

the players, coaches, families, and fans, it is truly a way of life.

It brings me great joy to see these athletes represent some of the best parts of our great Eighth District as State champions.

This group of hardworking young players has shown what dedication, passion, and unwavering commitment can accomplish. It is a true example of American exceptionalism.

I also honor the coaches for being outstanding role models and leaders to the Hawks this entire season. Head coach, Pat Andrews, and assistant coaches: Nate Buck, Matt Swanson, and Chad Huttel guided the team to not only the school's fourth State championship, but also a winning season concluding with 29 wins with only 2 losses. The Hawks secured the championship with an exciting 3-2 win over Warroad.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate every player, coach, and fan who lifted the Hermantown Hawks to victory. They have made our district so proud, and I wish every team member the best as they continue their hockey careers.

□ 0915

RECOGNIZING THE CENTRAL DEWITT SPECIAL OLYMPICS

(Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize some incredible students from Iowa's Second Congressional District.

On Saturday, March 12, the Central DeWitt Special Olympics basketball team earned a silver medal and the Sabers unified dance team earned a gold medal at the Mid-Winter Tournament in Iowa City.

For the last few years, Special Olympics Iowa has put on the Mid-Winter Tournament as part of their ongoing series of events to showcase the amazing skills and talents of our athletes.

The Mid-Winter Tournament sees competition in basketball, basketball skills, cheerleading, gymnastics, and powerlifting. Healthy Athletes screenings are also provided to athletes by healthcare professionals for dental, hearing, overall health and fitness, and more.

Organizations like Special Olympics strive to create a better world by fostering the acceptance and inclusion of all people. Through the power of sports, these athletes discover new strengths, skills, confidence, abilities, fulfillment, and success. They also learn the values of hard work, sportsmanship, perseverance, teamwork, and, most importantly, having fun.

Special Olympics has changed the lives of so many amazing athletes, and I am proud to have them in Iowa. But I am even prouder of the awesome athletes from Central DeWitt who are already making their mark on the world. Go Sabers.

CREATING A RESPECTFUL AND OPEN WORLD FOR NATURAL HAIR ACT OF 2021

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 979, I call up the bill (H.R. 2116) to prohibit discrimination based on an individual's texture or style of hair, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 979, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-36 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, 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 mis-

interpreted 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. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 2116.

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 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 or national origin is already prohibited, such as employment, education, and housing.

Although Republicans blocked passage of this bill a few weeks ago, their arguments have just as little merit now as they did then. That is why we are here again, to advance this important legislation.

Among the arguments that we heard previously was that this bill was not needed because the law already protects people from hair-based discrimination. While I agree that existing civil rights statutes, if properly read, already make such discrimination unlawful, several Federal courts have erroneously rejected this interpretation, leaving the state of the law unclear at best.

Far from being duplicative, this legislation is absolutely essential to remove any ambiguity from the law and to fix these courts’ misinterpretation of Federal civil rights law.

Republicans also argued that this legislation could somehow undermine the ability of employers to maintain workplace safety standards. But nothing could be further from the truth. This bill does nothing to prohibit employers from addressing safety concerns, and the longstanding provisions under the civil rights laws that enable employers to ensure workplace safety would remain firmly in place.

Since neither of these arguments holds up to scrutiny, it is important to step back and understand why the CROWN Act is so 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 hairstyles,” and other hairstyles traditionally associated with their race, like braids, locs, and twists.

This has real consequences for real people. Students have been sent home from school or told they could not walk at graduation. Employees have been told to change their hair because it violated their employer’s dress code. Some people have even been denied jobs 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.

I am disappointed that we did not see such bipartisan support when we brought this bill up a few weeks ago, but my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have another chance today to do the right thing. This is a matter of basic justice that demands a national solution by Congress. That is why I strongly support the CROWN Act and urge all my colleagues, including my Republican colleagues, to do so as well.

I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. 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.

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

Joe Biden inherited a relatively stable and calm world, and in 14 months, we have complete chaos.

Think about last summer. Think about that video last summer where you had people trying to jump on the wheel of the plane as it was taking off in Afghanistan, that situation there, the debacle that was the exit from Afghanistan. Think about what is going on in Ukraine today.

Here at home, in 14 months, we went from a secure border to complete chaos, over 2 million illegal immigrants coming into this country in 1 year.

We went from relatively safe streets to record levels of crime in every major urban area in the country. We went from stable prices to record-high inflation, 40-year-high inflation. We went from energy independence to \$5 a gallon gas and the President of the United States begging Iran and Venezuela to increase production. In 14 months, from stability to chaos.

Today, what are the Democrats bringing to the floor? A bill that is titled Creating a Respectful and Open World for Natural Hair Act of 2022. That is what we are focused on today.

How about a world where gas prices aren't \$5 a gallon? How about a world where you can actually walk safely on your streets and not have record levels of crime? How about a world where inflation isn't at a 40-year high? How about a world where we are actually energy independent? Those are the issues we should be focused on.

But Democrats today, Friday, March 18, 2022, with chaos all over the place, this is what they are focused on.

Madam Speaker, as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee just said, we have civil rights laws that cover any kind of discrimination. It is covered. It is wrong if it happens. But this is what the Democrats are focused on. Fourteen months of chaos, and we are doing a bill on hair.

I think the American people expect more from their Congress, expect more from their elected Representatives, and I hope we can actually focus on the things that matter to the American people.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I said that this was covered by the law, but several Federal circuit courts disagree. Therefore, it is not covered in those circuits, and that is why we need this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN), the sponsor of the bill.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman who is the chairman of our Judiciary Committee for recognizing me.

I really do wish we could concentrate on other issues as well, and I think that we are. I think that creation of 6.5 million jobs, of unity around the world, of restoring dignity and respect among our people, trying to put our attention onto things as important as Build Back Better and taking care of the economy, recognizes that Joe Biden, this administration, this Democratic majority in the House of Representatives, can chew gum and walk at the same time.

If my colleagues don't think this is worthy of debate, then they should have gone on and done what they did 2 years ago and vote for the bill a couple weeks ago.

But here we are today. Here we are today standing on behalf of those individuals, whether my colleagues on the other side recognize it or not, who are discriminated against as children in school, as adults who are trying to get jobs, as individuals who are trying to get housing, as individuals who simply want access to public accommodations and to be beneficiaries of federally funded programs.

Why are they denied these opportunities? Because there are folks in this society who get to make those decisions who think that because your hair is kinky, it is braided, it is in knots, or it is not straightened blond and light brown, that you somehow are not worthy of access to those issues. That is discrimination.

There is no logical reason that anyone should be discriminated against on any level because of the texture of their hair or the style of their hair.

I understand that my colleagues on the Republican side don't get the vast array of discriminatory practices because they spend so much time trying to perpetuate an all-White society here in the most diverse country in the world.

Nonetheless, this bill is vitally important. It is important to the young girls and the young boys who have to cut their hair in the middle of a wrestling match in front of everyone because some White referee says that your hair is inappropriate to engage in your match. That young man engaged in his match and he won it.

It is inappropriate for our girls to be sent home disciplined or pushed out simply because they have got braids in their hair. And it is doggone sure discriminatory to deny someone employment, housing, or public accommodations because of the way they are wearing their hair.

That is why we are standing here today. It is unfortunate that we have to, but we do.

With that in mind, I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for giving me this opportunity to speak on behalf of a bill that I think is vitally important, that represents movement and understanding in the 21st century,

what discrimination can look like and what it can do to people.

I urge all of my colleagues, including those on the Republican side that voted for it a couple weeks ago, to vote for it today.

□ 0930

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. BUSH), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. BUSH. Madam Speaker, St. Louis and I rise today in support of the CROWN Act.

As a Black woman who loves my braids, I know what it is like to feel isolated because of how I wear my hair.

For the last time, we say no more to Black people being demeaned and discriminated against for the same hairstyles that corporations profit from, no more to Black people being made to feel like we have to cut our locs just to get a job.

For the last time, we say no more to Black people being made to feel like we have to straighten our hair to be deemed professional, no more to Black children being suspended from school because their hair doesn't align with their school's dress code. This is actually a thing.

We are American, and we stand up and say no more for the last time. We are American. Black hair is not to be policed.

Madam Speaker, I commend my colleagues for their work on the CROWN Act, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, we are going to talk about hair, but this bill is about discrimination. This bill is about equality. This bill is about individual integrity. That is what this bill is about.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill. I thank my friend from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for putting it forward.

This bill, as I just said, is not about hair. It is about hair, of course, but it is about the reaction, the inequality, the discrimination, the "you are not welcome here if your hair texture is different," and you have to or want to fix it in a certain way.

It is about the ability of every person in our country to have access to education, to economic advancements, and to opportunities to get ahead.

This is an issue of civil rights. The legislation before us would prohibit discrimination based on a person's hair texture or hairstyle if that style or texture is commonly associated with a particular race or national origin.

My hair is different than BARBARA LEE's, who is seated next to me. Neither one of us had anything to do with that. I had no way to have the texture of my hair any way other than what

my genetic makeup was, nor did BARBARA LEE.

Why, therefore, should there be any thought that anybody would be able to discriminate on that basis? Too often, styles such as locs, cornrows, twists, braids, Bantu knots, and Afros are wrongly perceived as unkempt or unprofessional.

In fact, many of these styles are not only central to one's culture and heritage but also based upon convenience, based upon a way to have an easier time.

For a long time, and still today, expectations about what hairstyles are considered appropriate or professional, as the previous speaker said, have created immense pressure to conform to a beauty standard of straight hair that requires considerable time, effort, and cost. This burden falls disproportionately on Black Americans, particularly Black women and girls.

At the same time, enforcing the standard sends a terrible message to young people about their belonging in society and can harm their very self-esteem.

A survey commissioned by the Dove company found that Black women were 80 percent more likely to change their natural hair to fit into an office setting and 1½ times more likely to be sent home from the workplace due to their hair than non-Black women.

For children and teenagers in school, spending time conforming their hair to a different standard takes away from their time spent doing homework or getting enough sleep.

I hope I never get so old that I don't remember that I really cared about: Did I look like the other kids in school, or did I look different?

I happened to have been really skinny as a kid. I am not too fat right now, but I was really skinny as a kid, and I was really self-conscious about that. When you are a kid, being self-conscious is really painful, and you feel put off if somehow you are different.

For children and teenagers in school, spending time conforming their hair to a different standard takes away from time spent doing homework and getting enough sleep, but, much more importantly, their psychological well-being.

This legislation recognizes that natural hair, natural hair, natural hair—none of us made our nature; it was made for us—should not be a cause for discrimination or denial of opportunities.

If we treat this discrimination in the same way as we already treat discrimination based on race—nobody decides the color of their skin. It is who you are. It is what you have.

As Martin Luther King told us, it is really irrelevant. The content of character is what is relevant—not the hue of skin, but how I treat others and how others treat me.

That is what we meant by all men and women are created equal. They are not created the same. We are different.

But it is the character and conduct that ought to govern how we are accepted and treated.

This is similar to title VI and title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Fair Housing Act, and other civil rights laws.

Nationwide protection is necessary so that no one is denied the simple dignity of being one's authentic self in America while having access to all opportunities this country offers.

Character and conduct—our military took steps to end hair discrimination last year, if anybody thinks this isn't a real issue. Obviously, the military thought it was an issue, and it was an important enough issue that they took action.

The House passed this legislation in 2020 with bipartisan support. Frankly, it is disappointing that 188 Republicans opposed this legislation last week when we brought it to the floor under an expedited process, under suspension.

This should be something that all of us as Americans, as people who honor the Declaration of Independence and that statement that reverberated around the world of a very central premise that is America: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all," and we said "men" because we were limited in our thought pattern at that point in time. But as we have grown, we have expanded it.

Men and women of all different types and colors and, yes, sexual orientation are equal. Not the same, but deserving because God has created them, deserving of our respect and our equal treatment.

I am bringing this bill back to the floor, Madam Speaker, under a rule so that we can pass it with bipartisan support today. I think it will be bipartisan. This really ought to have unanimous support since it is about fairness and nondiscrimination.

I know that some people say, oh, this is going to cause some people problems because some people are going to claim that you violated my rights. Yes, that is America. That is why the Constitution says you have the right to redress grievances.

Yes, it may have some in court, but you can get around it really quickly: Don't discriminate. Treat people based upon their conduct and character.

We must act to ensure that everyone can get a job, succeed in school or at work, find housing, and obtain economic security without facing discrimination simply because of their hair.

Again, I thank my friend, BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN, for her leadership on this bill. And I urge my colleagues to make America a little fairer, a little more hewing to that basic premise of which I just spoke.

Let's pass this bill. Let's make America a little more American.

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

Madam Speaker, the majority leader just said that the bill is not about hair; the bill is about discrimination.

I would say he is wrong on both counts because disparate treatment cannot be based on race, color, national origin. That is already the law. That is constitutional.

So, he is wrong on that statement, and the bill is definitely about hair. Here is the title of the bill: Creating a Respectful and Open World for Natural Hair. So, he is wrong on both counts. So, the bill is about hair.

What the bill is not about is dealing with the crazy energy situation we find ourselves in today. The bill is not about opening up ANWR. The bill is not about increasing domestic production of energy so we don't have \$5 gas.

The bill is not about dealing with the inflation problem, the 40-year high inflation problem that this country faces, the problem that is impacting moms and dads and families across this country every single day. The bill is not about that.

It is definitely about hair. It is not about that.

It is not about dealing with the border situation, the 165,000 illegal encounters on the border last month alone. It is not about that. It is not about that.

The majority leader was wrong when he said this bill was not about hair. That is all it is about.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP), my friend and a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, to Mr. JORDAN's point, we are beset with problems.

Two of the most significant are that the Producer Price Index is at 10 percent. We face a cost environment that is unsustainable, and that affects every American's livelihood every time they visit a gas pump or go to the store. We face an employment environment where Americans have been disincentivized to work.

Every time I speak to people in my district—well, it may be different in the last couple of weeks and the latest catastrophes we have seen. But certainly, until then, the leading concern is the availability of people who are inclined to work in order to fulfill job opportunities.

The Judiciary Committee's report on this legislation points out that I and Representative CLIFF BENTZ from Oregon raised a question about this legislation in the markup, that it may prevent employers from regulating hairstyles for workplace safety reasons.

One of the cases involved, I believe, was about long dreadlocks that could become ensnared in machinery on a workplace floor.

Let me tell you what the Judiciary Committee's report by the majority says is the answer to that problem. They say that concern is misplaced because under the longstanding burden-shifting scheme applied by courts in title VII cases, an employer may defeat a discrimination claim by asserting that workplace safety was a legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for

taking an adverse employment action against an employee, with the burden then shifting to the employee to prove that the asserted reason was a pretext for discrimination.

Assuming the employee cannot demonstrate that the employer's assertion of workplace safety was pretextual, the employer would prevail against an employment discrimination claim. How extraordinarily comforting.

So, if an employee wants to wear dreadlocks, and an employer is legitimately concerned for the health and safety of the employee, that his scalp might be ripped off by a machine, then the employer can enter into the litigation.

It certainly couldn't be arbitrated. We took care of that yesterday right on the floor of the House. We have to have litigation. We will have expensive lawyers.

We will start, get the complaint filed, the answer filed. Maybe there will be a motion to dismiss that will be denied. We will get into the discovery process. We will send out the interrogatories and the document requests. We will ask for the other occasions where somebody has been fired, examine the processes and the practices of the employer for the last decade.

□ 0945

We will get some experts in. We have got to have some experts to come in and testify to the likelihood that long dreadlocks are going to get caught in the machinery. We will have conflicting experts on each side. They will disagree. Then the court will receive a motion for summary judgment, say if there is enough evidence to submit the case to trial, and the judge will have a 130-page opinion that will examine the burden-shifting scheme and the initial burden, and then the response burden, and the burden shifts to the employee to show pretext.

And the inflation rate creeps higher, and the folks willing to enter into jobs seem to be less and less, and the catastrophes keep coming. But this is the top priority.

I don't think we need to drive lawsuits between Americans. I think, in the main, Americans well understand the rules of the road. As the Judiciary Committee itself reports, courts have generally even recognized that hairstyle, to the extent it is associated with race, as a basis for decisions on employment or the like, is already unlawful. The EEOC's own manual says that discriminating on the basis of, for example, Afros is unlawful.

This bill is another solution to a problem that doesn't exist in any significant scope in this country, and the result being inflation that gets higher, more supply constriction that drives inflation higher, more animosity and obstacles between employees and employers, between merchants and customers to drive more lawsuits to pay more lawyers to make the quality of life in America so much better. That is

where we are. That is where we are today on the floor of the House.

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

I would point out again, because some of my Republican colleagues seem not to hear it, that this is the law, as they say, but that several circuit courts say it isn't the law, so all this bill is doing is reaffirming what the law is, despite several circuit courts. And we see that the law in those States where the circuit courts have upheld it properly has not resulted in any of the catastrophes we just heard.

Mr. HOYER. Will the chairman yield?

Mr. NADLER. Yes, I will. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Is it not correct, Mr. Chairman, the reason this bill is on the floor is because Republicans voted against a suspension—

Mr. NADLER. Yes.

Mr. HOYER. Which could have easily passed to say we are against discrimination? And because 188 Republicans voted "no," this bill needed to come forward because, as the chairman has just pointed out, the law is in doubt because courts have taken different positions. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2116, the Creating a Respectful and Open World for Natural Hair Act, commonly known as the CROWN Act. I would like to thank Speaker PELOSI, Chairman NADLER, and of course Congresswoman BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN for bringing this bill to the floor.

Let me just first say, we all know—and you have heard the debate—that this bill is going to take aim at prohibiting race-based hair discrimination. Let me tell the other side: I am an American, and this is very important to me and to millions of Americans. Yet, your arguments, you know they are outrageous, but they are not surprising.

Republicans, every step of the way, try to diminish the humanity of Black and Brown people, try to uphold white supremacy at every step of the way. Just listen to what you are saying in terms of arguing against this bill.

For decades, Black and Brown people have been penalized for wearing hairstyles, natural hairstyles deemed as messy, unruly, and unprofessional. We have seen students humiliated and unfairly disciplined because their braided hair extensions or locs were considered a violation of the dress code. And in the workplace, Black people with curly Afros, braids, twists or locs, or with no hair are often perceived as less professional than people with straightened hair, which negatively impacts their ability to be promoted or to get raises.

Yes, personally, I have always worn my hair however I chose. I have worn it

straight; I have worn it braided; I have worn it spiked; I have worn it curly; I have worn it in a big natural; you name it. Everyone should be able to make those choices without fear of repercussion.

Hair discrimination is rooted in systemic racism and is a real barrier to advancement and empowerment for our communities. 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 671, which prohibited many hairstyles worn by African-American women and other women of color, and I led an amendment in the fiscal year 2015 Defense appropriations bill to ban funding for this discriminatory rule.

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

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

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I just want to remind you, we put this in the Defense appropriations bill to ban funding for this discriminatory rule. The military understood it.

Due to our advocacy, a few years later the U.S. Navy removed their discriminatory policy, allowing women, especially women of color, to wear their hair in dreadlocks, large buns, braids, and ponytails. We owe it to ourselves and to future generations to take action here in Congress to break down these barriers. Everyone should be able to show up as their authentic selves and passing the CROWN Act is a major step in that direction. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I just want to point out, the majority leader just 3 minutes ago said the reason the bill is on the floor today is because of the minority. That can't happen. We don't schedule the floor. The reason the bill is on the floor today is because the majority is bringing it to the floor.

I would love to be able to have the power as the minority to bring legislation to the floor because if we could, I tell you what, it wouldn't be this bill. It would be a bill dealing with energy, a bill trying to bring down the price of gasoline, which is at \$5 a gallon in some States. It would be a bill trying to deal with the border situation. I wish we could schedule the floor.

Let's hope the American people are going to make a change this fall and put us in a position where we can schedule the floor because if we do, if we get that power, we will focus on those kinds of issues.

The majority leader of the House of Representatives just said the reason the bill is on the floor today is because of the minority. That cannot happen. I wish it could, but it can't. Those are the kind of arguments we are getting.

We should be focused on the issues the American people want us to focus on right now. Families across this

country, all families want us to focus on certain things. But not the Democrats. They are going to focus on the hair bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, to the point just made by Mr. JORDAN, it does strike me that what is being described, by the majority leader or by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, is that some courts in the hundreds of Federal courts that we have—I am not even sure they are all Federal they are describing, but I assume so—have decided that this is not an issue that is covered under one or more of these laws.

But you know what usually happens is, the Congress waits for the court system to work this out to the United States Supreme Court; and when there is a decision there, if the decision is contrary to the intent of Congress, Congress responds.

So again, in terms of picking up something that is unnecessary, that is what the majority is doing. It is not Republicans who bring the bill to the floor. It is not Republicans who pick a fight over something that most wouldn't even disagree about except in circumstances of safety, and then the question becomes one of the degree of burden imposed on employers, whether you want to drive lawsuits.

I was thinking maybe, as Mr. JORDAN was speaking, that it would be nice to bring, since the minority can get issues to the floor—I didn't know that. I have been here just since 2019, and we have been in the minority the whole time. I can think of a lot of things we should bring to the floor. We should bring a bill to unleash American energy independence. We really need that right now. Not just a bill cutting off imports from Russia, not just a bill driving prices higher so that Americans will not only be paying \$4 and \$5, thanks to Joe Biden, at the pump, but they will soon be paying \$6, \$7, \$8 at the pump.

If the minority could bring a bill to the floor, we could bring a bill to the floor that would say let's open up the ability to drill, let's encourage the energy industry in America to produce the energy that the world needs so that prices will be low and that Americans across the board, not just a few who have these extraneous handful of cases out of the whole Federal court system in which the result has not turned out the way we would like it to have turned out, let's worry about the millions and millions of Americans who will soon have to pay \$7 or \$8 at the pump every day, while it is \$4 or \$5 now. That is what I would do if the minority could bring something to the floor.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I just want to point out that we don't need new drilling legislation. There are 6,000 leases which have been granted by the Federal Government which the oil companies are not drilling. They can drill.

Madam Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2116, the CROWN Act. No one should be deprived of equal rights under the law because of their hair texture or style. It should never be the case that a person is denied the opportunity to participate in school sports or is sent home from work just because of what their hair looks like.

The most egregious example of this was a wrestling coach who had an African-American wrestler that had to cut his hair to perform. He wasn't allowed on the wrestling team unless his hair was cut because the wrestling coach didn't like it. Well, the wrestling coach was ignorant of the fact that that should have been his choice. He couldn't rise to understand it.

Now, Mr. BISHOP and I, we share something in common. We both don't have a wonderful crown with glorious locks. And sometimes when people, particularly people who aren't too smart, get mad at me—and I imagine this happens to Mr. BISHOP, too—they will say: You bald-headed whatever. I have no choice in the fact that I am bald headed. I had a lot of hair when I was young. I had more hair than Mr. JORDAN.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Let me just ask, do you think anyone has ever discriminated against you because you are bald?

Mr. COHEN. Well, they have said things they thought were nasty. But it was not nasty to me because I have no choice in the fact that I am bald.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Did you bring a lawsuit?

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time.

I am just as good a human being, just as smart, just as effective, and just as caring with or without hair; and the fact is it is discrimination, and it is ignorance.

African Americans have been discriminated against in many ways because of their hairstyles. It is a natural thing for African Americans, and they should not be penalized in the workplace, in sports, in school, or in any other ways.

I stand here for the CROWN Act. It was originally introduced, I think, by Cedric Richmond, and I joined with him on the Judiciary Committee to support it.

I had seen problems in Tennessee when I was a State senator, and supported bills there to protect people who wore braids and whatever. I hope people will rise up and vote "yes" in understanding of other people and think beyond themselves.

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

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

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, just let me say that, unfortunately, I had never taken psychology during my college preparation, but I do know certain things such as, what avoidance behavior is.

I tell you, the message discipline on that side is just perfect. You can talk about the southern border and inflation and all of that to avoid the topic of discrimination.

Sit down. I have the floor, sir.

You are avoiding the fact, and I know personally, as a person with my hair, that I have had people tell my employer that I was an embarrassment sitting in the front office because of the way my hair looked.

□ 1000

And so, to avoid a big conversation about discrimination that has an impact, particularly on African Americans, you talk about everything else. It is wrong. You are not engaging and, quite frankly, you are not being honest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LEE of California). The Chair would remind Members to direct all remarks to the Chair.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would just—avoiding? It sounds to me like the Democrats are avoiding the issues the American people care about. That is our point. I am focused on what the families in the Fourth District of Ohio come to me and talk to me about. They are talking to me about \$5 a gas; guarantee it. My guess it is the same in all your districts as well.

They are talking to me about the border, our southern border that has been complete chaos now for 14 months. They are definitely talking to me about the price of eggs, and milk, and butter, and food at the grocery store, about everything, because we are at a 40-year high inflation.

Avoidance? The people who are avoiding the issues the American people care about are on that side. And to get lectured and using that is so wrong, so out of touch with the American people. Avoiding. You have got to be kidding me. We want to focus on the issues the American people care about. That is the whole darn point.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. It is not a question of avoidance. It is a question of priority.

Here is a priority. In 2020, homicides across America increased 30 percent, from 16,500, roughly, to 21,500, an additional 5,000 homicides.

And even if you want to view it through a racial lens, since that seems to be the subject, 55 percent of homicides are suffered by Black Americans, even though they make up 13 percent

of the population. Of the increase I just described, Black Americans suffer 65 percent.

So we could have—if the minority were capable of bringing a bill to the floor, we could bring a bill that would address the rising crime in America, the historically exceptional, historically unprecedented, I believe, at least I saw something since maybe 1900 or 1902—I don't know what the circumstances were then. But since then, the most, the highest increase of homicides in a single year in the history of the United States, grossly disproportionately borne by Black Americans. Driven by rhetoric about defunding police. We could prioritize that. That wouldn't be avoidance. And yet, we do not because, indeed, we are in the minority and the priorities are being set not by the minority but the majority.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. And still I rise, Madam Speaker. And I rise today reminded that Dr. King addressed this very issue decades ago. He addressed it when he shared his poem with us:

Fleecy locks and black complexion cannot forfeit nature's claim. Though skin may differ, affection dwells in black and white the same. And were I so tall as to reach the pole or to grasp the ocean at a span, I must be measured by my soul because the mind is the standard of the man and woman.

I have lived enough now, at 74 years, to have seen a time when Black people would bleach their skin. The product was called Bleach and Glow, so that they could be as white as they could get.

I have lived long enough to see them process their hair so that they could make it as straight as they could get it.

I have lived long enough now, however, to see Black people having decided that they are going to be themselves; they are going to wear their hair as they chose; and they are not going to allow themselves to be discriminated against because of it.

I have lived long enough, now, to understand that it is not the color of skin or the texture of hair; it is the character within that determines the worth of men and women.

I have lived long enough to understand that Black people are American people, too. And when you say the American people don't want it, you cannot exclude Black people. Black people would have this be on the floor. This is a kitchen-table issue in Black households because when Johnny comes home and he has been fired because of his hair, that is a kitchen-table issue. That is unemployment. That impacts unemployment.

So we have a duty and obligation to do what we are doing with the understanding that we are going to be ourselves.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today on the floor of the House of Representatives, the people's House, to declare that Black girls with our braids, locs, Afros, all forms of natural hairstyles and, yes, even our smooth alopecia bald heads, belong everywhere.

Today, we take an important step toward codifying this fact into law by passing the CROWN Act legislation I am so proud to co-lead in partnership with Representatives WATSON COLEMAN, MOORE, LEE, and OMAR.

For too long, Black girls have been discriminated against and criminalized for the hair that grows on our heads and the way we move through and show up in this world.

In my home State, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, two twin sisters, Deana and Mya, high school students, were disciplined for showing up with braids. They were given numerous detentions, kicked off the track team, banned from prom, solely for their hairstyle.

In their own words, these scholars and athletes were judged more for their heritage than their homework.

No more.

For those sisters and thousands of other students who face discrimination based on their hair, the CROWN Act is for you.

For recent graduates who fear they must change their hair or cut their locs to secure a job, the CROWN Act is for you.

For our elders who have faced and fought this racism for generations, the CROWN Act is for you.

Just yesterday, the Massachusetts State legislature made history by passing similar legislation. By passing the CROWN Act today, we affirm, say it loud, Black is beautiful and so is our hair.

Whether you are a student in a classroom, an employee in the workplace, or the next Supreme Court Justice, or the Speaker pro tem, you deserve to show up as your full self, rocking your crown with your head held high.

I urge a "yes" vote for every person who has been asked to shrink or to apologize simply for the beautiful way with which God made them.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, some many years ago, with a bush as big as a bush on my head, an Afro, of which I was enormously proud, young, fragile ego, probably not that strong in my frame, some would say, skinny legs and high heels, an early teen, trying to express the pain that I felt, living in a segregated world, trying to assert the prominence of my community, my race of people, trying to associate belatedly with the foot soldiers and the battering

and the insults that they received, trying to come to grips with the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Bobby Kennedy, Malcolm X, I wore this bush, which I had to do extreme things; for the original style, as was done to young girls, is processed. It burned beyond recognition.

And I went out with my grandmother, a woman of tradition and, fearful for me, she asked me to go back because she couldn't walk with me with an Afro. The reason, of course, was her fear what an Afro signified, what it would do, how I would be harmed. Those were the conflicts and strife that Black people went through trying to come to grips with their identity.

Madam Speaker, I say to my good friend, Mr. JORDAN, we never encounter each other because we have mutual respect, as I do for him, and he does for SHEILA JACKSON LEE. We don't really get into it because we know we are the kind of folk that stand down from each other. But I enjoy engaging with the gentleman. I enjoy his leadership. And his constituents have every right to be concerned about gas prices.

My constituents are concerned about eating, being able to pay their rent. And I believe we can walk and chew gum at the same time. Let's get together about gas prices, and paying rent, and people eating, and having jobs, and ending discrimination. Why can't we do that together?

Because the gentleman has not walked in my skin. He has got to understand what it means when we are talking about a report that has been given. In 2019, the Joy Collective, the CROWN Act coalition: 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 hairstyle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. The CROWN Study found that Black women's hair is more policed in the workplace, thereby contributing to the climate of group control.

Black women are more likely to receive formal grooming policies; and 80 percent of Black women believe that they had to change their hair to be in the workplace.

Just imagine, just imagine the beauty of these hairstyles, Mr. JORDAN, the beauty of these hairstyles. This is what we are talking about; people who are severely discriminated against, young boys, young girls. A little girl in a Catholic school could not wear her hair, had to go home.

Or the fabulous Serena, who gives joy to all of us and, yet, these are the locs that she is wearing.

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

Mr. NADLER. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. And this young boy, who, like me, felt diminished because someone thought it was wrong for me, an Afro, for him, his braided hair.

Mr. JORDAN, we have engaged in a lot, but I will not stand down on the CROWN Act. We must pass the CROWN Act to give dignity and reaffirm the rights of all people. Wear your hair as you desire.

Madam Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 2116, the Creating a Respectful and Open World for Natural Hair Act of 2021.

This legislation prohibits discrimination based on hair texture or hairstyles if that style or texture is commonly associated with particular race or national origin.

The bill also prohibits this type of discrimination against those participating in federally assisted programs, housing programs, and employment.

I have long believed that discrimination based on hair texture and hairstyle is an impermissible form of 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,” and that they were 83 percent more likely to be judged harshly because of their looks.

The study indicated that Black women were one and a half times more likely to be sent home from the workplace because of their hair, and that they were over three 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 preventing women servicemembers from wearing their hair in dreadlocks, a regulation that had a disproportionately adverse impact on Black women.

The decision was a result of the 2014 order by the Secretary of Defense at the time, Chuck Hagel, who was reviewing the military's policies regarding hairstyles popular to African American women.

This decision to review these policies came after complaints from members of Congress, including myself, saying that these policies unfairly targeted Black women.

Hair discrimination is common, and the CROWN Study demonstrates that, but I would also like to take the time to share numerous stories from many Americans across the country in order to put faces and names to these statistics.

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.

Again in 2018, 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.

In 2019, 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.

In the following year of 2020 there were news reports of a Texas student who would not be allowed to walk at graduation because his dreadlocks were too long.

Finally, I'd like to share the story of a young man from my district, who was suspended from school just last year for his natural dreadlocks.

DeAndre Arnold was a senior at Barbers Hill High School in Houston, Texas.

Arnold had his dreadlocks for years and this hairstyle had become a part of his identity and allowed him to embrace his culture.

Arnold's family is from Trinidad and the men in his family often grow their locks near or below their waist.

Arnold had complied with the dress code throughout high school by keeping his hair up.

His high school routinely inspected his hair for violating a hair length school policy; upon inspection they ultimately decided to suspend him for violating the policy.

Arnold was not allowed to return to school, attend his senior prom, or his graduation ceremony unless he cut his hair.

Thankfully Arnold was able to take this decision to court, where the judge ruled that he could return to school without fear of recrimination.

However, Arnold's high school failed him, as students in our society should not have to undergo litigation just to peacefully obtain an education.

Students like DeAndre Arnold should not be faced with the impossible choice of either suppressing their cultural heritage and Black identity by cutting their natural hair, or forfeiting their right to equal educational and extracurricular opportunities.

People of color, especially Black people, have long felt pressure to alter their natural hair to conform to what society has deemed “acceptable.”

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, dreadlocks, cornrows, twists, braids, Bantu knots, and Afros.”

The legislation also provides that the prohibition will be enforced as part of Title VI of the

Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination based on 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.

The CROWN Act would end the demeaning practice of forcing conformity onto people of color.

It would make it illegal for employers and educators to deny an individual employment or educational opportunities due to the length, texture or style of their hair.

To be frank, it is a tragedy that we need federal legislation to end these discriminatory practices and give people of color the dignity that is their inherent right.

The CROWN Act says to Americans facing discrimination that the Congress of the United States hears them, sees them, and affirms their beauty and dignity and pride in their culture.

I rise in strong support of this bill so that men and women of color no longer feel that they cannot or should not enter certain spaces because they wish to wear the hair that they are born with.

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

I include in the RECORD a May 20, 2021 article entitled: “Opinion: Stop policing people of color's hair and pass the CROWN Act.”

[From Chron.com, May 20, 2021]

OPINION: STOP POLICING PEOPLE OF COLOR'S HAIR AND PASS THE CROWN ACT

Texas seems to be hell bent on policing Black peoples' hair—and it needs to stop. Immediately.

In Troy, an 11-year-old Native and African-American student spent more than a week in in-school suspension after administrators said his braided hairstyle violated the dress code, per 25 News KXXV's Jarell Baker.

Barbers Hill Independent School District voted unanimously in July of 2020 to uphold a school policy that allowed the district to suspend DeAndre Arnold and his cousin Kaden Bradford for refusing to cut their dreadlocks, even barring Arnold from his senior prom and high school graduation.

Such incidents are far from isolated in the Lone Star state, which begs the question: Why are Texas schools so determined to uphold dated rules that seemingly exist only to police the appearance of Black and brown students?

People of color, especially Black people, have long felt pressure to alter their natural hair to conform to what society has deemed “acceptable.” It's demeaning, and—quite frankly—sad. And it's time we proudly rocked all of our kinks and curls without being punished for it.

That's why the CROWN Act is important.

“Creating a Respectful and Open World for Natural Hair,” or CROWN, is an act that would prohibit race-based hair discrimination in Texas schools and workplaces. The CROWN Act would make it illegal for employers and educators to deny an individual employment or educational opportunities due to the length, texture or style of their hair.

It's sad that there even has to be a law in place, considering no other race has to deal with their hair being a Civil Rights issue. But here we are.

The law hasn't passed in Texas (yet), but with April 27 being Texas' CROWN Act Day, Texas Legislative Black Caucus members are working around the clock to see that it happens.

As a Black woman, I am tired of feeling like I can't or shouldn't enter certain spaces because my hair "isn't done" or straightened. I am tired of being asked if my hair is real or if someone can touch it. It's the hair I was born with, not a science experiment.

This is also the reason people of color get so upset about outside races wearing braids or other protective hairstyles. The issue is not the style itself, but the fact that you have an entire group of people who are seen as "less professional" in the workplace and even denied jobs for rocking styles they created while others are allowed to copy it and receive compliments? It's disgusting.

The CROWN Act is necessary for the culture, and the fact that Texas isn't moving quicker to pass it is quite telling.

Whether anyone wants to admit it, hair discrimination is race discrimination. And we've had enough.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. WILLIAMS).

Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the CROWN Act because all hair is professional hair.

While serving in the Georgia State Senate, a colleague greeted me with what she thought was a compliment. After spending most of the legislative session in braids, I had my natural hair pressed straight. She told me, NIKEMA, you should keep your hair that way. It looks better, more professional, more like a State Senator.

Remarks like this are all too familiar for Black women and girls; unacceptable on their own, but the outright discrimination that flows from them is worse. If I didn't work for the people in Congress, I know that I could be fired simply for wearing my hair in braids.

Nothing about this is okay, so I make it a point to create an environment where my team feels comfortable wearing their crowns in every texture.

Everybody deserves this level of safety, no matter where they work. Our hair is an expression of our authentic selves. Braids, locs, coils, or a silk press, all hair is professional hair.

Discrimination has no place in America; that includes discriminating against Black hair. The CROWN Act would make race-based hair discrimination a thing of the past, once and for all, and that is why we should pass it today.

□ 1015

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, for all the reasons we have talked about and what we should be focused on here, I would urge a "no" vote on the legislation and hope my colleagues will do the same.

Madam Speaker, 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.

This CROWN Act would make explicit that civil rights laws prohibit such discrimination. This is a matter of basic fairness and justice.

This bill passed the House last Congress unanimously, and I hope we will do so again today.

All the arguments we have heard about everything else are interesting and important but not relevant to this bill. This bill is purely about discrimination, purely about protecting people from discrimination, and we ought to pass it.

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

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, on H.R. 2116, the Creating a Respectful and Open World for Natural Hair Act of 2021, I am not currently recorded as a cosponsor. It was my intention to serve as a cosponsor of this legislation, but because the bill has now been reported by the appropriate Committees and placed on the Union Calendar, I am not able to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 979, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 189, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

YEAS—235

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Bacon
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Cárbaal
Cárdenas

Carey
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cheney
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar

Dauids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
García (TX)

Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahale
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch

Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mirvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Oberholte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger

Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—189

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais

Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
García (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)

Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar

Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Norman
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer

Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney

Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyn
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack

NOT VOTING—8

Budd
Diaz-Balart
Fitzgerald

Loudermilk
Pfluger
Turner

□ 1051

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

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, I was unable to attend the vote due to an important meeting with constituents in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 82.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Barr (Guthrie)	Fulcher (Johnson)	McHenry
Bass (Takano)	(OH)	(Murphy (NC))
Bergman	Garamendi	Moulton (Beyer)
(Stauber)	(Correa)	Neguse
Bowman (Garcia)	Garbarino	(Perlmutter)
(IL)	(Jacobs (NY))	Nehls (Fallon)
Brooks (Moore)	Gohmert (Weber)	Norman
(AL)	(TX)	(Donalds)
Brown (OH)	Golden	Pascarell
(Jeffries)	(Courtney)	(Pallone)
Calvert (Garcia)	Harder (CA)	Payne (Pallone)
(CA)	(Beyer)	Porter (Wexton)
Cárdenas	Harshbarger	Rodgers (WA)
(Gomez)	(Kustoff)	(Bilirakis)
Carter (LA)	Higgins (NY)	Roybal-Allard
(Newman)	(Pallone)	(Escobar)
Carter (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Rush (Evans)
(Hudson)	(Correa)	Ryan
Cawthorn	Johnson (TX)	(Perlmutter)
(Fallon)	(Jeffries)	Salazar (Dunn)
Clarke (NY)	Kahele (Mrvan)	Schrier (Aguilar)
(Jeffries)	Kaptur	Sires (Pallone)
Connolly	(Lawrence)	Smucker (Joyce)
(Wexton)	Kim (NJ)	(PA)
Crenshaw	(Pallone)	Steel (Oberholte)
(Fallon)	Kind (Beyer)	Suozzi (Beyer)
Crist	Kinzing	Swalwell
(Wasserman)	(Meijer)	(Gomez)
Schultz	Kirkpatrick	Taylor (Fallon)
Cuellar (Correa)	(Pallone)	Titus (Cicilline)
Curtis (Moore)	LaHood (Miller)	Trone (Beyer)
(UT)	(WV)	Upton (Katko)
Dean (Scanlon)	LaMalfa	Van Drew
DeLauro	(Palazzo)	(Tenney)
(Courtney)	Larson (CT)	Van Duyn
DeSaulnier	(Cicilline)	(Jackson)
(Beyer)	Lawson (FL)	Wagner
Deutch (Rice)	(Evans)	(Cammack)
(NY)	Lesko (Miller)	Walorski
Dingell	(WV)	(Buchson)
(Cicilline)	Lofgren (Jeffries)	Waltz (Gimenez)
Doyle, Michael	Maloney	Welch (Pallone)
F. (Evans)	Carolyn B.	Wilson (FL)
Fortenberry	(Wasserman)	(Cicilline)
(Moolenaar)	Schultz	
Frankel, Lois	McEachin	
(Wexton)	(Wexton)	

AMERICANS NEED PROTECTION
FROM CORPORATE GREED AND
ABUSE

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

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, we need to protect the American people from corporate greed and abuse. The FAIR Act is one of those protections.

Corporations use forced arbitration clauses to deny Americans their right to seek accountability and justice in disputes with private companies. They literally eliminated any chance a resident may have for accountability and justice from a dispute, specifically in the place of employment.

From employee handbooks to bank documents to college admission paperwork, companies include forced arbitration clauses as the main form of dispute resolution so that they can rig the rules and appoint themselves judge and jury in the arbitration process.

Forced arbitration is a private, secretive system without any enforceable standards or legal protections for our people. There is no public disclosure of proceedings or any requirements for arbitrators to follow the law.

Madam Speaker, forced arbitration makes it virtually impossible for anti-discrimination laws, disability rights laws, and so many other important laws to be enforced at the Federal level.

To put it simply, this is unjust, and has failed the American public for far too long.

Earlier this year, President Biden signed a law ending forced arbitration for cases involving sexual assault or sexual harassment.

So I urge the Senate to pass this legislation and send it to the President's desk so that we can protect the rights of consumers and workers from corporations that seek to exploit them.

HONORING THE LIFE OF RALPH
AHN

(Mrs. KIM of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KIM of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. Ralph Ahn, a pioneer in the Korean-American community, who exemplified the American Dream.

Ralph was the youngest child of Dosan Ahn Chang Ho, and Ralph joined the United States Navy and bravely served our country fighting in World War II.

Ralph eventually started acting, following in the footsteps of his older brother, Philip Ahn, who was one of the first Asian-American actors.

Ralph made his film debut as a Korean prisoner in “Battle Circus” before taking on the roles in “Mission Over Korea,” “Prisoner of War,” “The Hook,” “It Takes Two,” “The Golden

Girls,” and most recently as Tran on “New Girl.”

I remember last seeing Ralph at an event about a year ago commemorating the Korean-American Pioneers and Korean independence.

While I am sad that the last generation of Korean-American leaders have passed, I know that their legacy will continue to live on. I offer my deepest condolences to his beautiful wife, Anne, and his family.

□ 1100

REMEMBERING SHAR KNUTSON

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember Shar Knutson, former president of the Minnesota AFL-CIO, who passed away last month. Shar was a bridge-builder, trailblazer, and mentor.

Shar was a lifelong advocate for workers in St. Paul and across Minnesota. A trailblazer herself, the first woman to lead the Minnesota AFL-CIO, she mentored women in the labor movement and urged them to run for leadership.

She was a strong booster for pro-women labor supporters seeking public office. Her early and steadfast support and encouragement was instrumental to me in helping to run for Congress and advance our common values together.

Hosting Shar as my guest for President Obama's first official State of the Union address in Washington, D.C., was a privilege.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a February 22, 2022, article from the Union Advocate newspaper in St. Paul paying tribute to Shar Knutson's life and work.

[Feb. 22, 2022]

REMEMBERING SHAR KNUTSON: ‘HER PRESENCE WILL BE MISSED, BUT HER LEGACY LIVES ON’

(by Union Advocate)

Shar Knutson ascended the ranks of Minnesota's labor movement, starting as a member of AFSCME Local 1842 in St. Paul and retiring after six years in the state's highest union office. Remembered by colleagues and friends as a bridge-builder, trailblazer and mentor, Knutson died Feb. 2 at the age of 72.

A native of Fridley who made St. Paul her home, Knutson made history in 2009 as the first woman elected president of the Minnesota AFL-CIO, the federation of over 1,000 affiliate unions representing 300,000 working people statewide.

Knutson held the office until 2015, during a tumultuous time for American unions. Efforts to weaken workers' bargaining power and roll back labor standards succeeded in other states, but not in Minnesota. Under Knutson's leadership, Minnesota unions not only kept “right to work” and other anti-union measures at bay, but they lobbied to expand collective bargaining rights and pass the first statewide minimum-wage increase in a decade.

“Shar played an active role in the successful campaign to increase labor's voice in national, state and local issues, including raising awareness and promoting community debate about social and economic justice,”