MEMORANDUM
National Organization for Women Foundation

MEMO TO NOW FOUNDATION BOARD
5/16/2020
FROM Marcia S. Cohen, NOW Foundation Legal Counsel
CC: Toni Van Pelt, NOW Foundation President
RE: NOW Role in *Robinson v. Marshall*, US District Court, Middle District of Alabama

---

This is an update to the NOW Foundation Board describing the progress of our role in the federal district court case of *Robinson v. Marshall*.

The State of Alabama had appealed to the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals the Preliminary Injunction ordered by the district court judge, stopping the State Health Officer from using the COVID-19 pandemic as an excuse to ban abortions. Then the State filed in the district court an Emergency Motion to Stay the Preliminary Injunction while the appellate court heard its appeal of the Preliminary Injunction.

On April 16, 2020, an *amicus curiae*1 brief was filed with the 11th Circuit on behalf of the State of Alabama by the American Center for Law and Justice, self-described as an organization dedicated, inter alia, to the "defense of the sanctity of human life". Its main counsel of record was Jay Sekulow, one of President Trump's most trusted lawyers. A number of amicus briefs followed, including one from 18 states in support of the abortion providers, one from the so-called Foundation for Moral Law in support of the State of Alabama, and our own *amicus* brief in support of the abortion providers, ACLU and Planned Parenthood.

Our brief was filed on April 21 by the law firm of Covington & Burling, LLP, a distinguished Washington, DC law firm that prepared the brief pro bono. NOW Foundation partnered with the Feminist Majority Foundation and Legal Momentum on the brief, which was joined by the following civil rights organizations:

Civil Liberties and Public Policy Program
In Our Own Voice: National Black Women's Reproductive Justice Agenda
Jewish Women International
Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law
Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights
National Abortion Federation, National Advocates for Pregnant Women
National Alliance to End Sexual Violence
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)
National Coalition Against Domestic Violence
National Council of Jewish Women
National Domestic Violence Hotline
National Network to End Domestic Violence
SisterSong Women of Color Reproductive Justice Collective

Southern Poverty Law Center
SPARK Reproductive Justice NOW!, Inc.
Transformative Justice Coalition
Women's Law Project

Two days later, on April 23, a three-judge panel of the 11th Circuit Court of Appeal denied Alabama's Motion for Stay Pending Appeal in a strongly worded opinion adopting many of the arguments we made in our amicus brief. Needless to say, we celebrated. We thank our fellow *amici*, the Covington firm, and the talented lawyers with whom we worked on the brief. We hope to be working with them again on other amicus briefs in support of women's reproductive rights that may be filed in other states.

It was probably clear to Alabama and its State Health Officer that any further attempts on their part to argue that abortions should not be performed during the COVID-19 lockdown would be futile. They amended their Health Order a few times thereafter and finally stipulated that its appeal of the Preliminary Injunction was moot.

The original Complaint in Robinson v. Marshall, filed by the abortion providers, ACLU and Planned Parenthood, which challenged the 2019 Alabama statute criminalizing all abortion, still stands. NOW Foundation remains in that case.

Additional Litigation Reports

To: NOW Foundation Board Members
From: Jan Erickson, NOW Foundation Director of Programs; Emma Rose Lowder, Government Relations and Public Policy Intern
Date: May 25, 2020

State of California v. State of Texas
Amici Curiae Supporting Petitioners in No. 19-840
United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit
Issue(s): racial justice, gender equality, healthcare, Affordable Care Act
Docket No.: 19-840
Question(s) Presented:

- **Whether the individual and state plaintiffs in this case have established Article III standing to challenge the minimum coverage provision in Section 5000A(a).**
- **Whether reducing the amount specified in Section 5000A(c) to zero rendered the minimum coverage provision unconstitutional.**
- **If so, whether the minimum coverage provision is severable from the rest of the ACA.**

The National Women's Law Center, National Partnership for Women and Families, Black Women's Health Imperative, American Medical Women's Association, and counsel Goodwin Procter, with the support of organizations such as NOW Foundation, submitted an *amicus* brief to the U.S. Supreme Court supporting California's defense of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) in *California v. Texas*, consolidated with *Texas v. California*. In this case, a group of states led by Texas is attempting to dismantle the entirety of the ACA by arguing that the ACA's "individual responsibility provision" was rendered unconstitutional when Congress reduced the tax for not

having health insurance to zero as part of tax reform in December 2017. A coalition of states led by California and the U.S. House of Representatives have stepped in to defend the ACA, as the Trump administration has declined to do so.

In the brief, they explain the devastating impact that striking down the ACA would have on women and their families—and particularly on women and families of color.The brief also emphasizes that the COVID-19 pandemic and impending economic recession make the ACA's protections even more critical for women's health and economic security. The brief explains how the ACA's multiple protections against sex discrimination in health care have resulted in improved health outcomes and economic security for women and their families, and that Congress had no intention of discarding these protections when it lowered the tax for the individual responsibility provision in 2017.

Donahue Francis v. Kings Park Manor, INC. et al.
Amicus Curiae Brief in Support of the Plaintiff
United States Court of Appeals, Second Circuit
Issue(s): racial justice
Docket No.: 15-1823-cv
Question(s) Presented:

- **Whether a landlord may be liable under sections 2604 and 3617 of the Fair Housing Act of 1968 ("FHA", 42 U.S.C. Sections 3604, 3617, and analogous provisions of the New York State Human Rights Law ("NYSHRL"), N.Y. Exec. Law Section 296, for intentionally discriminating against a tenant who complains about a racially hostile housing environment that is created by and leads to the arrest and conviction of another tenant.**

The National Women's Law Center, the ACLU Women's Rights Project, the New York Civil Liberties Union, and Jenner & Block LLP, with the support of organizations such as NOW Foundation, submitted an amicus brief to the Second Circuit in support of the plaintiff in *Francis v. Kings Park Manor*. The case involves a Black tenant who faced severe racial harassment from a fellow tenant. The plaintiff alleges that the landlord had the obligation to take reasonable steps within its control to stop a hostile housing environment based on a protected class. The Second Circuit agreed with the plaintiff but now the court has voted to rehear the case en banc.

This brief addresses the consequences that the Second Circuit's decision will have for housing protections for all tenants and particularly for women. It argues that the decision will affect housing protections specifically with regard to sexual harassment.

Peltier, et al. v. Charter Day School, INC. et al.
Challenge to "Skirts" Dress Code Policy
United States Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit
Issue(s): gender inequality, Title IX
Docket No.: 7:16-cv-00030

The National Women's Law Center and Debevoise & Plimpton LLP, with the support of organizations such as NOW Foundation, submitted an amicus brief to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit in support of three students who are plaintiffs in *Peltier, et al v. Charter Day School, Inc., et al.,* No. 20-1001 (4th Cir.). The students are represented by the ACLU Women's Rights Project. Plaintiffs are challenging whether the defendant's school dress code policy, which requires all girls to wear skirts, "skorts," or "jumpers" to school, violates the

Equal Protection Clause of the U.S. Constitution, the North Carolina state constitution, Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972, and North Carolina state law.

The brief supports Plaintiffs' Title IX challenge, specifically arguing that the legislative and regulatory enforcement history of Title IX establishes that its prohibition on sex discrimination encompasses the dress code policy at issue in this case. They also argue that, as a policy matter, Defendants' dress code policy promotes harmful polices that violate Title IX, including the false notions that girls should be passive, and conform to specific sex stereotypes.

Pambakian v. Blatt
Challenge to Forced Arbitration in the Context of Sex Harassment
United States Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit
Issue(s): sexual harassment, workplace harassment
Docket No.: 2:19-cv-07053
Question(s) Presented:

The National Women's Law Center, the American Association for Justice, and Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, with the support of organizations such as NOW, will soon be submitting an amicus brief to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit opposing mandatory arbitration in support of the plaintiff in Rosette Pambakian v. Gregory Blatt. Pambakian was a Senior Executive at Tinder/Match when Blatt, the CEO, sexually harassed and assaulted her at a company holiday party in December 2016. After Pambakian reported the assault she was asked to sign a nondisclosure agreement and when she declined the company adopted a mandatory arbitration policy two years after the assault which all employees, including the plaintiff, were forced to agree to as a condition of continued employment. After Pambakian was terminated, she sued for wrongful termination and sexual assault, but the district court ruled in favor of the defendants to compel arbitration on all claims, holding that the 2018 arbitration agreement could be applied retroactively to the 2016 assault, despite finding "some degree of procedural unconscionability."

This brief focuses on the policy reasons that mandatory arbitration is harmful to sexual harassment claims and how it is especially unfair in this case where the agreement was signed after the harassment took place.

Kimberlie Michelle Durham v. Rural/Metro Corporation
Amicus Brief in Support of the Appeal for the Northern District of Alabama
United States Court of Appeals, Eleventh Circuit
Issue(s): pregnancy discrimination
Docket No.: 4:16-cv-01604-ACA

A recent victory! The Eleventh Circuit recently issued a decision in *Durham v. Rural/Metro Corporation* - an important pregnancy accommodation case in which A Better Balance and the Center for WorkLife Law submitted an amicus brief, and plaintiff-appellee Kimberlie Michelle Durham won her appeal!

Ms. Durham's employer refused to accommodate a 50-pound lifting restriction recommended by her doctor, despite the fact that it had a policy of providing light duty positions to employees injured on the job. In granting summary judgment in favor of the employer on Durham's Pregnancy Discrimination Act claim, the district judge applied a prima facie case that predated the Supreme Court's decision in *Young v. United Postal Service* and asserted that Durham could not meet it because she could not demonstrate that she had been treated differently than

others similarly situated. The amicus brief argues that the district court's decision contravened both the letter and the spirit of *Young* by, among other errors, categorically excluding workers with on-the-job injuries as appropriate comparators and conflating the evidence needed to make out a prima facie case with the pretext analysis.

In a *per curiam* decision, the Eleventh Circuit reversed and remanded the case to the district court. Acknowledging that *Young* had created a new framework to be used in PDA accommodation cases, the court found that Durham had met her burden of establishing a prima facie case, specifically rejecting the notion that workers with restrictions similar to Durham's were not "similar in their ability or inability to work" because they arose from injuries on the job. Importantly, the court also recognized that an employer's policy can establish that the employer accommodates others, which relieves plaintiffs of the burden of identifying the specific individuals who have been accommodated in order to make out their prima facie case. Finally, the court acknowledged that the district court erroneously considered the employer's legitimate, non-discriminatory reason for not accommodating Durham as part of the prima facie case.

Oracle America, Inc. v. U.S. Department of Labor, et al.
Amicus Brief in Support of the Proposed Intervenors in Oracle's Lawsuit Against the OFCCP
United States District Court for the District of Columbia
Docket No.: 1:19-cv-03574

These *amici curiae* are a group of former government officials and employees, civil and workers' rights advocacy groups (including NOW Foundation), labor unions, and law firms, who share a common interest in the ability of the OFCCP (Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs) to implement and enforce government policy against discrimination in government contracting. They have extensive experience and firsthand knowledge of how OFCCP works and the authority that it possesses and requires to carry out its critical mission: ensuring the government does not contract with businesses that do not afford fair and equal treatment to all workers.

Amici are concerned that, if successful, Oracle's challenge would severely undermine OFCCP's ability to promote equal opportunity and protect all contractor employees, a huge swath of the workforce in America, against unlawful discrimination in all its insidious forms.

***Pennsylvania v. Trump* and *Little Sisters of the Poor v. Pennsylvania* (consolidated)**
Amicus Brief filed by National Women's Law Center and Several Other Advocacy Groups
United States Supreme Court
Issue(s): reproductive health
Docket No.: 19-454 *(Pennsylvania v. Trump)*
Question(s) Presented:

- **Whether the agencies had statutory authority under the ACA and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993, 42 U.S.C. 2000bb et seq., to expand the conscience exemption to the contraceptive-coverage mandate.**
- **Whether the agencies' decision to forgo notice and opportunity for public comment before issuing the interim final rules rendered the final rules-which were issued after notice and comment-invalid under the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 551 et seq., 701 et seq.**
- **Whether the court of appeals erred in affirming a nationwide preliminary injunction barring implementation of the final rules.**

Docket No,: 19-431 *(Little Sisters of the Poor v. Trump)*
Question(s) Presented:

- **Whether a litigant who is directly protected by an administrative rule and has been allowed to intervene to defend it lacks standing to appeal a decision invalidating the rule if the litigant is also protected by an injunction from a different court?**
- **Whether the federal government lawfully exempted religious objectors from the regulatory requirement to provide health plans that include contraceptive coverage?**

The National Women's Law Center, National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health, SisterLove, Inc., and National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum, with support from Lowenstein Sandler and organizations such as NOW Foundation, are filing an amicus brief to the U.S. Supreme Court in the contraceptive coverage cases *Pennsylvania v. Trump* and *Little Sisters v. Pennsylvania*. In these consolidated cases, the Supreme Court will consider whether the lower court properly entered a preliminary injunction blocking the Trump administration's final birth control rules that allow employers and universities to deny insurance coverage of birth control. This is a critically important case for the future of access to affordable birth control for women and all who can become pregnant nationwide. If the Trump administration wins in this case, it could also set a dangerous precedent for allowing religion to be used as justification for extremist policies that encourage discrimination and threaten public health and safety.

This brief details the harm these rules would cause to the health, autonomy, economic security, and equality of women and all those who can become pregnant. The brief will emphasize how the rules would disproportionately impact women of color, LGBTQIA+ persons, immigrants, survivors of domestic violence, and others who already experience greater barriers to accessing health care, including contraceptive care.

***Our Lady of Guadeloupe School v. Morrissey-Berry* and *St. James School v. Biel* (consolidated)**
Amicus Brief in Support of the Schoolteacher Employees
Supreme Court of the United States
Issue(s): workplace discrimination
Docket No.: 19-267 (*Our Lady of Guadeloupe School v. Morrissey-Berry)*
Question(s) Presented:
- **Whether the Religion Clauses prevent civil courts from adjudicating employment discrimination claims brought by an employee against her religious employer, where the employee carried out important religious functions**

Docket No.: 19-348 *(St. James School v. Biel)*
Question(s) Presented:
- **Whether the Religion Clauses prevent civil courts from adjudicating employment discrimination claims brought by an employee against her religious employer, where the employee carried out important religious functions.**

The National Women's Law Center, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, and Kevin Russell of Goldstein & Russell, P.C., with the support of organizations such as NOW Foundation, submitted an amicus brief to the U.S. Supreme Court in support of the two schoolteacher employees in *Our Lady of Guadalupe School v. Morrissey-Berru* and *St. James School v. Biel* (consolidated). The cases involve the "ministerial exception"—a court-created doctrine that allows religious employers to circumvent all civil rights protections for employees who are deemed "ministers." The Supreme Court first recognized the exception in the 2012 case *Hosanna -Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church and School v. EEOC*, where it identified four factors relevant to determining whether or not a teacher is a minister, including formal title, if the job title reflects religious training, how the employee holds their self out, and whether job duties include important religious functions. The two cases now before the Court address the scope of

this ministerial exception. The cases involve two religious schools who claim that the teachers are barred from bringing claims of employment discrimination (one for disability discrimination based on her breast cancer and one for age discrimination) by the ministerial exception.

This brief addresses how religious employers are limiting workplace civil rights protections in a manner that is alarming and potentially far reaching. In these cases, the Court is asked to determine whether teachers or staff in religious schools, including ones with minimal ties to religious duties, could be stripped of all of their civil rights protections by simply assigning them relatively minimal religious functions—such as leading a prayer or devotional exercise, or taking children to worship services—to carry out from time-to-time as part of their jobs. It also notes the specific harms that women, people of color, immigrants, people with disabilities, older workers, LGBTQIA+ workers and others who face multiple and intertwining forms of description would face if the Court were to allow such far-reaching exceptions to workplace civil rights protections.

SOME IMPORTANT UPDATES

The National Organization for Women Foundation is currently working in conjunction with the ERA Coalition and many other prominent feminist organizations on a powerful amicus curiae brief supporting women's constitutional equality. Without the Equal Rights Amendment women still face inequality in nearly every sphere—in employment, the military, and government, as well as in matters of safety, violence, and economic security. And, despite a vast majority of public support to change the Constitution to enact the ERA, we still see leaders making women's equality difficult to achieve with arguments of "Constitutional disparities." We see two examples of these arguments in an *amicus curiae* brief submitted by the Eagle Forum Foundation (formerly known as STOP ERA) in support of the Defendant, and in the Defendant's official motion to dismiss the Plaintiffs' complaint; we cite both of these documents in our brief.

NOW Foundation finds it important to stress that:

A) The fight for equality has been long and hard-fought, as advocates have struggled to correct the basic flaw in our Constitution that excluded women.

B) Women today face persistent inequality in nearly every sphere, reflecting a continued need for the ERA.

C) It is particularly critical to respect the plain language of Article V, which neither imposes noe leaves room for any time limit of the effectiveness of an amendment ratified by three-quarters of the states.

We are anxiously awaiting the Court's ruling on *June Medical Services v. Russo* and believe it important to summarize the oral arguments that the Supreme Court livestreamed to the public for the first time in history. Despite calls from conservative lawmakers to overturn *Roe v. Wade*, Chief Justice Roberts and Justices Gorsuch and Kavanaugh focused narrowly on how the Court should apply its 2016 holding in *Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt* rather than on whether the Court should overrule or overhaul the undue burden standard. The bulk of the argument focused on how *Whole Woman's Health*'s holding (that a Texas law requiring doctors providing abortions to have admitting privileges at a hospital within 30 miles of the procedure constituted an undue burden on abortion) applied to other admitting privilege cases. In June Medical, the 5th Circuit reversed a district court decision holding that a virtually identical law imposed an undue burden. Julie Rikelman, counsel for June Medical, maintained that when courts review an admitting privilege law, they should apply Whole *Woman's Health*'s finding that such laws do not provide any health benefit.

The rest of the argument focused on whether Louisiana could establish that its law imposed greater benefits or lesser burdens than the Texas law. Louisiana's main argument on the benefit side was that the admitting privilege law serves a credentialing function. During this line of questioning, like 2016 *Whole Woman's Health* argument, the female justices asked several questions reflecting a familiarity with abortion and reproductive health procedures that made it difficult for Louisiana's Solicitor General Elizabeth Murrill to make unsupported assertions about a health benefit. On the burden side, Murrill and Principal Deputy Solicitor General Jeffrey Wall argued that the admitting privilege law did not cause the burden on abortion care because the doctors could have tried harder to get admitting privileges.

While Justice Gorsuch's silence makes it difficult to assess his views, questioning from the other justices suggested that a majority of justices wished to focus on the very narrow question of how lower courts should apply *Whole Woman's Health* to admitting privilege laws rather than to revisit the Court's abortion jurisprudence.

Robert F. Kennedy Human Rights, the Center for Health and Gender Equity, the Global Justice Center, and the Council for Global Equality sued the Trump administration over its "Commission on Unalienable Rights," which was established to undermine global progress on reproductive rights and the rights of LGBTQIA+ people. Their lawsuit seeks to disband a commission that Secretary of State Mike Pompeo set up within the State Department to review human right's issues with concerns that the commission will recommend that the administration narrow the definition of "unalienable rights" to exclude reproductive rights for women and LGBTQIA+ protections. The lawsuit alleges members of the commission hold biased views, and they were selected by Pompeo to yield a predetermined outcome, arguing that the commission's work is not in the public interest.

As discussed in the previous board report, NOW joined with Equal Rights Advocates and other civil and workers' rights organizations in submitting an amicus brief supporting Plaintiff-Appellant (Professor) Jennifer Freyd in her pay equity case against the University of Oregon. The case presents important issues on the interpretation and application of the Equal Pay Act and Title VII and *amic*i's involvement has attracted some positive media coverage shining a light on gender discrimination and pay equity issues in academia and beyond. Oral arguments took place on May 12, and we anxiously await the ruling of the court.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit ruled in favor of the City of Philadelphia, upholding the constitutionality of the City's Wage Equity Ordinance, and the City may now prohibit employers from asking applicants about their salary history. This is an important step forward in closing the wage gap and reaching economic equality for women and other protected classes in the country. Many individuals receive less or unequal pay to their white male counterparts when employers match previous salaries, and sadly, many use this information as justification to pay omen and persons of color less than what they should receive.

NOW Foundation's Advocacy for Women and People of Color in Broadcasting

The Institute for Public Representation at Georgetown University Law Center has been representing NOW Foundation for close to 20 years in efforts to stop media consolidation and to promote ownership opportunities for women and people of color to

own broadcast stations. We achieved a major victory last year in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. The circuit court reversed the Federal Communications Commission's (FCC) repeal of ownership limits because it found the FCC has failed to adequately consider the effect of its sweeping rule changes will have on ownership of broadcast media by women and racial minorities.

Unfortunately, the FCC (along with the Solicitor General's office) and numerous big broadcast organizations (including the National Association of Broadcasters, Fox and Sinclair) have asked the Supreme Court to overturn the Third Circuit. NOW Foundation is listed as a respondent in this case because we filed a brief on your behalf (and others) at an earlier state of this litigation.

The Institute for Public Representation is planning to file an opposition in the Supreme Court. A Supreme Court expert has agreed to write the opposition (and, if necessary, a brief on the merits) on a pro bono basis, so there would be no cost to NOW's participation. While the opposition will not be due until July, NOW Foundation has indicated its continuing interest this matter.

Two Dangerous Judges Nominated to Important Seats – Call Your Senators Now
May 9, 2020

Donald Trump has nominated two judges for important federal court seats. The most critical nomination is for the U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit which frequently adjudicates in matters arising from federal agencies potentially affecting the entire country. His confirmation vote could be held the week of May 11th. The second is a very right-wing, anti-abortion rights judge in Mississippi, Cory Wilson.

Justin Walker, currently on the bench in the Western District of Kentucky, was found by the American Bar Association, as "Not Qualified" for this current position because he lacked experience, having practiced less than ten years. Nonetheless, the conservative majority in the Senate confirmed him in October. Now that he has served a few months in that position, the Trump administration is trying to move this 37-year-old judge to one of the most important federal benches in the country where he can continue to exercise his offensive views. Here are just few of Judge Walker's regressive and anti-women's rights views:

- Judge Walker spent his career working against providing healthcare for millions of Americans; in his writings he has expressed approval of Justice Kavanaugh providing the "roadmap" for Supreme Court Justices to dissent from upholding the individual mandate of the Affordable Care Act (ACA}.
- Judge Walker has made statements against the right of women to access contraceptive healthcare and opposes the ACA 's mandate for employer-sponsored insurance plans to provide contraceptives
- Judge Walker stated Dr. Christine Blasey Ford's statements regarding her experience of sexual harassment was "mistaken." Judge Walker's dismissal of

Dr. Blasey Ford's testimony indicates he may not able to exercise impartiality necessary to examine the facts of a case.

Judge Walker has demonstrated a career-long commitment to rolling back the rights that determine our health, freedom, and well-being. As a judge in the influential District of Columbia Circuit, Judge Walker will have the power to decide many cases involving critical legal protections for groups and civil rights he has long worked against. Continuing his plan to pack the courts with the right-wing, anti-women's rights judges, Donald Trump has nominated **Cory Wilson** to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. Wilson has a long-standing commitment to eroding abortion access. In addition to publishing statements hostile to the holding in *Roe v. Wade*, Judge Wilson has taken numerous steps to limit abortion access, voted for abortion bans, for parental involvement laws, and defunding Mississippi Planned Parenthoods. Judge Wilson has persistently criticized the Affordable Care Act, calling it "illegitimate" and urging the Supreme Court to rule against it. In Mississippi, Wilson opposed Medicaid expansion that would have benefitted 100,000 persons without health insurance. He is also anti-LGBTQIA+ and has attacked voting rights laws. For more information go to, https://www.afj.org/document/cory-wilson-background-report/

CALL YOUR SENATORS NOW AND URGE THEM TO OPPOSE CONFIRMATION OF JUDGES JUSTIN WALKER AND CORY WILSON. The Capitol switchboard is 202-224-3121 or go to
https://www.senate.gov/general/contact_information/senators_cfm.cfm
ndicated its continuing interest in this matter.