers of color. Debt collectors incessantly contacting borrowers without consent adds another layer of loan distress, particularly during this pandemic.

This is why I introduced an amendment to this bill that requires a GAO investigation of communications by debt collectors, including specific recommendations for Congress to reduce the harassment and abuse of individuals with debt.

The Comprehensive Debt Collection Improvement Act is critical to protecting students, servicemembers, small business owners, and consumers with debt from predatory practices.

I urge my colleagues to support this entire legislation. It is important for

the dignity of the average borrower in this country.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, you wouldn't know it from the Democrats' floor schedule, but Sunday marked the beginning of National Police Week.

In 1962, President John F. Kennedy signed a proclamation designating May 15 as Peace Officers Memorial Day, and the week in which that date falls as Police Week.

Throughout this week, our Nation honors and pays tribute to law enforcement officers who made the ultimate sacrifice to keep our country and our communities safe.

When Republicans controlled the House, we marked this week by moving legislation to support our police officers and help them keep our communities safe. In stark contrast, this liberal, progressive majority is not moving a single bill to support law enforcement during this year's Police Week.

Instead, Democrats are choosing to ignore Police Week, even though 2020 was the deadliest year on record for police officers in 50 years; even though, barely 1 month ago, Capitol Police Officer Billy Evans, a father of two, was killed defending this very building in which we stand; and even though more police officers have been shot and killed in the first 4½ months of 2021 than in all of 2020 and 2019.

I guess that is not surprising coming from the party that has openly attacked our law enforcement officers and called for defunding, dismantling, and abolishing the police.

Don't believe me? Just take their word for it.

Congresswoman RASHIDA TLAIB tweeted: "Policing in our country is inherently and intentionally racist." The Congresswoman then went on and said: "No more policing, incarceration, and militarization."

Congresswoman CORI BUSH called St. Louis' decision to eliminate \$4 million from the city's police budget a "historic" move that "marks a new future for our city."

Then there is Chairwoman MAXINE WATERS, chairwoman of the Financial Services Committee, who tweeted, and I read the tweet verbatim: "Police reform is not enough. Getting rid of serial, racist, ignorant, and stupid cops must be a top priority. Let's call them out."

Not only is this disrespectful to the men and women who put their lives on the line every day to protect our communities, but it is actually dangerous. The stats speak for themselves. In Democrat-run cities that defunded the police, they have seen increases in crime. Let's look at some of the numbers.

Austin, Texas: They cut funding for police by \$150 million. In return, they saw a 50 percent spike in homicides.

Los Angeles: L.A. defunded the police by \$175 million. They, too, experienced an increase in crime, an 11.6 percent rise in homicides.

Then, there is New York City. New York City cut police funding by \$1 billion, that is billion with a B. In return, New York City saw a 97 percent rise in shootings and a 45 percent increase in homicides. Let me repeat that for you because the stats are so alarming: a 97 percent increase in shootings and a 45 percent increase in homicides.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans support law enforcement officers and want to help them do their jobs safely, effectively, and professionally. That is why if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to consider Congressman DON BACON's Back the Blue Act, Congressman JOHN RUTHERFORD's Protect and Serve Act, and Congressmen MCCAUL, CUELLAR, and CHABOT's Jaime Zapata and Victor Avila Federal Law Enforcement Protection Act. Let's talk about each one of those bills.

The Back the Blue Act would protect our police officers by making it a Federal crime to kill or assault a Federal law enforcement officer.

The Protect and Serve Act would create enhanced penalties for anyone who targets law enforcement officers and purposefully harms them.

The Jaime Zapata and Victor Avila Federal Law Enforcement Protection Act, a bipartisan piece of legislation, would ensure individuals who harm or attempt to harm U.S. Federal officers or employees serving abroad can be brought to justice and prosecuted here in the United States.

Mr. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEHLS). He is here to explain this amendment. He is my good friend and a former law enforcement officer.

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Back the Blue Act, the Serve and Protect Act, and the Jaime Zapata and Victor Avila Federal Law Enforcement Protection Act. Mr. Speaker, all of these are necessary and commonsense protections for our brave law enforcement officers.

The hateful anti-law-enforcement rhetoric over the past 12 months has led to violence and division in Democrat-controlled cities across our country. We saw it in Seattle, Minneapolis, and Portland, city blocks burned, businesses destroyed, lives ruined.

Our local, State, and Federal law enforcement officers have been subjected to violence like we have never seen in this country, ambush shootings taking officers' lives, violent riots, police precincts burned to the ground—yes, burned to the ground.

Now more than ever, we need to send a loud and clear message to would-be criminals targeting our brave law enforcement officers: If you attack or harm law enforcement in any way, you will pay. We back the blue in this country.

To the radicals chanting to defund and abolish law enforcement, who are you going to call if an armed criminal breaks into your home? It is certainly not going to be a social worker.

We are a nation of laws and law and order. Without law enforcement, our country would cease to exist. Keep that in mind when you hear anti-law-enforcement zealots chanting to abolish police. What they are really advocating for is abolishing the United States of America.

The hatred, vitriol, and violence against law enforcement have to stop. We need to stand and support our law enforcement officers. That is why I urge my colleagues to support the Back the Blue Act, the Serve and Protect Act, and the Jaime Zapata and Victor Avila Federal Law Enforcement Protection Act.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I want to remind my friends on the Republican side of the aisle that we passed a bill about 2 months ago called the American Rescue Plan. Not one Republican voted for that. That had money to support law enforcement and local governments and cities and States that saw their tax revenues fall off a cliff.

Mr. Speaker, when my friend, Mr. RESCENTHALER, says, oh, a billion dollars was cut from the funding here, or \$150 million cut from there, he forgot to talk about the fact that tax revenues across the country for local governments and State governments were cut to the bone because of the pandemic.

If my friends really wanted to put their money where their mouths are, then they would have supported the American Rescue Plan because it provided \$350 billion to State and local governments so that they could increase funding to the police, to law enforcement, to social services, to a whole variety of agencies and needs. But, apparently, they chose not to. Instead, they choose to bring claims that Democrats want to defund the police, which couldn't be further from the truth.

We put our money where our mouths are, and we said we support law enforcement. We support local government employees. We support State government employees. We provided in the American Rescue Plan, which not a single Republican voted for, hazard pay because it has been so difficult for law enforcement and for so many others to conduct their services, to be out in the community during this particular pandemic.

Mr. Speaker, I just would suggest to my friends, next time they get an opportunity to actually provide funding

to law enforcement, they vote for it and not just say they are supportive of it. Let's put their moneys where their mouths are.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL).

□ 1445

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, give me a break. Since when is having babies a liberal activity?

In fact, I believe that police women have babies, too. And let me tell you about a couple of other women.

Erica was working at a warehouse lifting heavy boxes. She had been working there for years. And when she was denied her request to pick up lighter boxes, she lost her pregnancy.

Hannah gave 5 years of her life to a healthcare company, was consistently promoted; but when she disclosed her pregnancy to her employer, she was fired.

And Sara, who spent 7 years building a tech startup from the ground up and truly loved her job and had been promised a promotion when she came back from maternity leave, had it revoked.

These are all true stories of women who have faced the real-world consequence of discrimination against pregnant workers in America. So right now, if a woman becomes pregnant, she can be denied, for example, an extra bathroom break, a place to sit, a lighter lifting, or fired for asking for simple accommodations or even just disclosing that she is pregnant.

This leaves many women having to choose between the health of their pregnancy and putting foods on their family's table. We are putting women in danger every single day while we hold off on this action. They are real-world implications for women like Erica and Sara and Hannah, especially in light of how women have really suffered the brunt of the job loss during the pandemic and as we see a rise in maternal mortality rates for women of color.

Mr. Speaker, so these stories are not unique. Pregnancy should not prevent a woman from putting food on the table, for paying her bills.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everybody to pass this good and needed bill, Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Colorado was talking about money in the American Rescue Plan and money going to States and how that is being used. Let's be clear about something.

California was actually running a surplus in their budget, yet that didn't stop them from taking the money from the American Rescue Plan and giving that not to the police, but to illegal immigrants.

And there is this myth out there that Democrats really don't want to defund

the police. I would say that it is not a myth. They actually do want to defund and dismantle the police. But don't take my words for it. We can take the words of my liberal colleagues, the Democrats.

Representative ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ, when reacting to Mayor Bill de Blasio's plan to cut one-sixth of New York City's Police Department budget, she actually deemed that as insufficient. And I will quote my colleague: "Defunding the police means defunding police. It doesn't mean budget tricks or funny math."

Again, that was my colleague from New York, a Democrat. Her words, not mine.

Representative CORI BUSH, when celebrating St. Louis defunding their police force, despite consistently ranking as one of the most dangerous cities in the United States, to that my colleague said: "Today's decision to defund the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department is historic. It marks a new future for our city."

Well, my colleague might be half correct because it was historic. It did usher in a new future for that city, and that is the fact that you have crime rates rising to historic levels.

My colleague from Missouri continued and she also said: "If we remove that"—meaning the funding from the police, if we cut police funding—"and take that money and put it into our education system, put it into making sure our unhoused community members are sheltered, putting it into mental health resources, that is what we are saying because that is what is going to make our communities safer."

So please stop the myth that Democrats actually don't want to defund the police. They absolutely do. They have said it over and over again, and their policies have proven it in many cities.

And what do the American people get?

Increased crime rates.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD), my good friend and a former sheriff.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge defeat of the previous question so that we can immediately consider the Protect and Serve Act, my bipartisan bill to increase penalties for individuals who deliberately target law enforcement officers with violence.

Throughout my 40 years of law enforcement, including 12 as sheriff, I have seen firsthand the dangerous situations our men and women in law enforcement face every day. In Jacksonville, in fact, our memorial wall is filled with the names of many good police officers who laid down their lives in service to their community.

This Police Week, we are honoring the memory of the 394 officers our Nation lost last year. We pause to remember their sacrifice and pledge to support policies that keep our officers

safe. These policies should include harsh penalties for violence targeted against our men and women in blue.

When I first introduced the Protect and Serve Act in 2018, it was overwhelmingly passed by the House 382–35.

Police Week has always been a unifying time to honor those lost, but now, now the majority will barely acknowledge it.

What is going on?

I think the answer is simple. Supporting our police has become unpopular in the Democratic Party. Pressure from online radicals, political pundits who have never worn a badge, never been on a ride-along, they are dictating what policies the House majority will support.

To make matters worse, House Democrats are pushing a police reform bill right now that eliminates qualified immunity, the lifeblood of law enforcement. Mr. Speaker, without qualified immunity, the entire profession would end as we know it today.

It makes you wonder if that is their goal: End local law enforcement and replace it with a national police force similar to almost every socialist country in the world.

Regardless, the growing antipolice rhetoric and widespread efforts to defund police departments are leaving officers increasingly at risk to attacks in communities less safe.

As mentioned earlier, we are not even halfway through 2021 and we have already seen more police officers shot this year than all of last year. Meanwhile, as mentioned earlier, American cities are experiencing a spike in violent crime. The U.S. surpassed 20,000 murders last year for the first time since 1995. And just this year, shootings in Chicago, up 43 percent; New York City, Los Angeles, up 36 percent; Washington, D.C., homicide up 63 percent.

Mr. Speaker, it turns out if you demoralize, defund, and delegitimize the police, crime goes up. I know many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do support law enforcement. I know that. In fact, I know that a particular few even have backgrounds in law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, so this is what I would like to impart to my Democrat colleagues: Here is your chance to say during Police Week that you support our law enforcement officers. Vote for my bill, the Protect and Serve Act, just like you did in 2018, and show your constituent police officers that you have their backs.

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD two Statements of Administration Policy. One on H.R. 2547, and the other one on H.R. 1065, both in support of the bills that are under consideration.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 2547—COMPREHENSIVE DEBT COLLECTION IMPROVEMENT ACT—REP. WATERS, D-CA, AND SEVEN COSPONSORS

The Administration supports House passage of H.R. 2547, the Comprehensive Debt

Collection Improvement Act. This legislation would expand necessary safeguards to ensure working families and small businesses are protected from predatory debt collection practices.

As our Nation works to recover from the worst economic and public health crises of our lifetimes, many families and small businesses are dealing with outstanding debts. In addition to providing robust relief, the government must also protect Americans from abusive and predatory practices.

H.R. 2547 would extend existing consumer protections against predatory lending arrangements to small businesses, prohibit debt collectors from threatening service members with a reduction in rank, prosecution or loss of security clearance, and restrict contact to consumers by email or text messages. The legislation would require discharge of private student loans for both the borrower and cosigners in the case of permanent disability for the borrower, establishing greater parity in protections for private and Federal student loan borrowers. The bill also clarifies protections for consumers in the case of non-judicial foreclosure proceedings.

The Administration applauds these steps to strengthen consumer protections for hard-working Americans and their families, and we look forward to working with the Congress further on the details of this legislation.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 1065—PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT—REP. NADLER, D-NY, AND 228 COSPONSORS

The Administration strongly supports House passage of H.R. 1065, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. Pregnant workers are too often unable to access simple changes to their working conditions that would allow them to keep doing their jobs and do so safely. This can create risks to their health as well as economic consequences. No worker should be forced to choose between a paycheck and a healthy pregnancy.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would provide basic, long overdue protections to ensure that pregnant workers and job applicants are not fired or otherwise discriminated against, or denied reasonable accommodations that allow them to work. Such protections promote family economic security by helping women stay in the workforce, including for those, often women of color, who are the sole or primary breadwinners in their families. Approximately two million women have left the workforce due to the COVID-19 pandemic, eroding more than 30 years of progress in women's labor force participation, and this Administration is committed to ensuring that women can both care for and support themselves and their families.

H.R. 1065 is a bipartisan bill that requires certain employers to make reasonable accommodations for qualified employees and job applicants with known limitations related to pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition. These accommodations might include simple modifications, such as modifying a no-food-or-drink policy, providing additional break time to use the bathroom, or helping avoid the lifting of heavy objects, depending on the circumstances. The bill would require employers to provide reasonable accommodations for qualified pregnant workers unless doing so would pose an undue hardship to the employer. It would also provide for an interactive process, where necessary, between employers and pregnant workers to determine appropriate and effective reasonable accommodations, and would protect pregnant workers from being denied employment opportunities, or from retaliation or interference, because they request or use an accommodation.

The Administration encourages the House to pass this bipartisan, commonsense legislation and looks forward to working with the Congress to protect pregnant workers across the country.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friends on the other side of the aisle trying to find a subject to talk about, since apparently they don't really have too many objections to either of the bills that are being discussed in the rule today.

Obviously, it doesn't seem like there is much conversation about H.R. 1065, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. And there isn't much discussion about the Comprehensive Debt Collection Improvement Act. Because those things are commonsense. They should be passed by this House. We thank so many Republicans for being cosponsors of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier in my opening remarks, a number of the provisions in the Comprehensive Debt Collection Improvement Act are really bipartisan, including the one Mr. Hall used to champion when he was a Member here in the Congress.

So you want to go off and talk about something else. I wonder where the outrage for brutality against our police was when a rightwing mob stormed this Capitol. And the only one of the people that really is speaking of the truth today in the Republican Caucus—Ms. CHENEY from Wyoming—was ousted from her leadership position because she talked about the truth and the fact there was a mob, and our police were beaten by a rightwing mob.

Mr. Speaker, so I would just say to my friends on the other side of the aisle: Take a look in the mirror, and let's support our police across the board. Because I certainly support the law enforcement in Colorado. I support our Capitol Police, our FBI—particularly, the FBI.

President Trump would always undercut the FBI.

So I would suggest to my friends: Take a look in the mirror. Let's all support our law enforcement because they are important members of our community.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Colorado is asking why we are talking about the police. Well, the Democrats have been doing a lot of talking about police themselves—lots of talking about police.

Representative ILHAN OMAR, in talking about the Minneapolis Police Department following the death of George Floyd, said: "You can't really reform a department that is rotten to the root."

So, again, we are talking about police because police are heroes. We have always stood with the police, as Republicans. I wish my Democrat colleagues could say the same. But they have said repeatedly throughout the summer, in the past, atrocious things about the police.

Chairwoman MAXINE WATERS, in response to the death of Rayshard Brooks, who tried to shoot officers with their own tasers during an attempted DUI arrest, said: "Police reform is not enough. Getting rid of serial racist, ignorant, and stupid cops must be a top priority. Let's call them out. Police protective unions, you have got to go, too."

The attacks go on and on, on our law enforcement. After the death of Daunte Wright, following a physical struggle where an officer fired their service weapon instead of the intended taser, Representative RASHIDA TLAIIB said: "Policing in our country is inherently and intentionally racist."

□ 1500

Representative TLAIIB has also said: "No more policing, incarceration, and militarization. It can't be reformed."

Again, this is what Democrats say about police.

And I know my colleague from Colorado said he supports police, but in response to riots across the country surrounding the death of George Floyd, my good friend from Colorado said: "Supporting Representative PRESSLEY's resolution to condemn all acts of police brutality, racial profiling, and excessive use of force is the first step, but an important step, in affecting change and working to end these injustices."

That sounds very benign, and understandably so. But if you look at the support for what the resolution actually said, let's read what the resolution said.

"The system of policing in America and its systemic targeting of and use of deadly and brutal force against people of color, particularly Black people, stems from the long legacy of slavery, lynching, Jim Crow laws, and the war on drugs in the United States."

So, in essence, supporting that resolution is really linking modern police to the horrors of slavery and Jim Crow. It is absolutely unacceptable.

Again, it was a Democrat, it was JFK in 1962, who declared this week Police Week. I just wish the current Democratic Party could stand with the Republicans and honor police, especially memorialize police who have died defending our communities and our country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON), my good friend the former general.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge defeat of the previous question so that we can immediately consider my bill to ensure that those who risk their lives to protect all of us are afforded greater protections as well.

I introduced the Back the Blue Act of 2021 with Senator CORNYN in the Senate and my two original cosponsors in the House, Representatives STIVERS and JOHNSON, during Police Week because this bill is needed now more than ever.

There have been more officers shot and killed in the last 4½ months of 2021

than all of 2020 and all of 2019. In 4½ months, we have had more fatalities, more murders of policemen than in the whole year of 2020 and the whole year of 2019. It is clear that we need to enforce greater protections for those who protect us, and that is why my colleagues and I introduced the Back the Blue Act.

The numbers are alarming. In 2018, 83 police officers were shot and 26 were killed. In 2019, 86 were shot and 18 were killed. And 2020, 89 were shot and 18 killed. This year, in 2021, as of April 30th, there have been 91 officers shot so far, and 19 of them killed by gunfire.

Our police are being targeted. We need to defend our law enforcement and public safety officers, and our bill does just that.

Specifically, the Back the Blue Act creates new criminal provisions to Federal law enforcement officers; U.S. judges; and federally funded public safety officers, such as firefighters, chaplains, and members of a rescue squad or ambulance crew.

The Back the Blue Act creates a new Federal crime for killing, attempting to kill, or conspiring to kill a Federal judge, Federal law enforcement officer or a federally funded public safety officer. The offender would be subject to the death penalty and a mandatory minimum sentence of 30 years if death results. The offender would otherwise face a minimum sentence of 10 years.

The bill creates a new Federal crime for assaulting a federally funded law enforcement officer with escalating penalties, including mandatory minimums based on the extent of any injury and the use of a dangerous weapon. However, no prosecution can be commenced absent certification by the Attorney General that prosecution is appropriate.

Now, I want to respond to my friend, who I respect, from Colorado. I condemned the behavior and the riot that occurred on January 6. Over one hundred of our policemen were injured. This bill provides extra protections for Capitol Hill law enforcement. Those who injured our Capitol Police on January 6 would be under greater punishment or penalties, if convicted.

Our bill also creates a new Federal crime for interstate flight from justice to avoid prosecution for killing, attempting to kill or conspiring to kill a Federal judge, Federal law enforcement officer or federally funded public safety officer. The offender would be subject to a mandatory minimum sentence of 10 years for this offense.

Lastly, the Back the Blue Act creates a specific aggravating factor for the Federal death penalty prosecutions. It expands self-defense and Second Amendment rights for law enforcement officers. It opens up grant funding to strengthen relationships between police and their communities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our law enforcement personally. I was a victim of crime twice, and both times I was deployed when I was assigned to the

Air Force. My house was robbed once when I was a captain deployed to Bahrain. Another time, someone assumed a false identity when I was a lieutenant colonel during the invasion of Iraq when I was flying combat operations. Thankfully, one of the times the police captured one of the perpetrators and arrested him and he was charged for a crime.

I deployed to go to the battle. Every day our police walk out their front door, after kissing their spouse goodbye, wondering if they are going to encounter a violent criminal. We cannot thank our police officers enough.

During Police Week, I urge my colleagues to support our first responders by immediately considering and supporting the Back the Blue Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, I commend my friend from Nebraska for condemning—finally, somebody condemning the riot and the attack that occurred against all of us and against our police, the Capitol Police, on January 6. I would also like to see more members of the Republican Party stand up and do exactly that same thing.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to see them do what Ms. CHENEY did, and condemn the ex-President, Donald Trump, for his role in inciting that whole mob action on January 6, and then we could start getting things back together.

Instead, my friend from Pennsylvania, reading a resolution that condemns racist policing that may have existed for a very long time, and I can't believe that he supports policing that is delivered in some kind of racist fashion. We have had too many people killed across this country. I know that is not what he meant.

So I just would urge us to focus on the bills that are at hand, which is the Comprehensive Debt Collection Improvement Act and the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, because those are important pieces of legislation that should be considered immediately by this House. And when we pass this rule, they will be considered.

So I oppose the gentleman's suggestions that we move to a different previous question. I appreciate Mr. BACON's comments about his bill. There are provisions in there that are really outstanding, but we are here to deal with debt collections and we are here to deal with pregnant workers' fairness.

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask how much time each side has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 2¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 10½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is relevant, these three police bills, because, as I said

when I opened, if we defeat this previous question, I will bring forth the amendment personally to bring up these three bills that actually honor our police officers.

Again, it is a historical norm in this body, in this Chamber, that during Police Week we focus on bills to help police officers. That is why this is relevant today. And the fact that my Democrat colleagues refuse to talk about the police raises a lot of questions. We need to help the police.

Let me just give you one example of the heroic acts of the police. After a suicidal man drove off a bridge into an ocean, San Diego Police Department K-9 officer, Jonathan Wiese, sprung into action, scaling down the side of a cliff to rescue twin 2-year-old sisters who were caught inside the vehicle.

When asked about this decision to throw himself over a cliff, Officer Wiese explained: "I didn't do this job to be liked every day. I didn't do it to become rich. I did it because I wanted to be out there making a difference and helping people."

That is the mentality of the men and women who are in our law enforcement. That is why this week they deserve our attention, and that is why my colleagues should be afforded the right to bring up their three bills through an amendment.

Mr. Speaker, while the rest of the Nation recognizes National Police Week and shows gratitude for the men and women keeping our communities safe, House Democrats are prioritizing two pieces of legislation that do absolutely nothing, nothing to help law enforcement officers.

Instead, they are jamming through a socialist takeover of our country's financial system that will actually hurt consumers and our Nation's small businesses. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, and I urge "no" on the underlying measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I, too, during this week, applaud our law enforcement and our first responders, but particularly law enforcement right now for their valor, for their protection of our communities. I appreciate the gentleman for bringing up that subject at this time.

But we are here on a rule dealing with the Comprehensive Debt Collection Improvement Act and Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. The treatment of consumers in the collection of debts and businesses and military personnel is a very important subject, especially during this time of COVID when so many families are struggling.

We have thousands and thousands of people who were laid off. In fact, where millions of people are still out of work a year and a half after COVID started. And, as a consequence, a lot of folks need assistance and need help, and they don't need to be hounded in improper ways as they go through this struggle.

So the Comprehensive Debt Collection Improvement Act is very important for the financial health of our consumers and people across the country. The provisions in the bill are bipartisan ideas to protect consumers from abusive debt collection practices. They also ensure pregnant women can receive reasonable workplace accommodations to ensure that they can stay in the workforce.

According to the CFPB 2021 Annual Report, more than one in four Americans have a third-party debt collection item attached to their credit report. And, last year, the CFPB received 82,700 consumer complaints about debt collection. It is time for Congress to act.

And based on the gentleman from Pennsylvania's argument, which has nothing to do with that particular bill or the facts as we have seen them develop during this pandemic, that should be an easy vote for everybody, whether they are Democrat or Republican.

The Comprehensive Debt Collection Improvement Act provides important consumer protections to stop abusive debt collection practices, and it ensures that small businesses, families, and individuals are treated fairly.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is necessary to support the more than 80 percent of women who will give birth to a child at some point during their working years. These women deserve to have reasonable accommodations, which oftentimes cost businesses little to no money to implement. So we can help pregnant women stay in the workforce. This bill passed on broad bipartisan vote last Congress, and I hope it passes with even more support again this week.

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

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 380

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 8. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 3079) to amend title 18, United States Code, to punish criminal offenses targeting law enforcement officers, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any 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 the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 9. Immediately after disposition of H.R. 3079, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 3080) to protect law enforcement officers, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any

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 the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 10. Immediately after disposition of H.R. 3080, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 2137) to amend title 18, United States Code, to further protect officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any 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 the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 11. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3079, H.R. 3080, and H.R. 2137.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 212, nays 206, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

YEAS—212

Adams	Cuellar	Johnson (TX)
Aguilar	Davids (KS)	Jones
Allred	Davidson	Kahele
Axne	Davis, Danny K.	Keating
Barragán	Dean	Kelly (IL)
Bass	DeFazio	Khanna
Beatty	DeGette	Kildee
Bera	DeLauro	Kilmer
Beyer	DelBene	Kim (NJ)
Bishop (GA)	Delgado	Kind
Blumenauer	Demings	Kirkpatrick
Blunt Rochester	DeSaulnier	Krishnamoorthi
Bonamici	Deutch	Kuster
Bourdeaux	Dingell	Lamb
Bowman	Doggett	Langevin
Boyle, Brendan	Doyle, Michael	Larsen (WA)
F.	F.	Larson (CT)
Brown	Escobar	Lawrence
Brownley	Eshoo	Lawson (FL)
Bush	Espallat	Lee (CA)
Bustos	Evans	Lee (NV)
Butterfield	Fletcher	Leger Fernandez
Carbajal	Foster	Levin (CA)
Cárdenas	Frankel, Lois	Levin (MI)
Carson	Gallago	Lieu
Carter (LA)	Garamendi	Lofgren
Cartwright	Garcia (IL)	Lowenthal
Case	Garcia (TX)	Luria
Casten	Gomez	Lynch
Castor (FL)	Gonzalez,	Malinowski
Castro (TX)	Vicente	Maloney,
Chu	Gottheimer	Carolyn B.
Ciilline	Green, Al (TX)	Maloney, Sean
Clark (MA)	Grijalva	Manning
Clarke (NY)	Harder (CA)	Matsui
Cleaver	Hayes	McBath
Clyburn	Higgins (NY)	McCollum
Cohen	Himes	McEachin
Connolly	Horsford	McGovern
Cooper	Houlahan	McNerney
Correa	Hoyer	Meeks
Costa	Huffman	Meng
Courtney	Jackson Lee	Mfume
Craig	Jacobs (CA)	Moore (WI)
Crist	Jayapal	Morelle
Crow	Jeffries	Moulton

Mrvan
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halloran
Ocasio-Cortez
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard

Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell

Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Auchincloss
Dunn
Golden
Greene (GA)

Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Kinzinger
LaMalfa

Murphy (FL)
Omar
Sherrill
Webster (FL)

Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halloran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips

Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger

Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—206

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert

Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar

Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Oberholte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Staubert
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—12

□ 1548

Messrs. KATKO, VALADAO, FEENSTRA, and PERRY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”
Ms. SPEIER changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”
So the previous question was ordered.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Stevens)
Cárdenas
(Gallego)
Crenshaw
(Pfluger)
Eshoo
(Thompson (CA))
Fallon (Joyce (OH))
Grijalva (García (IL))
Johnson (TX)
(Jeffries)
Kirkpatrick
(Stanton)

Lawson (FL)
(Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Ruiz (Jeffries)
Lowenthal
(Beyer)
McEachin
(Wexton)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Mfume
(Connolly)
Moore (WI)
(Beyer)
Napolitano
(Correa)

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 210, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

YEAS—214

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa

Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
García (TX)
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gotthelmer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford

Houlihan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahale
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawrence (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino

NAYS—210

Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul

McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Oberholte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Staubert
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne

Wagner	Wenstrup	Womack
Walberg	Westerman	Young
Walorski	Williams (TX)	Zeldin
Waltz	Wilson (SC)	
Weber (TX)	Wittman	

NOT VOTING—6

Deutch	Golden	Sherrill
Dunn	Murphy (FL)	Webster (FL)

□ 1619

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.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Stevens)	Lawson (FL)	Owens (Stewart)
Cárdenas	(Evans)	Payne (Pallone)
(Gallego)	Lieu (Beyer)	Porter (Wexton)
Crenshaw	Lofgren (Jeffries)	Ruiz (Aguilar)
(Pfluger)	Lowenthal	Ruppersberger
Eshoo	(Beyer)	(Raskin)
(Thompson)	McEachin	Rush
(CA)	(Wexton)	(Underwood)
Fallon (Joyce)	Meng (Clark)	Sewell (DelBene)
(OH)	(MA)	Strickland
Grijalva (García)	Mfume	(DelBene)
(IL)	(Connolly)	Wilson (FL)
Johnson (TX)	Moore (WI)	(Hayes)
(Jeffries)	(Beyer)	
Kirkpatrick	Napolitano	
(Stanton)	(Correa)	

DISMISSING THE ELECTION CONTEST RELATING TO THE OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE FOURTEENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 7 of House Resolution 380, House Resolution 379 is hereby adopted.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 379

Resolved, That the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Fourteenth Congressional District of Illinois is dismissed.

MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES AND PASS CERTAIN BILLS

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 6 of House Resolution 380, I move to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 297, H.R. 433, H.R. 478, H.R. 586, H.R. 721, H.R. 768, H.R. 810, H.R. 1205, H.R. 1260, H.R. 1324, H.R. 1448, H.R. 1475, H.R. 1480, H.R. 2862, H.R. 2955, and H.R. 2981.

The other suspension bills, either a vote was not requested or, alternatively, one bill, for which a problem has arisen, we have pulled that. Hopefully, we will consider that tomorrow under suspension.

The Clerk read the title of the bills. The text of the bills are as follows:

HAWAII NATIONAL FOREST STUDY

H.R. 297

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

SECTION 1. HAWAII NATIONAL FOREST STUDY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service.

(2) STUDY AREA.—The term “study area” means the islands of Hawaii, Maui, Molokai,

Lanai, Oahu, and Kauai in the State of Hawaii.

(b) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study—

(A) to determine the suitability and feasibility of establishing a unit of the National Forest System in the study area; and

(B) to identify available land within the study area that could be included in the unit described in subparagraph (A).

(2) COORDINATION AND CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) coordinate with the Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources; and

(B) consult with the Hawaii Department of Agriculture and other interested governmental entities, private and nonprofit organizations, and any interested individuals.

(3) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) consider unique vegetation types that occur in the study area and that should be targeted for inclusion in the unit of the National Forest System described in paragraph (1)(A);

(B) evaluate the ability of the Secretary—

(i) to improve and protect forest areas within the study area; and

(ii) to secure favorable water flows within the study area;

(C) determine whether the unit of the National Forest System described in paragraph (1)(A) would expand, enhance, or duplicate—

(i) resource protection; and

(ii) visitor-use opportunities;

(D) consider parcels of an appropriate size or location to be capable of economical administration as part of the National Forest System separately or jointly with the other land identified under paragraph (1)(B);

(E) evaluate the willingness of landowners to sell or transfer land in the study area to the Secretary;

(F) evaluate the suitability of land in the study area for potential selection and designation as a research natural area or an experimental forest;

(G) identify cost estimates for any Federal acquisition, development, operation, and maintenance that would be needed to establish the unit of the National Forest System described in paragraph (1)(A); and

(H) consider other alternatives for the conservation, protection, and use of areas within the study area by the Federal Government, State or local government entities, or private and nonprofit organizations.

(c) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section authorizes the Secretary to take any action that would affect the use of any land owned by the United States or not owned by the United States.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report that describes—

(1) the results of the study; and

(2) any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES FOR ADDICTION ACT OF 2021

H.R. 433

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Family Support Services for Addiction Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS STRUGGLING WITH SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER.

Part D of title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290dd et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 553. FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS STRUGGLING WITH SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘family community organization’ means an independent nonprofit organization that—

“(A) mobilizes resources within and outside of the community of families with individuals living with addiction, to provide a support network, education, and evidence-informed tools for families and loved ones of individuals struggling with substance use disorders; and

“(B) is governed by experts in the field of addiction, which may include—

“(i) experts in evidence-informed interventions for family members;

“(ii) experts in the impact of addiction on family systems;

“(iii) families who have experience with substance use disorders and addiction; and

“(iv) other experts in the field of addiction; and

“(2) the term ‘family support services’ means resources or programs that support families that include an individual with substance use disorder.

“(b) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall award grants to family community organizations to enable such organizations to develop, expand, and enhance evidence-informed family support services.

“(c) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the costs of a program funded by a grant under this section may not exceed 85 percent.

“(d) USE OF FUNDS.—Grants awarded under subsection (b)—

“(1) shall be used to develop, expand, and enhance community and statewide evidence-informed family support services; and

“(2) may be used to—

“(A) build connections between family support networks, including providing technical assistance between family community organizations and peer support networks, and with other family support services, focused on enhancing knowledge of evidence-informed interventions for family members and loved ones of individuals living with substance use disorders and reducing harm by educating service providers on current evidence regarding addiction and the family, including—

“(i) behavioral health providers, including such providers focused specifically on family and couples therapy in the context of addiction;

“(ii) primary care providers;

“(iii) providers of foster care services or support services for grandparents, guardians, and other extended family impacted by addiction; and

“(iv) other family support services that connect to community resources for individuals with substance use disorders, including non-clinical community services;

“(B) reduce stigma associated with the family of individuals with substance use disorders by improving knowledge about addiction and its treatment, providing compassionate support, and dispelling myths that perpetuate such stigma;

“(C) conduct outreach on issues relating to substance use disorders and family support, which may include education, training, and resources with respect to—

“(i) building a resilience- and strengths-based approach to prevention of, and living with, addiction in the family;

“(ii) identifying the signs of substance use disorder;