of this legislation by a vote of 374–52. Earlier in the year, the legislation advanced out of the Energy and Commerce Committee, where it garnered bipartisan support.

I commend the House bill's sponsors, Health Subcommittee Chairwoman ESHOO and Representative HUDSON, for their strong leadership and commitment to this bill.

The Foundation for the NIH is an independent nonprofit organization established by Congress in 1990 to develop private-public partnerships and advance American leadership in biomedical research.

Likewise, the Reagan-Udall Foundation for the FDA was established by Congress in 2007 to advance the mission of the FDA and catalyze innovation, modernize medical product development, and improve safety.

The NIH and FDA are authorized to transfer funding to their respective foundations, but that limit has not been increased since 2007.

This bill, S. 1662, would increase the transfer authority for both foundations, allowing the foundations to continue and expand upon the important work they have been doing. For example, during the COVID–19 pandemic, they have done important work to enhance the FDA and NIH's work on COVID–19 vaccines and diagnostics.

This bill will help build upon our ongoing efforts to advance biomedical research and promote better public health outcomes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S. 1662, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about S. 1662, the Supporting the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health and the Reagan-Udall Foundation for the Food and Drug Administration Act. The companion version of this bill, H.R. 3743, was led by Energy and Commerce Committee colleagues Representatives HUDSON and ESHOO and passed the House in December.

Unleashing biomedical innovation in the United States is critical in saving lives and maintaining our global competitiveness. We saw how important it was to invest in creating new treatments during the COVID–19 pandemic, and we need to carry that momentum into the future.

S. 1662 authorizes increased transfer authorities from the FDA and NIH to the Reagan-Udall Foundation and the Foundation for NIH, respectively. Allowing FDA and NIH to transfer additional resources to these public-private partnerships will give the Reagan-Udall Foundation and the Foundation for the NIH more flexibility to meet the growing research demands and accelerate future medical innovations.

And I close with this: I was in Brussels last week. I am on the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. I was with our allies as everything took place that we all saw in Europe.

This is the Energy and Commerce Committee. We have done some wonderful work on these bills, and they are important. But I will tell you, as I just talked about innovation and world leadership, it reminded me of this. We were energy independent a couple of years ago, and I will tell you, people in my part of the country, and I am sure all over the country, are struggling with what they are paying for gas. But I will tell you this: I was with our European allies, and they are terrified about what this is going to do to the oil markets.

What we are doing now is just not sanctioning the Russian oil because we are all terrified of that. So hopefully, the Energy and Commerce Committee will have the opportunity to look at the policies, why we are no longer energy independent and how we can move forward.

I saw the President's Press Secretary, Ms. Psaki, talking on an interview show yesterday. They asked her was the President going to do something to relieve fossil fuels, and her answer was, well, this just shows why we shouldn't be dependent on fossil fuels. Well, the answer is this is why we shouldn't be dependent on foreign fossil fuels when we have them available to ourselves. Of course, the interviewer didn't ask the following question: Well, maybe that is the case, but what are we going to do in the next weeks, months, and through the summertime?

We all know, because we see it on the television, that it is a dire situation. But when you look them in the eyes and you see it in their faces—the Ukrainians were eligible to come to this meeting, but obviously, they weren't there. We did have Zoom meetings with them. But we looked at our European allies, and it is a tough situation.

We can make it better. We can make it better for ourselves. We can make it better for them. I think it is the right thing to do.

So, hopefully, we will have the opportunity to move forward. But the bills that we are talking about today in my subcommittee are important, and I recommend this bill be passed, as well.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, again, there is bipartisan support for this bill, which I also believe would be going to the President, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1662, Supporting the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health and the Reagan-Udall Foundation for the Food and Drug Administration Act, to increase funding for the Reagan-Udall Foundation for the Food and Drug Administration and for the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health.

The Reagan-Udall Foundation for the Food and Drug Administration is an independent 501(c)(3) organization created by Congress "to advance the mission of the FDA to modernize medical, veterinary, food, food ingredient, and cosmetic product development, accelerate innovation, and enhance product safety."

The Foundation embodies FDA's vision of collaborative innovation to address regulatory science challenges of the 21st century and assist in the creation of new, applied scientific knowledge, tools, standards, and approaches the FDA needs to evaluate products more effectively, predictably, and efficiently, and thereby enhance the FDA's ability to protect and promote the health of the American public.

The Foundation serves as a crucial conduit between FDA and the public, providing a means for FDA to interact directly with stakeholders, including industry and consumers.

The Foundation for the National Institutes of Health (FNIH) has created hundreds of cross-discipline consortia and partnerships whose initiatives have generated new ideas, overcome obstacles and achieved groundbreaking biomedical research results.

The FNIH has created an environment where trust and the exchange of new ideas can thrive, resulting in scientific innovations.

The FNIH and its partners have successfully generated and implemented new research models that are lowering the cost and accelerating the progress of biomedical research nationwide and across the globe.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution grants Members of Congress the powers and the authority to "promote Science and useful Arts."

As Members of Congress, it is our duty to award funding to these institutions, so they may continue their groundbreaking work in their respective fields.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation and urge all Members to vote for the S. 1662, Supporting the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health and the Reagan-Udall Foundation for the Food and Drug Administration Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1662.

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.

CREATING A RESPECTFUL AND OPEN WORLD FOR NATURAL HAIR ACT OF 2022

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2116) to prohibit discrimination based on an individual's texture or style of hair, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2116

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 ''Creating a Respectful and Open World for Natural Hair Act of 2022'' or the ''CROWN Act of 2022''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS; PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Throughout United States history, society has used (in conjunction with skin color) hair texture and hairstyle to classify individuals on the basis of race.

(2) Like one's skin color, one's hair has served as a basis of race and national origin discrimination.

(3) Racial and national origin discrimination can and do occur because of longstanding racial and national origin biases and stereotypes associated with hair texture and style.

(4) For example, routinely, people of African descent are deprived of educational and employment opportunities because they are adorned with natural or protective hairstyles in which hair is tightly coiled or tightly curled, or worn in locs, cornrows, twists, braids, Bantu knots, or Afros.

(5) Racial and national origin discrimination is reflected in school and workplace policies and practices that bar natural or protective hairstyles commonly worn by people of African descent.

(6) For example, as recently as 2018, the U.S. Armed Forces had grooming policies that barred natural or protective hairstyles that servicemembers of African descent commonly wear and that described these hairstyles as ''unkempt''.

(7) The U.S. Army also recognized that prohibitions against natural or protective hairstyles that African-American soldiers are commonly adorned with are racially discriminatory, harmful, and bear no relationship to African-American servicewomen's occupational qualifications and their ability to serve and protect the Nation. As of February 2021, the U.S. Army removed minimum hair length requirements and lifted restrictions on any soldier wearing braids, twists, locs, and cornrows in order to promote inclusivity and accommodate the hair needs of soldiers.

(8) As a type of racial or national origin discrimination, discrimination on the basis of natural or protective hairstyles that people of African descent are commonly adorned with violates existing Federal law, including provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.), section 1977 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1981), and the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.). However, some Federal courts have misinterpreted Federal civil rights law by narrowly interpreting the meaning of race or national origin, and thereby permitting, for example, employers to discriminate against people of African descent who wear natural or protective hairstyles even though the employment policies involved are not related to workers' ability to perform their jobs.

(9) Applying this narrow interpretation of race or national origin has resulted in a lack of Federal civil rights protection for individuals who are discriminated against on the basis of characteristics that are commonly associated with race and national origin.

(10) In 2019 and 2020, State legislatures and municipal bodies throughout the U.S. have introduced and passed legislation that rejects certain Federal courts' restrictive interpretation of race and national origin, and expressly classifies race and national origin discrimination as inclusive of discrimination on the basis of natural or protective hairstyles commonly associated with race and national origin.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Federal Government should acknowledge that individuals who have hair texture or wear a hairstyle that is historically and contemporarily associated with African Americans or persons of African descent systematically suffer harmful discrimination in schools, workplaces, and other contexts based upon longstanding race and national origin stereotypes and biases;

(2) a clear and comprehensive law should address the systematic deprivation of educational, employment, and other opportunities on the basis of hair texture and hairstyle that are commonly associated with race or national origin;

(3) clear, consistent, and enforceable legal standards must be provided to redress the widespread incidences of race and national origin discrimination based upon hair texture and hairstyle in schools, workplaces, housing, federally funded institutions, and other contexts;

(4) it is necessary to prevent educational, employment, and other decisions, practices, and policies generated by or reflecting negative biases and stereotypes related to race or national origin;

(5) the Federal Government must play a key role in enforcing Federal civil rights laws in a way that secures equal educational, employment, and other opportunities for all individuals regardless of their race or national origin;

(6) the Federal Government must play a central role in enforcing the standards established under this Act on behalf of individuals who suffer race or national origin discrimination based upon hair texture and hairstyle;

(7) it is necessary to prohibit and provide remedies for the harms suffered as a result of race or national origin discrimination on the basis of hair texture and hairstyle; and

(8) it is necessary to mandate that school, workplace, and other applicable standards be applied in a nondiscriminatory manner and to explicitly prohibit the adoption or implementation of grooming requirements that disproportionately impact people of African descent.

(c) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to institute definitions of race and national origin for Federal civil rights laws that effectuate the comprehensive scope of protection Congress intended to be afforded by such laws and Congress' objective to eliminate race and national origin discrimination in the United States.

SEC. 3. FEDERALLY ASSISTED PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No individual in the United States shall be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under, any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, based on the individual's hair texture or hairstyle, if that hair texture or that hairstyle is commonly associated with a particular race or national origin (including a hairstyle in which hair is tightly coiled or tightly curled, locs, cornrows, twists, braids, Bantu knots, and Afros).

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—Subsection (a) shall be enforced in the same manner and by the same means, including with the same jurisdiction, as if such subsection was incorporated in title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.), and as if a violation of subsection (a) was treated as if it was a violation of section 601 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000d).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''program or activity'' has the meaning given the term in section 606 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d–4a); and

(2) the terms ''race'' and ''national origin'' mean, respectively, ''race'' within the meaning of the term in section 601 of that Act (42 U.S.C. 2000d) and ''national origin'' within the meaning of the term in that section 601.

SEC. 4. HOUSING PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No person in the United States shall be subjected to a discriminatory housing practice based on the person's hair texture or hairstyle, if that hair texture or that hairstyle is commonly associated with a particular race or national origin (including a hairstyle in which hair is tightly coiled or tightly curled, locs, cornrows, twists, braids, Bantu knots, and Afros).

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—Subsection (a) shall be enforced in the same manner and by the same means, including with the same jurisdiction, as if such subsection was incorporated in the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.), and as if a violation of subsection (a) was treated as if it was a discriminatory housing practice.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section—

(1) the terms ''discriminatory housing practice'' and ''person'' have the meanings given the terms in section 802 of the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3602); and

(2) the terms ''race'' and ''national origin'' mean, respectively, ''race'' within the meaning of the term in section 804 of that Act (42 U.S.C. 3604) and ''national origin'' within the meaning of the term in that section 804.

SEC. 5. PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No person in the United States shall be subjected to a practice prohibited under section 201, 202, or 203 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000a et seq.), based on the person's hair texture or hairstyle, if that hair texture or that hairstyle is commonly associated with a particular race or national origin (including a hairstyle in which hair is tightly coiled or tightly curled, locs, cornrows, twists, braids, Bantu knots, and Afros).

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—Subsection (a) shall be enforced in the same manner and by the same means, including with the same jurisdiction, as if such subsection was incorporated in title II of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and as if a violation of subsection (a) was treated as if it was a violation of section 201, 202, or 203, as appropriate, of such Act.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the terms ''race'' and ''national origin'' mean, respectively, ''race'' within the meaning of the term in section 201 of that Act (42 U.S.C. 2000e) and ''national origin'' within the meaning of the term in that section 201.

SEC. 6. EMPLOYMENT.

(a) PROHIBITION.—It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer, employment agency, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee controlling apprenticeship or other training or retraining (including on-the-job training programs) to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual, or otherwise to discriminate against an individual, based on the individual's hair texture or hairstyle, if that hair texture or that hairstyle is commonly associated with a particular race or national origin (including a hairstyle in which hair is tightly coiled or tightly curled, locs, cornrows, twists, braids, Bantu knots, and Afros).

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—Subsection (a) shall be enforced in the same manner and by the same means, including with the same jurisdiction, as if such subsection was incorporated in title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.), and as if a violation of subsection (a) was treated as if it was a violation of section 703 or 704, as appropriate, of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000e–2, 2000e–3).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section the terms ''person'', ''race'', and ''national origin'' have the meanings given the terms in section 701 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e).

SEC. 7. EQUAL RIGHTS UNDER THE LAW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No person in the United States shall be subjected to a practice prohibited under section 1977 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1981), based on the person's hair texture or hairstyle, if that hair texture or that hairstyle is commonly associated with a particular race or national origin (including a hairstyle in which hair is

tightly coiled or tightly curled, locs, cornrows, twists, braids, Bantu knots, and Afros).

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—Subsection (a) shall be enforced in the same manner and by the same means, including with the same jurisdiction, as if such subsection was incorporated in section 1977 of the Revised Statutes, and as if a violation of subsection (a) was treated as if it was a violation of that section 1977.

SEC. 8. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit definitions of race or national origin under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000a et seq.), the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.), or section 1977 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1981).

SEC. 9. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Creating a Respectful and Open World for Natural Hair Act, or the CROWN Act, is a critically important civil rights bill that would explicitly prohibit discrimination on the basis of hair texture or hairstyles commonly associated with a particular race or national origin. It would do so in areas of the law where discrimination on the basis of race and national origin are already prohibited, such as employment, education, and housing.

To be clear, it is my view that existing civil rights statutes already make such hair-based discrimination unlawful. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission agrees, having issued guidance interpreting title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to prohibit such discrimination as a form of race discrimination in certain circumstances. Unfortunately, some Federal courts have erroneously rejected this interpretation. The CROWN Act simply fixes these courts' misinterpretation of Federal civil rights law.

This fix is urgently needed. According to a 2019 study conducted by the JOY Collective, Black people are ''disproportionately burdened by policies and practices in public places, including the workplace, that target, profile, or single them out for natural hair styles'' and other hairstyles traditionally associated with their race, like braids, locs, and twists.

The study also found that 80 percent of Black women believed that they had to change their hair from its natural state to fit in at the office and that they were 83 percent more likely to be judged harshly because of their looks.

While this study illustrates the prevalence of hair discrimination, it is the people behind those numbers that make this legislation so vital. For example, a Texas student was told that he would not be able to walk at graduation because his dreadlocks were too long; a Florida boy was turned away from his first day of school because his hair was too long; and a New Orleans-area girl was sent home from school for wearing braids.

Similarly, numerous Black employees have been told to change their hair because it violated their employer's dress code. Some have even been denied employment altogether because of their hairstyles.

In view of these disturbing facts, 14 States have enacted statutes prohibiting discrimination on the basis of an individual's natural hairstyle—in every case with bipartisan support and sometimes even with the unanimous support of both parties.

While I applaud these States for taking action, this is a matter of basic justice that demands a national solution by Congress. That is why I strongly support the CROWN Act. The House passed a nearly identical measure last Congress, and I hope that we will do so again today.

I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey, Representative BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN, for her leadership and for introducing this important bill this Congress. I urge all Members to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1545

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

Mr. Speaker, racial discrimination is wrong; it is un-American; and it is contrary to our ideals. Our Federal civil rights laws recognize these facts. The laws are clear, and courts have been consistent that disparate treatment of one individual when compared to another cannot be based on race, color, or national origin.

A person also cannot use a pretextual reason as cover for taking a discriminatory action prohibited by our civil rights laws. The Supreme Court settled that issue in 1973. As early as 1976, Federal courts held that discrimination on the basis of a hairstyle associated with a certain race or national origin may, in fact, constitute racial discrimination.

In other words, under current law, if a person's hairstyle or hair texture is associated with a person's race or national origin and is used as a pretext for discrimination, that conduct is unlawful.

These decades of precedent make the bill that we are debating today unnecessary and duplicative. In fact, the chairman of the committee just said that 3 minutes ago.

The problem raised by the Democrats is one solved by enforcing our existing laws, not by making this conduct illegal for a second time.

The Democrats may have recognized this fact if they had held legislative hearings on this bill this Congress, but they didn't. So, the Committee on the Judiciary didn't have the opportunity to hear from experts about the legislation or how it comports with existing law. That is just one example of the deficient process that brought this bill to the floor today.

At markup, Republican members of the Committee on the Judiciary raised multiple concerns about this bill's potential impact. For example, schools, employers, and other entities covered by Federal civil rights laws may have race-neutral policies that everyone must follow. These policies are sometimes necessary to ensure an employee can adequately and safely do their job, such as a prohibition on hairstyles that could prevent a firefighter from properly wearing a respirator or a helmet.

This bill, however, may jeopardize these policies because it creates a blanket prohibition on adverse treatment because of certain hairstyles or hair textures.

These concerns and the Democrats' deficient process caused every Republican Member to oppose this bill at markup. Instead of working to address these problems, the Democrats are bringing this bill, which was reported on a party-line vote, to a vote under suspension of the rules. The Democrats are prioritizing this legislation, a bill to prohibit conduct already unlawful under our law, for political messaging reasons.

This bill does not address any of the serious problems our country currently faces. Think about the crime problem; the 40-year-high inflation problem; the 2 million illegal immigrants that have come across our border in 1 year's time alone; and, of course, not to mention the situation going on in Ukraine as we speak.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN), sponsor of this bill.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of our committee for allotting me this time to speak on a bill that I think is very important.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise today to defend the right of Black people to exist as their authentic selves.

Mr. Speaker, 58 years after the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, racial discrimination still runs rampant.

Far too often, Black people, especially Black women and girls, are derided or deemed unprofessional simply because their hair does not conform to White beauty standards.

Our natural hair is as innate a quality of Black people as the presence of melanin in our skin. Discriminating against our hair is no different than discriminating against the color of our skin.

Hair discrimination forces Black people to choose between employment and existing authentically.

Black women are 80 percent more likely to alter their hair to fit in at work. It is no different at school, where Black students are disproportionately suspended for unapproved hairstyles.

Fortunately, with the support of groups like the CROWN Coalition, State legislatures across the country have banned hair discrimination. State-level progress is an important step in the right direction, but it is not enough.

Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced the CROWN Act to end hair discrimination at the Federal level. My bill would eliminate an undue burden that Black women face every day.

The methods Black women use to manipulate their hair are not only costly and time-consuming but also damaging to their hair. Nobody should have to sacrifice their time, their money, and the health of their hair for the sake of complying with racist standards of professionalism.

Further, the CROWN Act is a necessary step toward protecting Black beauty and culture. Prohibiting hair discrimination is only the beginning. Even if this bill becomes law, we have a long road ahead toward a truly inclusive society.

As Members of Congress, we must pass legislation that promotes diversity over discrimination and inclusivity over intolerance. And through our work with other organizations like the CROWN Coalition and the Screen Actors Guild, we can change the culture and build an America where everyone, from our essential service workers to our most beloved television stars, can live authentically. I thank those groups for doing everything in their power to raise awareness of this important but often ignored racial justice issue.

The CROWN Act is long-overdue civil rights legislation. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support it and send it to the President's desk without delay.

No one should be forced to alter their appearance to be accepted. It is time that Congress recognizes that, and I ask for their support.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding, and I thank, with deep appreciation, Congresswoman BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN.

I am delighted to be an original cosponsor, and I thank the Committee on the Judiciary for really standing for these issues that are uniquely engaged in the Constitution and equality and justice but that would get no light of day had our chairman and our subcommittee chairpersons not thought that it was valuable and important.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, I am very glad for their recitation of the civil rights laws. And they are right: They are extremely important in protecting the civil rights of those who have been infringed upon. But they are not perfect, and they are not perfect as evidenced by the continuous, stark discrimination regarding hairstyles, particularly with African-American women and others.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say, I realize that this is a tough business. But wear hairstyles such as what I wear and note the social media calling you monkeys over and over again.

So, it is not just the fact that you wear a style that could be called a crown; it is the advantage that others who want to racially divide—do you know who they do it to? Our children.

It is evident that there is a need for the CROWN Act because it prevents discrimination on the texture of hair or hairstyles commonly associated with a particular race or national origin in areas of the law where discrimination on the basis of race and national origin is already prohibited, but it is not precise. This law is precise.

Black people are disproportionately burdened by policies and practices in public places, including the workplace, that target, profile, or single them out.

But others are engaged as well. The CROWN study found that Black women's hair is more policed in the workplace, therefore contributing to a climate of group control. But I have seen cases as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security of Black women coming back from the Caribbean and their hair being searched, or they are being targeted as having something in that hair. That is insulting and offensive, and it is not constitutional as it relates to equal justice under the law.

The findings also say that 80 percent of Black women believe that they had to change their hairstyle. But, again, the young people who in the midst of their competition in the State of Texas, boys, girls, were required to, in an outrageous manner, cut their dreadlocks before they could compete. How heartbreaking that is. How destroyed those children were. And a young man had to go all the way to the Federal court because he refused to cut his dreadlocks. Why should he?

Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful that the military saw the outrage some years ago. In 2014, Secretary Hagel indicated a review of military policy. The Marine Corps, in 2015, followed suit and issued a regulation to permit locand-twist hairstyles.

So it is, in fact, very crucial to know that it is Native Americans; it is men; it is women.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to the chairman for the time. I thank him so very much.

Again, this is an outstanding tennis player. This is a young man. These are styles that are neat and certainly acceptable. This is a Native American. Again, a Black woman.

And here is the ultimate insult in my State. This young man, before he could compete, had to have his dreadlocks cut.

Mr. Speaker, the CROWN Act is imperative; it is needed; and I can assure you, it will not impact any medical attention that you need because the CROWN Act is about hair and hair does not impact your medical needs.

Mr. Speaker, we need the CROWN Act.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the committee on the Judiciary, Homeland Security, and on the Budget, and an original cosponsor of this important legislation, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2116, the "Creating a Respectful and Open World for Natural Hair Act of 2021" ("CROWN Act).

This necessary legislation explicitly prohibits discrimination on the basis of hair texture or hairstyles commonly associated with a particular race or national origin in areas of the law where discrimination on the basis of race or national origin is already prohibited.

It has long been my position that discrimination based on hair texture and hairstyle is a form of impermissible race discrimination.

According to a 2019 report, known as the CROWN Study, which was conducted by the JOY Collective (CROWN Act Coalition, Dove/Unilever, National Urban League, Color of Change), Black people are "disproportionately burdened by policies and practices in public places, including the workplace, that target, profile, or single them out for their natural hair styles—referring to the texture of hair that is not permed, dyed, relaxed, or chemically altered.

The CROWN Study found that Black women's hair is "more policed in the workplace, thereby contributing to a climate of group control in the company culture and perceived professional barriers" compared to non-Black women.

The study also found that "Black women are more likely to have received formal grooming policies in the workplace, and to believe that there is a dissonance from her hair and other race's hair" and that "Black women's hairstyles were consistently rated lower or 'less ready' for job performance."

Among the study's other findings are that 80 percent of Black women believed that they had to change their hair from its natural state to "fit in at the office," that they were 83 percent more likely to be judged harshly because of their looks.

The study indicated that Black women were 1.5 times more likely to be sent home from the

workplace because of their hair, and that they were 3.4 times more likely to be perceived as unprofessional compared to non-African-American women.

Eight years ago, the United States Army removed a grooming regulation prohibiting women servicemembers from wearing their hair in dreadlocks, a regulation that had a disproportionately adverse impact on Black women.

This decision was the result of a 2014 order by then-Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel to review the military's policies regarding hairstyles popular with African-American women after complaints from members of Congress, myself included, that the policies unfairly targeted black women.

In 2015, the Marine Corps followed suit and issued regulations to permit lock and twist hairstyles.

The CROWN Study illustrates the prevalence of hair discrimination but numerous stories across the country put names and faces to the people behind those numbers.

In 2017, a Banana Republic employee was told by a manager that she was violating the company's dress code because her box braids were too ''urban'' and ''unkempt.''

A year later, in 2018, Andrew Johnson, a New Jersey high school student, was forced by a white referee to either have his dreadlocks cut or forfeit a wrestling match, leading him to have his hair cut in public by an athletic trainer immediately before the match.

That same year, an 11-year-old Black girl in Louisiana was asked to leave class at a private Roman Catholic school near New Orleans because her braided hair extensions violated the school's policies.

The next year, two African-American men in Texas alleged being denied employment by Six Flags because of their hairstyles—one had long braids and the other had dreadlocks.

And earlier this year, there were news reports of a Texas student who would not be allowed to walk at graduation because his dreadlocks were too long.

The CROWN Act prohibits discrimination in federally funded programs and activities based on an individual's hair texture or hairstyle if it is commonly associated with a particular race or national origin, including ''a hairstyle in which hair is tightly coiled or tightly curled, locs, cornrows, twists, braids, Bantu knots, and Afros.''

The legislation also provides that the prohibition will be enforced as if it was incorporated into Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in federally-funded programs, and that violations of Section 3(a) will be treated as if they were violations of Section 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

I strongly support this legislation and urge all Members to join me in voting for the passage of H.R. 2116, the CROWN Act.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and, of course, the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of, and as a proud sponsor of, the CROWN Act.

For far too long, people with hairstyles or hair textures associated with their race or their nationality have faced discrimination. Yes, there are laws on the books, but it does not protect DeAndre Arnold, who was a senior at Barbers Hill High School in the Houston area. He was told to cut his dreadlocks in order to attend prom and his graduation ceremony.

Imagine, you work all those years because they tell you that you need to graduate, and then he is told you have to cut your dreadlocks.

For DeAndre, his hairstyle was important to him because it was part of his Trinidadian culture and about who he is.

This is wrong. It must never ever happen again. The way that individuals choose to style their hair is a direct representation of their culture and of who they are. When individuals are told to alter, cut, or change their hairstyle, what they are really being told is to alter their culture and their being. This must end.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to cosponsor this bill. I urge my colleagues here today to support it, to vote for it, and let's make this wrong a right.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK), the newest Member of Congress.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to represent every person of African descent across this country and in Florida's 20th Congressional District with natural hair.

I call on my colleagues from the U.S. Senate to pass the CROWN Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of hair texture or hairstyle that is commonly associated with a particular race or national origin.

Lawsuits initiated by Black workers alleging discrimination against their natural hair in the workplace have filled courthouses for more than 40 years. This legislation will provide us with the freedom to wear our crowns without discrimination.

We must understand that hair discrimination is rooted in systemic racism. Anti-Black hair sentiment on U.S. soil has existed for centuries.

As Members of Congress, we have a legal and ethical obligation to push back against the Eurocentric beauty perpetuated across TV and in the media.

Hair discrimination is race discrimination. Unfortunately, some employers discriminate against people of African descent who wear natural hair even though the employment policies involved are not related to workers' ability to perform the job.

The notion that some of these policies are race-neutral policies and, therefore, not covered under the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which outlaws discrimination based on race, sex, color, religion, and national origin, is absurd and lacks merit.

As a mother of African-American children, I want our beautiful daughters and sons in my district to feel comfortable in their skin without retaliation. Sadly, Black students are three to six times more likely to be suspended or expelled from school.

Today, there remain regressive movements that continue to criminalize natural Black hairstyles under the auspices of preparing them for the real world.

We must, instead, teach our children to embrace their natural beauty and understand that their humanity is not tied to their hair.

To the organizations that have consistently advocated for the passage of this critical piece of legislation, we thank you for your commitment.

□ 1600

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN for her stewardship over this bill. I also want to thank AYANNA PRESSLEY, ILHAN OMAR, and so many women who rose up to support this, not only this session but last session as well. I want to thank State representative LaKeshia Myers in my State in the city of Milwaukee for the ordinances and the bills that they have passed, which are similar to the CROWN Act.

Mr. Speaker, just let me say, with my short 2 minutes here, that my being instilled with low self-esteem started before I got to kindergarten, and it all revolved around my nappy hair and the way it just coiled. Two minutes is not long enough to carry you on this journey of what it is like to have your employers tell you that you are making them look bad because of the way your hair looks, and having hot combs, lye, chemicals, and being burned so that you can look White.

When I ran for this office in 2005 because I had so many pictures with my hair coifed in a European style, my handlers wouldn't let me change it. After 20 hours a day of campaigning every day, I had to figure out how to straighten my hair out. Thank God for the CROWN Act.

Mr. Speaker, I thank God for being able to stand here under the e pluribus unum as my authentic, nappy-headed self.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, my great home State of Louisiana is where the tignon laws originated. These laws mandated that Black women of Louisiana cover their beautiful hair, making it illegal to expose our hair. Imagine that.

All Americans should have the right to wear their hair that naturally grows

out of their heads without fear. We, as Members of Congress, must act to ban any discrimination against natural hair. Whether it is locs, curls, braids, or twists, Black Americans have the right to exist as their authentic selves and wear their natural hair with pride.

The CROWN Act would give and defend the right by prohibiting discrimination on the basis of hair texture or hairstyle in employment, education, and several other important spheres. This legislation has been heavily vetted and has already been passed in several States.

I am proud to have authored in advance the CROWN Act as a member of the Louisiana State Senate, but not complete the process before I was elected to Congress. This is particularly special for me. For the people of Louisiana and for people across the Nation, Federal action is needed.

Studies show that 80 percent of Black women feel they have to change their hairstyles to simply fit in to the workplace, that natural hair is somehow unprofessional. This is unacceptable.

I am calling on this Chamber to do the right thing, that all elected officials stand up and do what is right by the people of America. This includes those who may not live in your district and those who have different life experiences.

For the overwhelming majority of our country's existence, racial discrimination in its various forms has been legal. Today, we can continue to move this Nation forward.

Today, the House will vote to make discrimination based on hairstyles a thing of the past and make our workplaces more inclusive and truly free for people to express themselves.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, what is Congress doing today? What is the people's House—under the Democrat majority—what is the House of Representatives up to today? Passing a bill to prohibit conduct that is already unlawful under the law. Discrimination based on hairstyle is already unlawful.

That is what the Congress, what the House of Representatives, is going to pass today. Think about it. That is the priority today when we have gone in literally 1 year's time from a secure border to complete chaos. Two million illegal crossings in 1 year on our border. In fact, we don't really have a border.

We have gone from safe streets to record crime in every major urban area in 1 year's time. They are focused on a bill to make conduct that is already unlawful, unlawful again, I guess.

We went from energy independence to the spectacle of the President of the United States begging OPEC to increase production. We have gone from stable prices to a 40-year high inflation rate, and Democrats are focused on this bill.

This past summer we had the debacle that was the exit from Afghanistan. As we speak, the Ukrainian people are fighting for their lives, and Democrats are passing a bill to prohibit conduct already unlawful under Federal law, a bill that says you can't discriminate based on hairstyle, which is already unlawful.

We have had a year now where Democrats attack every liberty we enjoy under the First Amendment, every single one. There are still some locations in America where a full congregation cannot meet on a Sunday morning. There are some places where you still can't assemble and can't petition.

The Democrats have kept the Capitol closed to the American people, their own darn Capitol. How are you supposed to come in and petition your Member to redress your grievances if you are not even allowed in your Capitol that your tax dollars pay for? Of course, we know what they have done to freedom of speech and the attacks there. Their focus today is on this bill.

Madam Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote. Let's focus on the issues that I think the vast majority of the American people want us to focus on like crime, like the 40-year high inflation rate, like the border problem, and like the fact that we were an energy independent country just a few months back. Let's focus on those issues.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, while racism and discrimination sometimes appear in overt forms, they can also manifest themselves in more subtle ways. One way is through discrimination based on natural hairstyles and hair textures associated with people of a particular race or national origin.

As we have discussed on this floor, this is intolerable and it is not taken care of by current law, despite the statements from the other side notwithstanding. The CROWN Act would make explicit that the civil rights laws prohibit such discrimination. It is a matter of basic fairness and justice.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to support this important legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2116, the Creating a Respectful and Open World for Natural Hair Act, commonly known as the CROWN Act. I am honored to co-lead this bill with Rep. WATSON COLEMAN, Rep. PRESSLEY, Rep. OMAR and Rep. MOORE, which will take direct aim at prohibiting race-based hair discrimination for African Americans and people of African descent.

Hair discrimination creates illogical barriers to advancement in the workplace or equal treatment in schools for people of African descent. For example, our sons and daughters are penalized in school for natural hair styles deemed as ''messy'' and ''unruly.'' We've seen students humiliated and unfairly disciplined because their braided hair extensions or locs have been judged as a violation of the dress code. In the workplace, a study found that women with curly afros, braids or twists, are often perceived as ''less professional'' than Black women with straightened hair. These perceptions have real impacts on their ability to be promoted or get raises.

I have been fighting to end this discriminatory practice for years. In 2014, the women of the Congressional Black Caucus urged the Army to rescind Army regulation 670–1, which prohibited many hairstyles worn by African American women and other women of color and I led an amendment included in the FY15 Defense Appropriations Bill to ban funding for this discriminatory rule. Due to our advocacy, a few years later the U.S. Navy removed their discriminatory policy allowing women, particularly women of color, to wear their hair in dreadlocks, large buns, braids, and ponytails.

This laid the groundwork for California to become the first state to ban discrimination against African Americans for wearing natural hairstyles at school or in the workplace with the passage of The Creating a Respectful and Open Workplace for Natural hair (CROWN) Act. We should be able to show up as our whole selves—and passing the CROWN Act is a major step in that direction.

We owe it to our children to take action here in Congress to break down these barriers, and make sure that they are able to build the future they deserve. I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary, Homeland Security, and on the Budget, and an original cosponsor of this important legislation, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2116, the ''Creating a Respectful and Open World for Natural Hair Act of 2021'' (''CROWN Act).

This necessary legislation explicitly prohibits discrimination on the basis of hair texture or hairstyles commonly associated with a particular race or national origin in areas of the law where discrimination on the basis of race or national origin is already prohibited.

It has long been my position that discrimination based on hair texture and hairstyle is a form of impermissible race discrimination.

According to a 2019 report, known as the CROWN Study, which was conducted by the JOY Collective (CROWN Act Coalition, Dove/Unilever, National Urban League, Color of Change), Black people are ''disproportionately burdened by policies and practices in public places, including the workplace, that target, profile, or single them out for their natural hair styles—referring to the texture of hair that is not permed, dyed, relaxed, or chemically altered.''

The CROWN Study found that Black women's hair is ''more policed in the workplace, thereby contributing to a climate of group control in the company culture and perceived professional barriers'' compared to non-Black women.

The study also found that ''Black women are more likely to have received formal grooming policies in the workplace, and to believe that there is a dissonance from her hair and other

race's hair'' and that ''Black women's hairstyles were consistently rated lower or 'less ready' for job performance.''

Among the study's other findings are that 80 percent of Black women believed that they had to change their hair from its natural state to ''fit in at the office,'' that they were 83 percent more likely to be judged harshly because of their looks.

The study indicated that Black women were 1.5 times more likely to be sent home from the workplace because of their hair, and that they were 3.4 times more likely to be perceived as unprofessional compared to non-African-American women.

Eight years ago, the United States Army removed a grooming regulation prohibiting women servicemembers from wearing their hair in dreadlocks, a regulation that had a disproportionately adverse impact on Black women.

This decision was the result of a 2014 order by then-Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel to review the military's policies regarding hairstyles popular with African-American women after complaints from members of Congress, myself included, that the policies unfairly targeted black women.

In 2015, the Marine Corps followed suit and issued regulations to permit lock and twist hairstyles.

The CROWN Study illustrates the prevalence of hair discrimination but numerous stories across the country put names and faces to the people behind those numbers.

In 2017, a Banana Republic employee was told by a manager that she was violating the company's dress code because her box braids were too ''urban'' and ''unkempt.''

A year later, in 2018, Andrew Johnson, a New Jersey high school student, was forced by a white referee to either have his dreadlocks cut or forfeit a wrestling match, leading him to have his hair cut in public by an athletic trainer immediately before the match.

That same year, an 11-year-old Black girl in Louisiana was asked to leave class at a private Roman Catholic school near New Orleans because her braided hair extensions violated the school's policies.

The next year, two African-American men in Texas alleged being denied employment by Six Flags because of their hairstyles—one had long braids and the other had dreadlocks.

And earlier this year, there were news reports of a Texas student who would not be allowed to walk at graduation because his dreadlocks were too long.

The CROWN Act prohibits discrimination in federally funded programs and activities based on an individual's hair texture or hairstyle if it is commonly associated with a particular race or national origin, including ''a hairstyle in which hair is tightly coiled or tightly curled, locs, cornrows, twists, braids, Bantu knots, and Afros.''

The legislation also provides that the prohibition will be enforced as if it was incorporated into Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in federally-funded programs, and that violations of Section 3(a) will be treated as if they were violations of Section 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

I strongly support this legislation and urge all Members to join me in voting for the passage of H.R. 2116, the CROWN Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2116, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam 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 motion are postponed.

EMMETT TILL ANTILYNCHING ACT

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 55) to amend section 249 of title 18, United States Code, to specify lynching as a hate crime act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 55

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 ''Emmett Till Antilynching Act''.

SEC. 2. LYNCHING; OTHER CONSPIRACIES.

Section 249(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) LYNCHING.—Whoever conspires to commit any offense under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) shall, if death or serious bodily injury (as defined in section 2246 of this title) results from the offense, be imprisoned for not more than 30 years, fined in accordance with this title, or both.

''(6) OTHER CONSPIRACIES.—Whoever conspires to commit any offense under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) shall, if death or serious bodily injury (as defined in section 2246 of this title) results from the offense, or if the offense includes kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, be imprisoned for not more than 30 years, fined in accordance with this title, or both.''.

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, the Emmett Till Antilynching Act is long-overdue legislation that would correct a historical injustice by finally specifying lynching as a crime under Federal law.

Our Nation endured a shameful period during which thousands of African Americans were lynched as a means of racial subordination and enforcing white supremacy. These violent incidents were largely tolerated by State and Federal officials, and they represent a stain on our Nation's legacy.

Today, we acknowledge this disgraceful chapter in American history, and we send a clear message that such violent actions motivated by hatred and bigotry will not be tolerated in this country.

The term ''lynching'' generally refers to premeditated public acts of violence—often resulting in death—carried out by a mob in order to punish an alleged transgressor or to strike fear among a targeted group.

Throughout history, lynching has been employed as an extreme form of informal group social control and has often been conducted with the display of a public spectacle for maximum intimidation.

This legislation is named in honor of Emmett Till, a 14-year-old African-American youth from Chicago, who was lynched in a particularly gruesome fashion while visiting an uncle in Mississippi in 1955. His murder and the antilynching movement that followed set the stage for the creation of the civil rights movement that we recognize today.

Though lynching touches all races and religions and occurs throughout the United States, it has been most common in the South and was targeted primarily at Blacks.

During the period between the Civil War and World War II, thousands of African Americans were lynched in the United States. These violent incidents profoundly impacted race relations and shaped the geographic, political, social, and economic conditions of African-American communities in ways that are still evident today.

The first Federal antilynching legislation was introduced in 1900, almost 120 years ago, by Congressman George Henry White, the only African-American Member of Congress at that time. Unfortunately, neither his bill nor any antilynching bills that were introduced in the decades that followed managed to pass Congress.

The Department of Justice has used other laws to prosecute some civil rights-era crimes and hate crimes that were described as lynching in public