

I will continue to fight to uphold the Hyde amendment and make sure not one dollar of taxpayer dollars goes to destroy the life of an unborn child. These children are the future of our country.

Life is too sacred, and we must respect the millions of Americans who believe everyone has a right to life.

In God we trust.

HELP IS ON THE WAY

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

Ms. BROWNLEY. Madam Speaker, many families across the country have felt the crushing economic burden of the pandemic, but additional help is on the way.

The American Rescue Plan is delivering on President Biden's promise to help working families make ends meet. This once-in-a-generation investment includes an expanded child tax credit, and many American families are eligible for a refund of up to \$3,600 per child, with \$300 monthly payments beginning on July 15.

This direct assistance to families will help parents put food on the table, buy clothing for their children, or pay for other expenses while building better lives for their families. These tax credits will also help lift millions of families and children out of poverty, including more than 145,000 children in my district of Ventura County in California.

Ending childhood poverty will help increase educational attainment and lifetime earnings, allowing for a prosperous future for America's families and children. The expanded child tax credit also ensures families can keep more of their hard-earned money and keep our Nation on the path to recovery.

ABORTION IS NOT HEALTHCARE

(Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Hyde amendment and stand to denounce President Biden's budget that proposes the most radical pro-abortion budget in decades.

For nearly 45 years, the Hyde amendment has saved millions of lives by ensuring no taxpayer dollars are appropriated to support abortion services. This amendment has been included in every single government funding bill with widespread support since 1976. Even President Biden himself voted in favor of the amendment for decades.

What has changed? Who is running the show at the White House?

The Democrats love to talk about the big lie. The biggest lie in the country right now is President Biden's promise to be bipartisan.

The good people of eastern North Carolina do not want their hard-earned tax dollars paying for abortions, like done with Planned Parenthood. We must put faith and family back in the center of our lives and promote policies that support our innocent unborn.

I am a physician. Abortion is not healthcare. It is murder. The Constitution is clear on our right to life, and the Hyde amendment protects that. I believe the Hyde amendment should be included in every budget.

WHEN FAMILIES DO WELL, OUR NATION DOES WELL

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, with each passing week, we are seeing the tremendous impact of the American Rescue Plan on our Nation, in New York State, in New York City, and in my own district of New York 12.

Included in the American Rescue Plan is the 1-year expansion of the child tax credit. Next month, families will begin to receive credits of up to \$300 per month to help with food, to help with rent, to help with the cost of childcare.

It is estimated that this funding will cut childhood poverty in half. Let me repeat that. It will cut childhood poverty in half. In my district alone, New York 12, this will help 54,000 children and lift nearly 5,000 children out of poverty.

Knowing the impact this tax credit will have on our families, I am asking all of my colleagues to join me in working to make it permanent.

When families do well, our Nation does well.

WE DESERVE ANSWERS ON COVID-19'S ORIGINS

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

Mr. PFLUGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to demand answers and call for all intelligence into the origins of the COVID-19 virus to be declassified.

The United States should not rely on the World Health Organization, the same organization that covered for the Chinese Communist Party in the early days of the pandemic, to deliver answers to the American public about the origins of a virus that wrecked our economy and tragically claimed hundreds of thousands of American lives.

In April of last year, President Trump and Secretary Pompeo raised concerns of a COVID-19 lab leak. These concerns were completely ignored and censored by social media companies and traditional news outlets due to their vitriol and hatred for the former President. Now Speaker PELOSI and

House Democrats are stonewalling House Republicans' efforts to deliver answers.

It is our responsibility to keep this country safe. If the CCP is indeed found responsible for the leak and cover-up, they must be held accountable for the needless loss of life and for our economy.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to immediately join Republicans in our call for answers. The American people, and all those around the world who have lost loved ones, deserve answers.

CHILD TAX CREDIT BRINGS MUCH-NEEDED RELIEF

(Ms. UNDERWOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, on Monday, I had the privilege of joining my colleagues, Representatives BILL FOSTER and SEAN CASTEN, and three incredible working mothers from my community, to speak about the importance of the expanded child tax credit.

We heard from these working moms how the child tax credit will deliver much-needed relief for their families after an incredibly difficult year. They will no longer have to worry about how they will afford their mortgage, childcare, and putting food on the table for themselves and their kids.

It is estimated that the expanded credit will cut child poverty in half, lifting 5,400 kids in my district out of poverty and benefiting thousands more.

We must sustain this investment in our kids and working families by making the child tax credit permanent to ensure millions of children have the resources they need for a brighter future.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2062, PROTECTING OLDER WORKERS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2021; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 239, EQUAL ACCESS TO CONTRACEPTION FOR VETERANS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1443, LGBTQ BUSINESS EQUAL CREDIT ENFORCEMENT AND INVESTMENT ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 13, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION RELATING TO "UPDATE OF COMMISSION'S CONCILIATION PROCEDURES"; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 14, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

RELATING TO “OIL AND NATURAL GAS SECTOR: EMISSION STANDARDS FOR NEW, RECONSTRUCTED, AND MODIFIED SOURCES REVIEW”; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 15, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF CURRENCY RELATING TO “NATIONAL BANKS AND FEDERAL SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS AS LENDERS”; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 486 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 486

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2062) to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-6, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor 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 Education and Labor or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting

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

SEC. 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. 239) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for limitations on copayments for contraception furnished by the Department of Veterans Affairs, 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 Veterans' Affairs or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1443) to amend the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to require the collection of small business loan data related to LGBTQ-owned businesses. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-7 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; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 13) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission relating to “Update of Commission’s Conciliation Procedures”. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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 Education and Labor or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 8. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 14) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to “Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Review”. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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 Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 9. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 15) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of Currency relating to “National Banks and Federal Savings Associations as Lenders”. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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 Financial Services or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 10. House Resolution 485 is hereby adopted.

SEC. 11. (a) At any time through the legislative day of Friday, June 25, 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 June 22, 2021, or June 23, 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.

□ 1220

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

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 486, providing for consideration of H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, under a structured rule. It provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. It self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairman SCOTT and makes in order five amendments. The rule provides for en bloc authority to Chairman SCOTT or his designee and for one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 239, the Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act, under a closed rule. It provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 1443, the LGBTQ Business Equal Credit Enforcement and Investment Act, under a closed rule. It provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services and provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule further provides for consideration of S.J. Res. 13, S.J. Res. 14, and S.J. Res. 15 under closed rules. It provides the Committees on Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Financial Services each 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by their respective chairs and ranking minority members. It also provides each joint resolution one motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule deems passage of H. Res. 485 and provides the majority leader or his designee the ability to en bloc requested rollcall votes on suspension bills considered on June 22 or 23. This authority lasts through June 25.

Madam Speaker, the House is set to take up a number of critical bills and resolutions in this rule, but I would like to begin by saying a few words about H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act.

Instances of age discrimination at the workplace, including being passed up for a promotion or forced to retire

early, are far too common across the country. A recent survey conducted by AARP found that nearly two out of three workers 45 years and older have seen or experienced age discrimination while on the job.

Importantly, we can expect this problem to be exacerbated in the coming years by the continued growth of the number of older workers in America, which is outpacing the growth of the overall labor force.

Discrimination against workers is not only unfair and morally wrong; it creates a major drag on the U.S. economy. According to a recent report, the economy missed out on an additional \$850 billion in GDP in 2018 all because older workers aged 50 years and older were not given the opportunity to remain in or re-enter the labor force, switch jobs, or be promoted within their existing company. Clearly, age discrimination not only harms older workers; it harms the country as a whole.

Despite the enormity of this problem, the Supreme Court in 2009 made it much more difficult for age discrimination lawsuits to be successful. The Court's ruling in *Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc.* imposed a much higher burden of proof on plaintiffs alleging discrimination than previously required under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act passed by Congress in 1967.

This new standard from *Gross* requires plaintiffs to prove that age discrimination was the decisive, determinative but-for cause for any adverse employment action taken by the employer. The new sole-factor test replaced decades of precedent allowing that employees need only show that their age was a key factor, potentially among other factors, in the employer's adverse employment action.

The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act simply restores the pre-2009 evidentiary threshold, allowing individuals to show a discriminatory motive was merely a key factor for the adverse employment action, which is consistent with the standard for other workplace discrimination claims based on race, religion, sex, or national origin. This legislation ensures that older workers can pursue their livelihoods and hold employers accountable for age discrimination.

This rule also sets up consideration of three Congressional Review Act resolutions, all of which overturn harmful rulemaking implemented by the Trump administration.

S.J. Res. 13 overturns a rule finalized by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission that provides employers with significant unfair advantages during the informal conciliation process, which allows parties to settle a charge of employer discrimination without going to court.

S.J. Res. 14 overturns efforts by the Trump EPA to gut a 2016 rule finalized by the Obama administration, which placed critically important limits on

methane emissions from the oil and gas industry sector.

The last CRA resolution overturns the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency's true lender rule, which makes it easier for predatory lenders to launder loans through out-of-State banks that are not subject to State interest rate caps. Prior to this rule, the "true lender" in partnerships between banks and nonbank financial service companies was whichever entity had the primary economic interest in the loan. This harmful OCC action changed the test for the "true lender" to be simply whichever bank is listed on the loan origination documents, making it extraordinarily easy to create a rent-a-bank relationship between nationally chartered banks and nonbanks, allowing nonbanks to avoid State interest rate cap laws where they are actually doing business.

Especially during the midst of a once-in-a-lifetime pandemic and economic crisis, it is astounding that the Trump administration chose to focus on making it easier for predatory lenders to take advantage of Americans in need.

Finally, the House is also set to consider two additional bills. The Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act, H.R. 239, prohibits the Department of Veterans Affairs from requiring copayments for contraception coverage, bringing the policy in line with the Department of Defense and the private sector. The second bill, LGBTQ Business Equal Credit Enforcement and Investment Act, H.R. 1443, requires financial institutions to collect the sexual orientation and gender identity of the principal owners of small businesses, in addition to existing requirements that institutions collect data on sex, race, and ethnicity.

Both of these bills should be non-controversial. Although Members of the House Republican Conference inexplicably blocked these bills from passing under suspension last week, I am pleased that we will not further delay passage of this critical legislation.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, three CRAs to overturn harmful administration actions of the previous administration, and commonsense legislation to support women veterans and the LGBTQ business community.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. MORELLE for yielding me the customary 30 minutes. I would parenthetically note that it took about 30 minutes to read the actual rule itself, so this is one of the longer rules that we have had under consideration.

There are six measures included in this rule. First is a bill that seeks to protect older Americans from discrimination in the workplace, protection

which already exists. There are two bills that failed to pass on suspension last week, and three Congressional Review Act resolutions.

The legislation considered in this rule will revoke commonsense regulations, expand the Federal Government, and create duplicative and unnecessary red tape for America's small businesses, employees, and consumers.

□ 1230

In 1967, Congress enacted the Age Discrimination in Employment Act to protect applicants and employees over 40 years old from discrimination on the basis of age in employment matters. This act is enforced by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

In 2009, the Supreme Court held in the case of *Gross v. FBL Financial Services* that the standard of proof for a claim under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act requires that age stand alone as the cause of the adverse action rather than in conjunction with other evidentiary factors.

In 2013, the Supreme Court also ruled, in the *University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center v. Naïel Nassar*, that the plaintiff must prove that a retaliatory motive was the decisive cause of an adverse employment action.

H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, would reverse the Supreme Court decisions by allowing mixed-motive claims in Age Discrimination Employment Act cases where age would only need to be a motivating factor for discrimination, even though other factors also motivated discrimination. In other words, the bill shifts the burden of proof to allow plaintiffs in age discrimination cases to demonstrate that any practice by an employer for which age was a motivating factor is covered. Eliminating the decisive factor approach disregards two Supreme Court cases and existing law.

Other provisions of H.R. 2062 prohibit a court from awarding damages or requiring any employment activity other than injunctive relief, making the only true beneficiaries of this legislation members of the plaintiffs' bar.

The Supreme Court stated in the *Nassar* case that "lessening the causation standard could also contribute to the filing of frivolous claims, which would siphon resources from efforts by employers, administrative agencies, and courts to combat workplace harassment."

Republicans are committed to eliminating discrimination in the workplace; that includes for older Americans. Discrimination of any kind is already against the law through the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Rehabilitation Act, and the Civil Rights Act.

Today's rule also contains two bills that were brought up on suspension last week but were unable to pass with the required two-thirds vote: The

Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act, and the LGBTQ Business Equal Credit Enforcement and Investment Act.

The final three measures included in the rule utilize the Congressional Review Act to overturn three Trump-era rules that attempted to provide commonsense regulations, reduce red tape, and to promote transparency. But in the zeal to repeal all things Trump, commonsense reduction of red tape, and promoting transparency may just be regarded as collateral damage, as everything associated with the former President must be undone in the eyes of House Democrats.

First, S.J. Res. 15 nullifies a rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency relating to National Banks and Federal Savings Associations as Lenders. This agency rule provides clarity by determining exactly when a national bank or a Federal savings association is, in fact, the "true lender" when partnering with a third party to provide loans.

In today's markets, it is common for financial technology companies to partner with banks to meet the needs of their consumers. Unfortunately, Court rulings have created uncertainty when partnerships occur in determining who is the "true lender" in these circumstances.

This Office of Comptroller of the Currency rule provides much-needed clarity for market participants and ensures consumers are, in fact, adequately protected. Federal law requires "true lenders" to comply with certain consumer protection laws, and clearly delineating the "true lender" will eliminate this uncertainty.

While the majority claims that this rule gives a green light to predatory relationships by allowing a "rent-a-character" partnership, this could not be further from the truth. This rule provides greater transparency into such practices, allowing better protections for consumers. With more transparency comes more accountability; after all, sunlight is the best disinfectant.

The next resolution, S.J. Res. 13, uses the Congressional Review Act to nullify the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's rule titled "Update of Commission's Conciliation Procedures." Conciliation is a process by which two parties may resolve disputes informally and confidentially without ever having to go to court.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission rule is designed to bring its conciliation procedures in line with the Supreme Court's decision in *Mach Mining, LLC v. EEOC*, and would update these procedures for the first time since 1977.

By encouraging the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission claims to be resolved outside of court, this rule ensures that disputes can be resolved at less expense in a more timely basis and ensure accountability.

Passing S.J. Res. 13 would not promote a better workplace for employees;

it would only encourage more litigation. And by utilizing the Congressional Review Act, this resolution would prevent the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission from ever updating its conciliation procedures without additional Congressional action. Simply put, this resolution would only make it more difficult to settle workplace disputes.

The final resolution in this rule is S.J. Res. 14, which would use the Congressional Review Act to nullify the Environmental Protection Agency's rule titled "Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Review." Should this be signed into law, it would have significant ramifications for America's energy industry but, in fact, it would have little impact on America's public health or America's environment.

In 2020, the Environmental Protection Agency issued new regulations that right-sized New Source Performance Standards for the oil and gas industry. Despite the hyperbolic language in the media and from interest groups, the Environmental Protection Agency found that these methane rules had no real impact on emissions.

Let's say that again, because it is so important: Despite the language in the media and from interest groups, the EPA found that these methane rules had no real impact on emissions. Simultaneously, barriers to entry were lifted and companies of all sizes were able to compete. This allowed America to regain its position as a global energy leader.

Throughout the Trump administration, Americans benefited from historically clean air and cleaner water. Greenhouse gas emissions fell throughout the Trump Presidency. The lesson is quite simple: Promoting innovation and investment in the energy sector is a better way to promote economic and environmental success.

I am very concerned about this resolution's impact, especially in my home State of Texas. In recent months, Americans have seen sharp increases, sharp increases in the price of gasoline, sharp increases in the price of electricity. Energy costs are rising, and this resolution only threatens to send them higher. History shows us that the most substantive changes that can be made occur faster through innovation and not greater regulation.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I appreciate very much the comments from my friend and my colleague on the Committee on Rules, Mr. BURGESS.

I do want to just note that when it comes to discrimination, the standard that we use for discrimination in the workplace that relates to race, religion, sex or national origin, is that

those factors are a key motivating factor in an employment decision that allows a claimant to come forward. That is what we wish to make the standard for age discrimination for older Americans.

What is being suggested by my friends on the other side of the aisle, however, are two different standards. In this case, when it comes to age discrimination, that it needs to be the sole factor. Prior to the 2009 Supreme Court case, indeed these were on par. The same standards would apply, the same criteria that it be a key motivating factor.

And frankly, when you think about it, if you are an older American and you are being denied a promotion, you are being denied a pay raise, and your employer suggests, well, you are a little older, and oh, by the way—and lists a couple other things. Well, because it is not the sole factor that they articulated, you don't have a cause for a claim. And we believe that there shouldn't be two different standards when it comes to discrimination. If it is a key motivating factor, which it was up until the 2009 opinion, that is how it should stand. And we should make certain that the law of the land when it relates to employment discrimination is the same, whether or not it is because of race, religion, sex, national origin, or age.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY).

Ms. BROWNLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule providing consideration for my bill, the Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act.

As you know, this rule is necessary to bring critical veterans' healthcare legislation to the floor, because last week House Republicans failed to support the Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act when it was considered under the suspension of the rules.

They voted "no" despite the bill having passed in the 116th Congress by voice vote with broad support.

They voted "no" despite the fact that veterans' service organizations overwhelmingly support the bill.

They voted "no" despite the fact that women veterans have put their lives on the line for our country and overwhelmingly want equal access to healthcare.

They voted "no" despite 87 percent of the American people supporting women's access to contraception.

While it is both disappointing and perplexing to me that anyone would vote to deny women veterans equal access to healthcare—the same healthcare we give women currently serving in the military—I am grateful the Speaker and the majority leader have given us—all of us—a second chance to do what is right. I thank the Committee on Rules for its swift action.

Contraception is a medication used by millions of Americans for a wide

range of conditions, and it is estimated that 62 percent of our Nation's 2 million women veterans use contraception. In addition to family planning, contraception is used to treat or alleviate migraines, acne, endometriosis, and PCOS.

In fact, the median number of contraception methods used by women in the U.S. is three, and nearly one-third of women in the U.S. have used five or more methods over their lifetime. Contraception is essential to a women's whole health and to her economic security. Yet women veterans who use VA healthcare are not treated the same as women in the military or civilian women.

Addressing this inequality is long overdue. All veterans and former servicemembers deserve the very best healthcare without any unnecessary barriers. They earned it, and they deserve it.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to demonstrate their commitment to the patriotic women who make up 20 percent of our military and 10 percent of our veteran communities and vote "yes" on the rule so we can bring the Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans back to the floor.

Let's do the right thing, for equality, health, and economic security for our women who bravely served our country for all of us to have the same.

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

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2021.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, this bill, introduced by Representative CHRIS SMITH, prohibits the use of Federal funds for abortions or for health coverage that includes abortions.

The Hyde Amendment first passed Congress in 1976 to ban Federal funding for most abortions. President Biden's fiscal year 2022 budget request omits this ban for the first time in over 40 years, breaking longstanding precedent.

H.R. 18 would make the ban on Federal funding for abortions permanent, with exceptions for rape, incest, or if the mother's life is in danger.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), my good friend, and a true leader on this issue, to further explain the amendment.

□ 1245

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, more than 20 peer-reviewed

studies show that more than 2.4 million people are alive today in the United States because of the Hyde amendment, with about 60,000 babies spared death by abortion each and every year.

Over 2.4 million girls and boys who would have been aborted instead survived because taxpayer funding was unavailable to effectuate their violent demise. Growing numbers of Americans, Madam Speaker, continue to be shocked to learn that the methods of abortion include dismemberment of a child's fragile body, including decapitation, and that drugs like RU-486 starve the baby to death before he or she is forcibly expelled from the womb. There is nothing benign or compassionate about abortion methods.

The multibillion-dollar abortion industry cleverly markets the sophistry of choice while going to extraordinary lengths to ignore, trivialize, and cover up the battered baby victim. By reason of their age, dependency, immaturity, inconvenience, fragility, and unwantedness, unborn children have been denied justice and the most fundamental of all human rights, the right to life.

The right to life, Madam Speaker, is for everyone, not just the planned, the privileged, and the perfect.

Ultrasound has not only been an amazing diagnostic tool for treating disease and disability before birth, it has also made the unborn baby more visible. Today, for many expectant moms, first baby pictures aren't of their precious newborn baby, but of ultrasound imaging photos and videos chronicling the amazing miracle of their child's journey before birth.

Madam Speaker, 166 Members of Congress have cosponsored my bill, H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, to make the Hyde amendment and other current abortion funding prohibitions permanent.

According to public opinion polls, most Americans, by a decisive margin of 58 percent to 38 percent in a recent Marist Poll, agree that taxpayers should not, I say again, should not be compelled against their conscience to fund abortion.

Years ago, then-Senator Joe Biden wrote to constituents explaining his support for the Hyde amendment and said it would "protect both the woman and her unborn child."

He said in another letter, "I have consistently—on no fewer than 50 occasions—voted against Federal funding of abortions. Those who are opposed to abortion should not be compelled to pay for them."

So says Joe Biden in the past.

I wholeheartedly agree. Those of us opposed to abortion should not be compelled or forced to pay for them.

Madam Speaker, someday future generations of Americans will look back and wonder how and why such a seemingly smart, enlightened, and compassionate society could have enabled and facilitated the extermination of over 62.5 million children, a number of child

deaths that equates with the entire population of Italy.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. So with deep respect for my colleagues, I believe unborn children need the President of the United States and Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle to be their friends and advocates, not powerful adversaries.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to just talk for a moment about H.R. 239, the Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act, which is actually before us today. Although some might want to make this debate about other issues, it is not.

Comprehensive healthcare for women, including access to contraception, is critically important. Access to contraception is an economic issue. It helps people stay in the workforce, earn wages, support stronger families. It has even been shown to lift women out of poverty.

Even relatively small copays have been found to be a barrier to accessing contraception. Costs associated with contraception result in women foregoing it completely, choosing less effective methods, or using it inconsistently.

Congress eliminated copays for contraception as part of the Affordable Care Act. And, as I said, for members of the Defense Department, for people in military service, there is no copay. It is time we did the same for those brave women who entered armed services and now are veterans.

We also want to make sure that we have equal access. Women represent the fastest growing subpopulation of veterans in the Nation, yet they lack access to the basic preventative healthcare needs like contraception.

So I want to make sure that we focus on what is before us, the bills before the House, what this conversation is about, and not to be distracted by things not before us and part of an extreme agenda.

This is a simple issue. It has passed by voice vote in the last Congress, and it is not clear to me what has changed. This is an important issue for women all across America, and we owe that to our veterans to make sure that they don't have additional barriers to contraception that no one else in American has.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Louisiana (Ms. LETLOW), one of our newest Members, to speak again on defeating the previous question and considering the amendment.

Ms. LETLOW. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that

we can amend the rule to allow the consideration of H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

This critical bill will finally codify the Hyde amendment and uphold the longstanding bipartisan agreement that prevents taxpayer dollars from funding abortions.

While Republicans and Democrats have engaged in heated debates over abortion in the past 40 years, we were always able to agree on the simple principle that public funding should not be used for abortions. The Hyde amendment, which explicitly spelled this policy out, has been included in every single appropriations bill since 1976, including those passed under the Clinton and Obama administrations.

This commonsense, lifesaving amendment has been supported by many Members of this body, including many of my colleagues across the aisle. It is incredibly disappointing to see that this administration and the Democratic majority have decided to ignore four decades of consensus and instead embrace a controversial new policy opposed by over 60 percent of Americans.

As both a Christian and a mother, I deeply understand the preciousness of an innocent child's life. When I arrived in Congress a few months ago, one of my first actions was to sign on to H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. But whether you are a strong pro-life advocate like me, or hold an opposing view, we should all be able to get behind this bill.

Taxpayer dollars should not be used to fund abortions. It is a simple, commonsense measure that should have as much bipartisan support this year as it has in the past.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the ranking member of our Rules Committee.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the previous question, and I fully support the immediate consideration of H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2021.

The bill would codify protections for the unborn and would make them permanent. These protections are commonly carried as part of the Hyde amendment, which has been carried in the appropriations bills produced by the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee of Appropriations, where I am the ranking member, for the past 45 years.

There is no cause greater for any Member of Congress than defending life, especially amongst the most vulnerable. When I was privileged to be chair of the subcommittee, every one of the annual appropriations bills passed out of the subcommittee carried this important protection.

Yet the majority has once again begun the misguided assault on life;

first, with President Biden's revocation of the Mexico City policy, followed by legislative efforts to dismantle the Hyde amendment, both of which protect life and prevent taxpayer-funded abortions.

Since the Hyde amendment was first enacted in 1976, it is estimated that this provision has saved more than two million lives. It has been supported by lawmakers of both parties on both sides of the aisle, and signed into law by Presidents of both parties every single year since then. Indeed, every Democratic Member, other than freshmen, has voted for legislation containing the Hyde Amendment.

When he was serving in the United States Senate, President Biden, at that time, expressed his support for the inclusion of this provision, a stance he has since abandoned. Eliminating this provision in the annual appropriations bills would be a terrible mistake and at odds with the beliefs of a strong majority of the American people.

A recent Marist Poll found that 58 percent of Americans oppose the taxpayer funding for abortion, while only 38 percent support it. Hyde protects the conscience rights of the great majority of Americans who are opposed to publicly funded abortions for religious, moral, or fiscal reasons. It allows States to choose to fund elective abortions or not with State taxpayer dollars, and the people of 34 States have voluntarily chosen not to do so.

As we look ahead to the annual appropriations process, I would remind my friends on the other side of the aisle that 200 Republicans, including every single Republican member of the Appropriations Committee, signed a letter to congressional leadership stating that they would oppose any spending bill that did not include Hyde protections.

I see no better way for us to continue to celebrate life and ensure protections for the unborn than by making the Hyde amendment permanent, which we can do if we pass H.R. 18 into law.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK) on the motion against the previous question.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge immediate consideration of H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act.

Our Nation has stood unified in our opposition to federally funded, on-demand abortion services for the past 40 years. The Hyde amendment has acted as a stopgap against publicly funded abortion and as a safeguard for our Nation's most vulnerable, the unborn.

Before the Hyde amendment took effect in 1980, over 300,000 American children per year were denied their most basic right to life and were aborted using taxpayer-funded dollars. This fight is one that we must undertake in

Congress to protect our most fundamental rights and important tenets that make our country great.

The Biden administration and congressional Democrats seem to have forgotten the bipartisan support the Hyde amendment has received from both Republican and Democrat administrations in the past, as well as the overwhelming support from the American public, for this important provision.

It is a national shame for this administration and congressional Democrats to overlook and marginalize the right to life that we, as Americans, hold dear. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is not just a saying; it is a guiding principle by which we should all govern.

Let's come together as Americans, leave party lines behind, and support the right to life because America's future depends on it.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and provide for immediate consideration of H.R. 18 for the sake of America's future generations.

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I just note that we have in front of us two CRAs. We have two important bills: The LGBTQ Business Equal Credit Enforcement and Investment Act, as well as the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act of 2021.

And we are not talking about any of those. So I am prepared to talk about those, which are actually before the House, whenever my friends choose to.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH), a valuable member of the Rules Committee, to speak against the previous question.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, in 1994, then-Senator Joe Biden said: "Those of us who are opposed to abortion should not be compelled to pay for them."

Well, Mr. President, I certainly agree.

For more than four decades, the Hyde amendment has ensured the American people are not forced to fund abortion on-demand, a procedure at great odds with so many of our personal and religious beliefs, and an injustice that leaves an irreversible mark on so many lives.

Since 1976, the Hyde amendment has had bipartisan support from Congress, has been signed into law by both Republican and Democrat Presidents, and has been supported by the majority of the American people.

□ 1300

It has saved the lives of millions. But President Biden and the Democrats want to end those protections, forcing the American people to fund a procedure that is at such serious odds with our personal, religious, and moral beliefs.

There is no more vulnerable person than a child in the womb. Do they not

deserve our care and our protection? Does that life not also have value, just like the lives of you and me, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, I will say it again: We are treading in dangerous territory. Instead of working toward a government that builds all people up for the common good, we are choosing to subsidize the deaths of unborn babies.

I believe that is appalling, and I urge my colleagues to reconsider their positions. We must pass H.R. 18 and respect the wishes of the American people: Tax dollars should not be used to fund abortions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge "no" on the previous question.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). The gentleman from Texas has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I am prepared to close if that is in accordance with the wishes of the majority, so I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the bills in this lengthy rule will not achieve the benefits for the American people that are being claimed.

The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act lowers the threshold for age discrimination cases in the workplace. It is already illegal to discriminate against an employee because of age. Lowering the burden of proof to allow for mixed-motive claims will, in fact, only benefit the trial lawyers who actually bring the suits.

I do want to direct attention to a letter that most Members received from the United States Chamber of Commerce. It is a very good letter opposing S.J. Res. 15. This is the Congressional Review Act repeal of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency's rule on national banks and Federal savings associations and lenders.

The reason I bring this up is because I know many of my friends on the other side of the aisle do claim that their support from the United States Chamber of Commerce is what makes them bipartisan and, hence, they should be reelected. But here we have the U.S. Chamber of Commerce sending each of us a letter talking about how damaging excluding that rule from the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency would be.

If I may just read a portion of this letter: "Partnerships between banks and third parties have become a critical avenue for making credit available to both consumers and small businesses. . . . Fintech partnerships provided funding for many of America's smallest businesses which, according to McKinsey & Company, are disproportionately minority-owned."

Mr. Speaker, by undoing this Trump-era rule, you are, in fact, going to be

hurting some of the smallest businesses in the country, and I don't think that is what you would have intended.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the letter from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Washington, DC, June 18, 2021.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce strongly supports the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency's (OCC) rule on "National Banks and Federal Savings Associations as Lenders," also known as the "True Lender" Rule, and strongly opposes S.J. Res. 15, which would effectively overturn it.

The True Lender Rule provides important legal certainty for national banks and federal savings associations regarding loans they may issue in conjunction with third parties. Various judicial rulings have created legal uncertainty as to who is the "True Lender" of a loan when a bank works with a third party, thus calling into question the laws that apply to these loans. This legal uncertainty discourages financial institutions from partnering to provide credit to consumers and small businesses.

Partnerships between banks and third parties have become a critical avenue for making credit available to both consumers and small businesses. In fact, FinTech partnerships represented 15% of Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) loans to small businesses last year. More importantly, the median value of FinTech partnership-enabled PPP loans was \$15,000. That median value amount was the smallest of all lending providers including Minority Development Institutions and Nonprofits. That means FinTech partnerships provided funding for many of America's smallest businesses which, according to McKinsey & Company, are disproportionately minority-owned.

The OCC's rule establishes a clear test for determining the "True Lender" when a bank makes a loan, which clarifies what legal frameworks are applicable to a loan. The rule provides that a bank is the "True Lender" when it, as of the date of origination, (1) is named as the lender in the loan agreement or (2) funds the loan. This clarification is critical for banks to partner with third parties and does not undermine the myriad consumer protection laws enforced by state and federal regulators.

The Chamber opposes S.J. Res. 15.

Sincerely,

NEIL L. BRADLEY.

Mr. BURGESS. The Congressional Review Act is a legitimate tool to review executive actions, but it should not be used as a political tool to overturn a previous administration's actions simply because, Mr. Speaker, you don't like the previous occupant of the White House.

The CRAs in this rule are not based on sound policymaking. They are instead being used as an attempt to score political points by undoing Trump-era policies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my fellow Members to reconsider these measures by simply focusing on the policy and not the policymaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have no other conclusion than to urge a "no" vote on the previous question, a "no" vote on the rule, and a "no" vote on the underlying measures.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I do want to thank the gentleman, Dr. BURGESS, a colleague and friend on the Rules Committee. I always appreciate hearing from him.

I think there are compelling issues here in this rule and the reasons that the House should adopt the rule.

The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act is a critical tool for so many Americans who are discriminated against in the workplace. It deserves our support. I am confident that it will pass the House, but we should remember how important it is, not only to those workers, but to the U.S. economy.

H.R. 239, the Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act, makes sure that women who have served and are veterans have the same rights that every other person in America has to not have to pay copays in order to receive contraception from their healthcare policy.

We also take up critical legislation regarding LGBTQ businesses, to make sure they get equal access to credit and equal access to investments. H.R. 1443 would require lenders to start to gather information on those businesses that are owned by LGBTQ individuals.

The CRAs, in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, are all well-informed, and they do focus on the policies, policies which, frankly, we don't agree with here in the House and which the Senate didn't agree with. The Senate has passed these on to us in bipartisan fashion, so these aren't simply questions of whether or not we approve of the previous President. This is about the policies themselves, and they have found themselves here to be voted on because our colleagues across the corridor in the Senate agree with us that these rules ought to be overturned using the CRA process.

This is an important rule. It affects millions of Americans in so many ways.

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

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 486

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 12. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 18) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions. 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 Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommend.

SEC. 13. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 18.

Mr. MORELLE. 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. BURGESS. 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.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MFUME) at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2062, PROTECTING OLDER WORKERS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2021; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 239, EQUAL ACCESS TO CONTRACEPTION FOR VETERANS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1443, LGBTQ BUSINESS EQUAL CREDIT ENFORCEMENT AND INVESTMENT ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 13, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION RELATING TO "UPDATE OF COMMISSION'S CONCILIATION PROCEDURES"; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 14, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "OIL AND NATURAL GAS SECTOR: EMISSION STANDARDS FOR NEW, RECONSTRUCTED, AND MODIFIED SOURCES REVIEW"; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 15, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF CURRENCY RELATING TO "NATIONAL BANKS AND FEDERAL SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS AS LENDERS"; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution

(H. Res. 486) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2062) to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 239) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for limitations on copayments for contraception furnished by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1443) to amend the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to require the collection of small business loan data related to LGBTQ-owned businesses; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 13) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission relating to "Update of Commission's Conciliation Procedures"; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 14) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Review"; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 15) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of Currency relating to "National Banks and Federal Savings Associations as Lenders"; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 209, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 175]

YEAS—218

Adams	Case	Demings
Aguilar	Casten	DeSaulnier
Allred	Castro (FL)	Deutch
Auchincloss	Castro (TX)	Dingell
Axne	Chu	Doggett
Barragán	Ciциlline	Doyle, Michael
Bass	Clark (MA)	F.
Beatty	Clarke (NY)	Escobar
Bera	Cleaver	Eshoo
Beyer	Clyburn	Espallat
Bishop (GA)	Cohen	Evans
Blumenauer	Connolly	Fletcher
Blunt Rochester	Cooper	Foster
Bonamici	Correa	Frankel, Lois
Bourdeaux	Costa	Gallego
Bowman	Courtney	Garamendi
Boyle, Brendan	Craig	Garcia (IL)
F.	Crist	Garcia (TX)
Brown	Crow	Golden
Brownley	Cuellar	Gomez
Bush	Davidson (KS)	Gonzalez,
Bustos	Davis, Danny K.	Vicente
Butterfield	Dean	Gottheimer
Carbajal	DeFazio	Green, Al (TX)
Cárdenas	DeGette	Grijalva
Carson	DeLauro	Harder (CA)
Carter (LA)	DelBene	Hayes
Cartwright	Delgado	Higgins (NY)