



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 27, 2019

No. 53

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COSTA).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 27, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JIM COSTA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, this week we celebrate Public Schools Week. It serves as a reminder that every child deserves access to quality education that helps them reach their full potential.

Public schools are where our students become citizens. They learn to think critically, solve problems, and build relationships. They grow to contribute to our society, our economy, and our communities, and it all starts

with the men and women who want to make a difference.

I want to thank our teachers and educators and professionals who work in these fields, and I want to include Ms. Lucy Gamby, who was my sixth grade teacher, and thank her for the influence that she had in my life. I am sure every one of us has someone like that that is that special teacher.

WORLD DOWN SYNDROME DAY

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, we celebrated Down Syndrome Day.

Many people don't know this, but they do know I have 11 grandchildren. My sixth grandchild and third grandson is Stanley. Stanley has Down's, and Stanley is an amazing, fun child, wonderful.

You know, it is kind of our job as grandparents to make sure that each grandchild believes that they are the favorite, and I do my best to do that, but today I want to recognize Stanley because I want to make sure that people understand that the people and the families that are involved and have Down syndrome children or grandchildren, that we live and we work to make sure that they can achieve to the highest level that they can in life. So this day I want to say, "Stanley, I love you."

We want to recognize all of our children who have Down's and our adults who have Down's and encourage them to be the best that they can be.

LIBERIAN IMMIGRANTS IN MINNESOTA NEED PEACE OF MIND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the clock is ticking and thousands of Minnesotans are running out of time. Business owners are going to lose their workforce, workers are going to lose their jobs, and children are going to

lose their parents, and it will be because we here in Congress failed to take simple action when we were called to make change.

We have been handed a game-winning layup or, in Minnesota terms, an empty net, and all we have to do is tap in the puck. All we have to do is say to our Liberian population who came here fleeing bloody civil war and the terrors of the Ebola virus: You matter; you are doing everything right. The world took everything from you, and you came to our country. You work hard, legally, you pay your taxes, and you are valued members of our community.

But because we gave Liberians an immigration status DED, that does not allow a pathway to citizenship; and because that status expires now in 4 days, these friends, neighbors, and family members will be subject to deportation, and it will tear our community apart, and it will be on us.

Mr. Speaker, I recently heard from Nicole Mattson, a healthcare employer in senior care back in the Twin Cities: "We don't have enough workers. At my facility, 60 percent of employees are immigrants, and over half of those are Liberians. We would have to say goodbye to a pool of talent that is highly skilled and educated."

"I have no idea why we would leave behind such a critically important group of people to the healthcare industry. Very simply, we cannot do the work, we cannot care for people, we cannot care for seniors without them. We need them here, and we are glad they are here."

Mr. Speaker, I would say that we need courage to pass a legislative fix to save Minnesota's healthcare industry and keep hardworking members of our population home. I would say that we need courage to keep our families and communities and brothers and sisters together. This is so simple and so easy, that we do not even need courage. We just need to pass a bill.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2831

These are immigrants who have done everything the right way: They are here legally; they work hard; they pay their taxes; and they have made themselves irreplaceable contributors to our communities.

Their immigration status has been extended by every President from Bill Clinton to Donald Trump. These would be undocumented citizens of our very own creation.

If you need the human argument, hear it from my constituent, Michael: "Going back to Liberia is not an option for me. My only brother, who we were not able to bring to America, died in Liberia a few years ago. My parents and siblings all live here in the United States.

"I was recently accepted into a doctoral program in education. My whole life is here. This is my home. Liberia is a fragile country still recovering from a decades-long war."

Or Matthew, who could lose his older brother: "It affects me deeply as a U.S. citizen. This is someone I look up to. If he was to up and leave the U.S., that would be very difficult for him, for me. He has a daughter. I cannot take on that responsibility of being my niece's caretaker.

"I cannot even imagine the nightmare that this will create in my community. This is not just about me and my family; it is about our community. We are going to be losing friends and family. I am not ready for this."

We have the legislation. We have a fix ready to go to move DED holders to TPS for 3 years while we pass a more comprehensive fix.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, ask yourselves: Are we here to make a difference? Are you here to make people's lives better? Are you here to help business owners and workers, or are you here to keep playing politics with people's lives?

Let's rise to the occasion and be better than that and finally, at long last, give our Liberian community the peace of mind that they so richly deserve.

KINETIC KIDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to spotlight Kinetic Kids, an organization in my hometown that helps more than 2,800 children with special needs in San Antonio, Schertz, and New Braunfels.

A few weeks ago, I joined over 470 Texans in the cold and the wet to support these local children with special needs.

In 2001, Kinetic Kids was founded by Tracey Fontenot and Kacey Wernli, pediatric physical therapists who saw that children with special needs needed more exercise. They needed motivation; they needed camaraderie; they needed the joy that comes from being part of a team.

I am proud to be part of their team, and I will always be here to cheer them on.

Congratulations on a great event, and thank you for the important work you do in the community.

FIGHTING THE BUREAUCRACY

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my team and I are committed to fighting the bureaucracy for folks I represent across the 23rd Congressional District of Texas who can't battle it on their own.

Recently, my team helped Kinney County in south Texas cut through Federal red tape to secure \$4 million in funding and spare the county from financial ruin. The county was being punished simply for following orders, but due to conflicting information from Washington bureaucrats regarding how much to pay employees at the county detention center, they were told they owed the Federal Government \$4 million.

Once my office heard about this issue, we worked relentlessly with the U.S. Marshals Service to ensure these costs were covered.

I thank Kinney County Judge Tully Shahan for informing me of this issue and the Department of Justice for working with my office to resolve this situation.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Joyce Meyer once said that "teachers can change lives with just the right mix of chalk and challenges."

For Amistad National Recreation Area Education Specialist Lisa Nielsen, her chalk is a trail, a shoreline, and a pair of binoculars. The 28-year National Park Service veteran has created several innovative and interactive programs that have educated tens of thousands of Texans I represent of all ages on the importance of conservation and maintaining our south and west Texas natural treasures for future generations to come.

I am proud to rise today to honor Lisa and all of the women who are making an impact each day across the 23rd Congressional District of Texas as we continue to celebrate Women's History Month.

BUDGET PROPOSAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise out of a deep concern for our country and its ability to sustain investments in growing our economy and making opportunities available for our people.

Our country suffered the longest government shutdown in its history just a few months ago. For 35 days, 800,000 Federal employees and their families were forced to go without paychecks. Our economy was burdened by uncertainty and a lack of confidence in our leaders.

That shutdown was the direct result of the Trump administration's confrontational approach to governing and its irresponsible decision to insist

on a position that Congress had already rejected.

I would have hoped that they learned from that experience, but it appears that that is not the case. Now President Trump and Mick Mulvaney—a former colleague of ours who voted not only to shut down the government, but against the wishes of the Republican Speaker, voted against opening government up—have sent to Congress a budget proposal that ramps up confrontation and sets up an even more difficult impasse.

Their budget proposal rejects 6 years of governing consensus enshrined in three 2-year budget agreements to raise the caps put in place by the Budget Control Act in a bipartisan way and according to the principles of parity, fairness, and equality.

Adhering to that path and working together to raise the caps responsibly and at the same rate for defense and nondefense investments would be, in my view, the best way to ensure that appropriations for next year proceed on a bipartisan basis so that we can do the job of funding the government and avert another unnecessary, dangerous, and harmful shutdown in October.

The administration's proposal of using the overseas contingency operations account to avoid negotiating with Congress on responsibly dealing with the BCA caps and hiding increases in defense funding is a massive gimmick.

Who said that? The Republican majority said that a number of years ago.

It is more than just an accounting sleight of hand, with real implications for our national security planning and long-term strategy.

The OCO account, again, overseas contingency operations account, was created to fund imminent defense priorities outside of the normal Pentagon budget planning cycle.

Now Mr. Mulvaney wants to use OCO at the rate of some \$175 billion-plus as if Afghanistan, in which we have been involved for some 17 years, is a contingency. It is not a contingency. It is an operating expense.

If OCO were used in the way the administration intends, it could cripple multiyear planning by our military by calling into question every penny shifted into that account in future years.

It is also disingenuous for them to demand that Congress pour money into defense through what Mr. Mulvaney himself has called a "backdoor slush fund." That is what he called OCO in 2015 when he was a Member of Congress.

And now that same Mr. Mulvaney, the Acting Chief of Staff and, frankly, I believe, also, the Acting OMB Director, proposes to use what he called a backdoor slush fund without acknowledging the need to compromise elsewhere on the ledger.

□ 1015

This is fiscal irresponsibility at its worst, because it is a veneer of concern

for fiscal discipline used to hide the ugly truth of fiscal recklessness and brinksmanship. The Trump-Mulvaney budget is, to put it bluntly, a fraud.

It is the Congress' job to move ahead with good faith efforts to agree on raising the caps. We have a procedure called sequester that, if we do not amend the caps, will go into effect 15 days after we adjourn this session and cut to levels that no Member of Congress, in my view, believes is reasonable, rational, or responsible. It would automatically occur if we do not pass a caps bill.

That is indicative that there is bipartisan agreement, which has happened over the last 6 years in 2-year cycles, that the caps required by the sequester bill were irrational. I think there is a consensus. So, as opposed to confrontation, and to avoid a shutdown in October, we ought to come to an agreement. The President, of course, needs to be part of that agreement, because he would need to sign legislation amending the sequester act.

Appropriators need guidance, also, to begin the hard work of writing funding bills. They need to know what the agreed spending level will be. We call it a 302(a). What it really means is: How much money are you going to spend on discretionary spending for defense and nondefense objectives?

Now, I am an appropriator. I haven't served on the committee for some years, because I am in the leadership, but I am on leave. I understand as well as anyone how important it is to have agreed-upon top-line numbers in order for the committee to do its work effectively on a bipartisan basis.

I will tell my Republican colleagues, as I have told my Democratic colleagues, it is my intention, as majority of the House of Representatives, to provide for the passage of the appropriations bills through the House of Representatives by the end of June.

The Budget Act requires us to do it by June 30. We have never done it. We haven't done it on our side; the Republicans haven't done it on their side. What inevitably happens is we don't get our work done, and we had a shutdown last year and this year of historic proportions and of historic cost and of historic undermining of confidence in the United States of America here and around the world.

We need to get to work; we need to get to work together; and we need to get this job done. Let's strive to achieve that which I know is achievable.

I have talked to Ms. GRANGER. I have talked to the ranking member of the Budget Committee here in the House, STEVE WOMACK, a good friend of mine. I have talked to Senator ENZI, the chairman in the Senate. And I have talked to Senator MCCONNELL. I haven't heard from anybody who doesn't think we need to get caps established so that we can do our work for the American people and reestablish confidence in the rational oper-

ations of the Congress. It won't be easy, but it is necessary.

Let us not delude ourselves into believing, just a few weeks removed from the longest government shutdown in our history, that the administration's shortsighted approach will lead to anything but another shutdown at the end of the fiscal year. Divided government need not be confrontational government.

I tell people on a regular basis that the Congress is less than the sum of its parts. What do I mean by that? I mean the individual Members have integrity and a willingness to work together, but, as a body, we have found ourselves unable or unwilling to do just that. We are less than the sum of our parts, less than the sum of our Members' intellect and willingness to act responsibly.

We can disagree on details, but we must try to reach agreement on the caps in order to assist appropriators, promote fiscal responsibility, reduce uncertainty, and protect the ability of our military to plan its budget over the long term with confidence.

If OCO is relied upon, in terms of billions of dollars, they cannot do that. It is undermining our national security, as well as undermining the ability to meet our domestic needs.

The Trump-Mulvaney budget proposal was, sadly, a missed opportunity and more of a fiscally irresponsible charade.

I say to my friends on both sides of the aisle: Let us strive to not miss our own opportunity to meet in good faith and produce a budget caps agreement that promotes fiscal sanity, upholds the principle of parity, and allows us to invest in a better future for our country. Certainly, we ought to expect no less of ourselves, and, certainly, that is what our constituents expect of us.

Then, let us proceed to achieve a realistic, fiscally responsible path toward a real, sustainable budget agreement worthy of our duty to our country and constituents and to future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to come together, to reason together, and to establish a plan to proceed, not just for this year, but for a decade to come, that is fiscally responsible, meets the challenges that we have, and seizes the opportunities that are in front of us.

DIGNITY, OPPORTUNITY, AND AMERICAN VALUE OF WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I grew up in a large working-class family in central South Dakota. I suppose there were some years when we were more poor than we were working class. But I want to make it clear, my parents worked hard every single day. So did I, and so did my brother and my sisters.

Even with that hard work, there were times when we needed help from gov-

ernment to get by. I am who I am today because of the experiences of both welfare and hard work.

Government assistance can help meet people's basic needs. We all know that. But on its own, welfare alone means surviving just barely on the edges. Welfare can meet short-term basic needs, but education and work—yes, education and work—they deliver long-term hope and dignity and purpose and opportunity.

That brings me, today, to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP. Many of us call it food stamps. I know this program well from a number of personal and professional experiences.

Most of you probably know that, under Federal law, able-bodied nonseniors—people between the ages of 18 and 50—who don't have children at home are required to work or train or volunteer or go to school for 20 hours a week to receive their benefits.

To most Americans, these work requirements are common sense, just as they were when they were passed, in 1986, into law in a bipartisan manner. They are common sense because work isn't punishment. Work is opportunity.

Unfortunately, over the years, some States have used gimmicks and loopholes to trigger waivers. Those waivers water down the work requirements that we have been talking about. These, I am sure, well-intentioned but misguided efforts, mean that one-third of our country lives in an area with no work requirements.

Today, despite a record-high 7 million job openings, we have 2.7 million SNAP recipients who can work but who aren't. There is a better way, I am happy to say, and I want to tell you about it.

A few years ago, because of State waivers, too many Arkansans were not experiencing the kind of dignity and opportunity that comes from work, so Arkansas changed course. They put their work requirements back into place, and the results were breathtaking. They were impressive.

People who left the program because they didn't work or didn't train or didn't volunteer ended up better off than they were on welfare. Necessity pushed them into a job path that brought them more resources than welfare alone could ever provide.

With all of those people moving off the welfare rolls and into the workplace, they were earning money, and the State saw its revenues go up.

That kind of success can, and is, happening elsewhere. When Maine reimplemented work requirements, incomes of former enrollees more than doubled and caseloads declined by 90 percent.

These results show all of us how important it is for us to close these loopholes. USDA Secretary Sonny Perdue should be commended for his efforts to do just that through a proposed rule, making sure that food stamp recipients are encouraged and rewarded for their work.

I want to make very clear, these actions are not about taking aid away from areas that are struggling with high unemployment. There are clear exceptions for those areas. Instead, this is about prompting more States and more citizens to experience the successes that have been experienced by Maine and by Arkansas.

We all know that every one of us does better, every single one of us does better, when we are pushed, when we are moved past our comfort level. Growth requires effort. That is true in athletics; that is true in academics; that is true in raising children; and that is true in all other areas of life as well. Denying millions of able-bodied SNAP recipients that push, that growth, also denies them a chance at a better future.

In States where work requirements have been reinstated, a clearer path out of poverty has reemerged. We have to do that elsewhere. We have to do that everywhere.

I close today, Mr. Speaker, by saying that work has dignity; work is opportunity; and work is an American value.

CELEBRATING VAISAKHI

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARDER of California). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the Sikh community in celebrating Vaisakhi.

On April 14, Sikhs around the world, including thousands and thousands in California's San Joaquin Valley, will celebrate the Vaisakhi festival. This week, we welcome members of the Congressional Sikh Caucus to the Hill to participate in those celebrations.

The festival marks the new year and the beginning of the spring season for the global Sikh community.

The date of the Vaisakhi festival has tremendous significance in Sikhism. The festival commemorates the year 1699, when Sikhism emerged as a collective faith in what is now modern-day India.

It also celebrates both the birthday of the 10th Sikh guru, Guru Gobind Singh, and the foundation of the Khalsa Panth, the Sikh brotherhood.

Sikhs across the globe celebrate this day with enthusiasm and joy. I know they do in the rich San Joaquin Valley that is home to so many who are farmers, businesspeople, and community leaders. I have the honor to represent them and to celebrate with them.

This festival models what all cultures strive for: strong communities coming together to celebrate progress, renew its dedication to helping one another, and peace.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please join me in celebrating this special tradition in the Sikh community.

WOMEN TRAILBLAZERS

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, every March, we come together to honor trailblazing women who have come be-

fore us, who have made a difference throughout the history of our country and throughout the world, and those who continue to pave the way for the next generation, those who have broken the glass ceiling, and those who are role models.

□ 1030

The unsung heroines of these courageous pioneering women continue to always make a difference.

The role model for me, and one who I must say made the incredible difference, was our mother, Lena Cordoza Costa, a daughter of immigrants, born before the Depression, raised during it, having to quit school as a freshman in high school to help raise her seven siblings because her father had been injured in an agricultural accident.

She went on with our father to be—as Tom Brokaw noted—perhaps America's greatest generation, striving with the values of hard work, of teaching us to treat others as we would want to be treated ourselves, and values of common sense.

As a young boy, learning that, Jim, you know, the truth is the truth, and that you should always never forget those who are less fortunate.

After our father passed away, my mother in her mid-70s quietly decided to go back to school and to get her GED. She didn't need to. She was a successful business person; she was an artist, a voracious reader, and a competitive bridge player.

And when she got her GED, she told my sister and me. We said, Mom, why didn't you tell us?

She says, Well, I wasn't sure I would do well.

Our mother did—everything that she did, she did well, and continued to serve as a role model.

Later on, the high school in which she had to quit as a freshman, at a 100th anniversary of that high school, asked her to come—with myself—and they presented her her high school diploma.

She was so proud of that high school diploma. And today, it sits on my desk. And I show students that you can be whatever you want to be if you have the proper role model and encouragement.

It is women who are guiding our Nation towards a more equal future—like our mother—who make a difference.

Today, I am proud to be a Member of the most diverse Congress in the United States' history, with over 102 women in this body, women serving the people's House.

We honor their sacrifice, their brilliance, and the strength of their service for our Nation.

JOE BIDEN: DECADES OF BEING WRONG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, former Vice President Joe Biden has been in the

news a lot lately, along with a predictable narrative from the Washington know-it-all chorus and their mainstream media partners that he has a distinguished record and reputation as an expert on foreign policy.

How very "Washington" it is to assume that with his long Washington resume, especially his chairmanship of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that Joe Biden is a foreign policy genius.

Nice guy that he is, let's look at the facts.

Because America's national security depends on America's wise choice of our next President, I want to quote the great Charles Krauthammer, who more accurately described Mr. Biden's record back in 2012.

The Vice President over the last 30 years holds the American record for being wrong on the most issues in Foreign Affairs ever. And the list starts with the nuclear freeze in the early eighties against Thatcher and Reagan, which is one of the follies of the era. He supported it.

He was against aid to the Nicaraguan Contras, which in the end brought democracy and ended the Sandinista rule at the time.

He was against Reagan's expansion of the defense budget, which bankrupted the Soviet Union and led to the end of the Soviet Empire.

He was against Reagan on strategic defenses, which is the big advantage that we have now in missile defense.

And look at where he was on Iraq. He opposed the first Iraq war, the Gulf war that liberated Kuwait, that everyone agrees was a good thing.

He supported the second Iraq war, which he, not I, say was a terrible mistake. And then when the surge happened, he opposed the surge in Iraq which rescued a losing war and ended in our leaving with our heads held high and some promise of the future.

He seems to be the Herbert Hoover of American foreign policy. And for him to be the spokesman for the Obama Administration on these affairs, I think is quite ironic.

It is not just conservative commentators who can see through the illusion of Vice President Biden's foreign policy judgment.

Robert Gates, former CIA director and Defense Secretary for George W. Bush and Barack Obama, had this to say about Biden in his book, "Duty: Memoirs of a Secretary at War":

"I think he has been wrong on nearly every major foreign policy and national security issue over the past four decades."

I rarely, if ever, agree with Barack Obama, and I am glad to see our country is now back on the road to a strong foreign policy. But I will give President Obama credit for wisely disregarding Vice President Biden's counsel on, arguably, the greatest achievement of Obama's presidency: his authorization in 2011 of the raid by America's SEAL Teams that killed Osama Bin Laden.

As Vice President Biden, himself, recalled to a group of Democrats in 2016, President Obama asked for a final recommendation from his national security team, and he asked, Joe, what do you think?

His answer was, Mr. President, my suggestion is, don't go.

Many agree that President Obama picked Biden as his Vice President in 2008 to quell concerns about his youth and lack of experience in Foreign Affairs, but in retrospect, it has now become clear that the most useful role he played was for Mr. Obama to take whatever he recommended and advised and conclude that it was probably the wrong approach.

Mr. Biden now believes that he is the right man to lead our Nation as President. America will choose a President in 2020, and I hope that Republicans and Democrats will conclude, as our 44th President and countless others have, that the opposite might just be true.

HEALTHCARE FOR ALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this moment to go down a very tough, and for many families, humiliating journey down memory lane.

Memories full of sick mothers and fathers, sick children, and maybe even those who lost their life because they could not get affordable healthcare.

Apparently, this administration doesn't understand; for those of us who were here before the Affordable Care Act, the years and years of work, the thousands of pages of testimony, the many different committees—even my committee, the Committee on the Judiciary—we heard the pain and cries of those who did not have health insurance.

Maybe he doesn't know—the administration—the story of the 8-year-old girl whose family actually took her to the office of the insurance company—she had leukemia—to beg for coverage. And they denied her, and she died.

Maybe they did not hear the story of the mother whose son had hepatitis because he had not been able to overcome his drug addiction, even though he was a lawyer, and his only basis of healthcare was the emergency room in a city hospital;

Or maybe the doctor who drove to another city hundreds of miles away to get his intern son, put him in the backseat of his car and drive him all the way back so that he could be inside the jurisdiction in which his healthcare covered.

Maybe the administration and the President do not know about junk insurance policies, that when you get to the hospital, as they look over you in the emergency room and say, There is no room at the inn for you because your insurance doesn't cover hospitalization.

Or the tap on the door of your hospital room while you are in the bed, and although you are still ill, you are evicted because your insurance has capped.

All of that was eliminated with the Affordable Care Act.

What a disaster for this administration to proudly and arrogantly stand up to take a stand to destroy the Affordable Care Act in my State, in Texas v. Azar, and how sad it is that State officials from the moment they got elected in my State, Republicans, every day have been fighting to destroy the Affordable Care Act.

And my own county health department is begging for relief; begging for the expanded Medicaid; begging to serve the many thousands upon thousands that are in need who are working poor, but my State refused to accept the expanded Medicaid. And now, with great hubris, pompousness, this Government—it is supposed to be for the people, of which we are—has decided to take a stand to destroy the Affordable Care Act.

Rather than do what we are attempting to do as Democrats and protecting preexisting conditions and to expand and improve on healthcare, we are looking to lower health insurance premiums, strengthen protections for people with pre-existing conditions, stop insurance companies from selling junk health insurance plans, and reverse the administration's healthcare, sabotaging needlessly driven-up premiums and uninsured rates and empower States to innovate and invest in enrolling more people.

Outreach. I have been engaged in outreach and education, and the families are excited when they are eligible for insurance.

All of the people that I mentioned, and some who died, had preexisting conditions. Over 50 percent of the American people—maybe upwards of 65 percent—have preexisting conditions.

In 2012, there were 45 million uninsured persons, but the Affordable Care Act was making its way so much so that we have reduced the amount of uninsured persons, as the numbers show in 2018, down to about 28 million, and we were making steady progress.

What kind of caring attitude do you have?

Where is your humanity, that you would take insurance away from sick children, families, and the elderly, and that you would allow their prescription drugs to shoot through the roof, which is what will happen when you destroy and implode the Affordable Care Act.

It is not an overnight success. 50 years America was trying to work on a system that would work, beyond the Medicare system, and Medicaid.

We are supporting—many of us—a way to provide healthcare for all, like Medicare for all. I am supporting this legislation, but what is happening in the administration is nothing but an implosion of a lifeline for the American people.

We need to stop that now.

CONGRATULATING WHEELING PARK HIGH SCHOOL SPEECH AND DEBATE TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Wheeling Park High School Speech and Debate Team, which has won the West Virginia State championship for 40 years in a row.

Think about that.

Their uninterrupted string of victories began when Jimmy Carter was President, and now has extended through the administrations of Presidents Reagan, Bush 41, Clinton, Bush 43, President Obama, and now President Trump.

Their winning streak is longer than most of my staff has been alive. Their 40-year record may very well be the longest in the country's history.

Their students are part of a dynasty. Some even have a personal family legacy because they are following the footsteps of their parents, who also won when they competed in the high school competition at Park.

Look, Generation Z suffers from a lot of negative stereotypes, but the team members on the Wheeling Park Speech and Debate Team are examples of a great new generation and what they can do.

These students are dedicated. They work year-round and compete in competitions to hone their skills. They are able to convey emotions and sway an audience while passionately arguing today's most pressing topics.

We couldn't be prouder of these students. There is no doubt in my mind, they have a bright future ahead of them, and that has everything to do with their work ethic and dedication.

I would also like to congratulate and thank their coaches, Bill Cornforth, Kayla Nelson, Isabella Droginske and Brigitte Mazure, as well as the team's founding coach, Fran Schoolcraft, who led them through their first 25 victories.

Congratulations on their first 40, and here's to the road to 41.

□ 1045

CONGRATULATING AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF CRITICAL-CARE NURSES

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of the American Association of Critical-Care Nurses.

My wife, Mary, was a critical-care nurse for over 45 years and served as the past president of AACN. Her time as a critical-care nurse taught me how difficult it is to have a career in nursing.

It requires working long hours, weekends, and caring for people during the most challenging times of the patients' lives. And while sometimes nurses get to see happy endings, other times, they share in the emotions of families making very difficult decisions.

That is why it is important to honor the American Association of Critical-

Care Nurses, their dedication to their patients, and their push for excellence because, like their mission statement says, "Nothing less is acceptable."

CHILDCARE CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk about an important issue affecting families across our country, including in my home State of California.

I am a single mom, and I know firsthand that we have a childcare crisis in this country. Two years ago, I spent \$16,000 on childcare for my daughter Betsy to attend the U.C. Irvine-Verano Preschool. That is more than it would have been for an entire year of tuition for her to be an undergraduate at U.C. Irvine.

I was able to keep \$5,000 of the money that I earned pretax to go toward those childcare expenses in a flexible spending account, but that didn't go very far to cover childcare for Betsy, never mind my other two children. The \$5,000 doesn't even get me to tax day. This is the reality of raising a family in Orange County and in so many places across the country.

In only one State is childcare considered affordable. Let that sink in. In every State but one, the majority of families have to spend more than 7 percent of their income on childcare.

My constituents in the 45th Congressional District have asked me to help them make childcare affordable.

Jennifer, who works in my district, has two children under the age of 3. She and her husband will spend 23 percent of their gross income on childcare next year. That is not affordable.

In Irvine, Erica and her husband spend \$1,350 each month for childcare for their 3-year-old son. They have access to a flexible spending account through their employer, but the \$5,000 that current law allows only covers 31 percent of their annual childcare cost.

Even for those with school-age children, the most affordable city-sponsored camps so parents can work during the summer and spring break, exceed \$5,000. And the cost of eldercare is equally out of proportion to the current \$5,000 limit on the Dependent Care Flexible Spending Account.

That is why I am introducing the bipartisan Family Savings for Kids and Seniors Act. This bill will allow families to keep more of their own paychecks, pretax, to use for the care for kids, grandparents, and other family members that they incur so that they can work. The bill does this by adjusting the limit that Americans can put into their Dependent Care Flexible Spending Accounts, or FSAs. Families use this pretax benefit to help pay for preschool, camps, adult daycare, and childcare.

The \$5,000 limit under current law has not changed since it was enacted in 1986, but childcare costs have certainly

risen with the cost of inflation. There is no reason why a family's ability to save for dependent care shouldn't have increased with time as well.

If my bill were in effect now, families would be able to put \$11,300 in their flexible savings accounts. That is about the average cost of childcare for one child in this country.

The Family Savings for Kids and Seniors Act offers families a way to keep more of what they earn to pay for the childcare and eldercare that allows them to work. The work that parents do adds to the vitality and the strength of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting America's working families.

RECOGNIZING GRACE BIBLE CHURCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a faith community in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, that truly embodies the virtues of kindness and charity. Grace Bible Church in Souderton, will be hosting its sixth annual Easter dinner, where all members of our community are welcome.

Like last year, Grace Bible Church will be offering transportation to residents of Grundy Manor in Telford and Valley Vista in Souderton so that they are able to participate in an evening of food and fellowship.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to all of the congregants of Grace Bible Church for opening their doors to our neighbors and for living out their Christian faith in their actions.

I would like to particularly thank and recognize one of the event's organizers, Carol Doyle, for her work, along with Pastor Dave Dunbar for his vision and for his leadership.

RECOGNIZING ALAN HARTL IN HIS RETIREMENT

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the retirement of a true professional and advocate in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, after his nearly 40 years of providing mental health counseling and recovery services to members of our community.

Alan Hartl will be stepping down as the chief executive officer of the Lenape Valley Foundation after a long and distinguished career. A psychologist, Alan has, for decades, been a strong advocate for those with behavioral health needs.

Widely respected throughout Bucks County and among his peers, Alan is a member of the board of directors of both the National Council for Behavioral Health and the Pennsylvania Rehabilitation and Community Providers Association.

Alan's dedication to improving the lives of our neighbors and his delivering hope to those most in need are truly admirable. I wish him all the best

in his new chapter, and I wish his successor, Sharon Curran, all of the best in her new role.

RECOGNIZING CAROLANN BEGLEY FOR HER WORK TO PREVENT HUNGER

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize an outstanding school administrator in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, who was recently recognized by a national nonprofit organization for her work to prevent hunger amongst our community students.

Carolann Begley, nutrition services area supervisor at North Penn High School, was named a Breakfast Hero by the organization, No Kid Hungry.

Carolann's work has been instrumental in making breakfast more accessible to students, notably through her work to implement a breakfast cart for the 2018-2019 school year.

Mr. Speaker, our community school administrators and educators work tirelessly to give our students the resources they need to pursue their goals. I applaud Carolann for her service, and I would also like to thank North Penn High School Principal Pete Nicholson and the No Kid Hungry network, an organization, for all of the work that they do for our community.

COMMEMORATING THE FIGHTIN' FIFTY-FIFTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACON. Madam Speaker, I rise to commemorate the longstanding bond our Midwest communities enjoy with the Fightin' Fifty-Fifth Wing, the United States Air Force wing right here at Offutt Air Force Base in Nebraska. It has units all over the world.

The 55th Wing and the 55th Wing Association will jointly celebrate a uniquely treasured relationship at this year's reunion in April that will feature numerous dedications and commemorative events.

The Fightin' Fifty-Fifth's historic lineage began before World War II. Since 1940, the unit has distinguished itself as a preeminent Air Force organization, flying and supporting worldwide operations in peace and conflict. Of note, the 55th Fighter Group conducted fighter sweeps over the invasion beaches on June 6, 1944, using their P-38s. In 1966, the Fightin' Fifty-Fifth transferred to Nebraska as part of the Strategic Air Command.

For over 50 years, the 55th Wing personnel have supported national interests around the world, focusing on providing first-class reconnaissance, real-time intelligence, command and control, information warfare, and combat support capabilities. It is the largest wing in Air Combat Command and flies the most diverse types of aircraft.

Notably, since Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm, the 55th Wing is the only Air Force wing with continuous operations, maintenance, and aircraft presence in

the United States Central Command theater of operations.

Indeed, the sheer longevity of this storied unit's history and global mission reach personifies their motto, "The Sun never sets on the Fightin' Fifty-Fifth."

The unit's exceptional record of service was the catalyst for the 55th Wing Association's creation. Following decades of the Fightin' Fifty-Fifth camaraderie, global deployments, and operational achievement, a handful of veteran aviators were determined to preserve this invaluable heritage so it would not be lost to future generations.

This innovative initial cadre formed the 55th Strategic Reconnaissance Wing Association to serve alongside the Offutt's 55th Strategic Reconnaissance Wing Active-Duty force. Both organizations were eventually renamed to today's 55th Wing and 55th Wing Association, respectively, and have remained in Nebraska ever since.

The 55th Wing Association is comprised of Air Force veterans who served honorably in the Fightin' Fifty-Fifth, most of whom were stationed at Offutt Air Force Base. The 55th Wing Association's support to their Active-Duty counterparts is second to none, and its support to the 55th Wing alumni is a model for other Air Force organizations to emulate. It embodies the impressive relationship between alumni veterans and Active-Duty military members, and they have it in their credo, "Honoring those who served, and serving those who do." It could not be said any better.

This bond between veteran citizens and military personnel is nothing short of remarkable. These organizations demonstrate the very best of cooperation to serve our national interests, sustain organizational values, and foster military fellowship from as far back as those who served in World War II to those of the present who still fly, fight, and win our Nation's battles right now. Their relationship will forever be enshrined at the many ceremonies in Nebraska on April 6, where monuments will be dedicated to the alumni of the Fightin' Fifty-Fifth past, present, and future.

In 2003, the 55th Wing Association captured the inspirational essence of their history in choosing the following inscription on their U.S. Air Force Museum monument, and it says:

We must never forget that freedom is never really free; it is the most costly thing in the world. And freedom is never paid in a lump sum; payments come due in every generation. All any of us can do is to offer the generations that follow a chance for freedom.

The 55th Wing Association also chose these same words for inclusion on the monuments they will dedicate this April. They are fitting praise for the accomplishments of the past and a challenge to the Fightin' Fifty-Fifth for the future.

Just 11 days ago, Nebraska was hit with the worst national disaster in the

history of our State and a third of Offutt Air Force Base was damaged, including key operations and support facilities. The Fightin' Fifty-Fifth never missed a beat supporting operations all over the world. This indomitable spirit of the Fightin' Fifty-Fifth led the Secretary of the Air Force, Heather Wilson, to say: "Not even Mother Nature could defeat the 55th Wing."

So, after 75 years as an organizational flying wing, over a half century based in Nebraska, and more than 25 consecutive years deployed in the Middle East for combat operations, the Fightin' Fifty-Fifth deserves our highest respect, and I am honored to salute the 55th Wing Association for all of its efforts to preserve its rich heritage.

RECOGNIZING COLONEL CRAIG OSBORNE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Colonel Craig Osborne, a soldier in my district who will be retiring this week after 30 years of service in the United States Army.

Colonel Osborne graduated from Illinois State University in 1989 as a distinguished military graduate, and during his time with the Army, he has participated in a total of five combat deployments: Operation Desert Shield, Operation Desert Storm, Operation Joint Guard, Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Time and time again, Colonel Osborne has answered the call to serve his country. He has served at the headquarters of Allied Land Forces Southeastern Europe in Turkey, as well as the chief of staff for a combined, joint, and interagency task force in Kabul, Afghanistan.

□ 1100

In his current position with the National Defense University, he contributes to the education of future generations of our servicemembers.

Among his many distinctions, Colonel Osborne has earned three Defense Superior Service Medals, the Legion of Merit, five Bronze Star Medals, three Defense Meritorious Service Medals, the Combat Infantryman's Badge, and numerous other awards.

Words cannot express how thankful I am for Colonel Osborne's service. He is a great example of someone who has dedicated his life to serving his country, and I am proud to honor him today.

Congratulations on your retirement, Colonel.

REMEMBERING GARY JONES

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember Gary Jones, a good friend and dedicated police officer who passed away earlier this month after a long battle with cancer.

Gary and I both grew up in Taylorville, Illinois. After graduation, he went on to serve in the Army and in the Army National Guard. He eventually became a police officer in our hometown. He was proud of his job and always loved going to schools to teach students about the police station and his job protecting our community.

Outside of work, Gary's greatest hobby was firearms. He was a gunsmith, a proud member of the NRA, a master firearms instructor, and my and my wife's concealed carry instructor. Gary loved teaching people about the responsibility of owning firearms and teaching people the importance of gun safety.

I will remember Gary as a true example of patriotism and service to our community that we share as a hometown. He made a tremendous impact on the lives of many in Taylorville, and he will truly be missed.

My prayers are with his wife, Gina; their four children, Logan, Kaylee, Tanner, and Dylan; and all those like me who were blessed to know Gary Jones.

SLOW DOWN TO PROTECT FIRST RESPONDERS

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight a dangerous, disturbing, and unacceptable trend in Illinois and across the country. It is the rising number of first responders being struck by drivers.

We are not even 3 months into this year, and 14 members of the Illinois State Police have been struck by drivers while on the road or responding to incidents. These accidents have resulted in one fatality and more than a dozen injuries.

Our first responders put their lives on the line every day to protect us, and it is inexcusable to have this number of them injured by errant and distracted drivers. These numbers average out to more than one trooper struck per week and is nearly double the number of incidents in all of 2018.

Even though every State has laws requiring drivers to change lanes or slow down when vehicles or emergency personnel are on the side of the road, these tragedies keep occurring. For the safety of our first responders, construction workers, and tow truck drivers, please slow down, avoid distractions, and be alert on the road to help save lives and buck this tragic trend.

MOTORCYCLE COMMUNITY PROFILING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I rise today to bring awareness to the issue of motorcycle profiling.

This week, I joined Congressman BURGESS, my fellow co-chair of the Congressional Motorcycle Caucus, to introduce a resolution that encourages

greater collaboration between the motorcycle community and law enforcement officials to prevent instances of profiling.

There is no doubt, motorcycles represent more than just a mode of transportation to those of us who ride them. They often signify a sense of freedom, identity, and camaraderie. In Michigan, we have thousands of local riders and many more who come from out of State to enjoy our Great Lakes, scenic highways, and the great outdoors.

As an avid motorcyclist myself, I have heard from many in the riding community who felt that they had been profiled by law enforcement at least once, oftentimes solely because of their motorcycle-related apparel. While I certainly support actions taken to enforce violations of the law, we should all be concerned about profiling of riders based on their attire and absent any wrongdoing.

To be clear, motorcyclists have a deep appreciation for our Nation's law enforcement officers. We understand the difficulties they face on a daily basis, and we are not disparaging that in any way. Our resolution simply seeks to bring increased awareness and encourage a cooperative effort to address an issue that affects many of our constituents in the motorcycle community.

By having an open dialogue, I hope we can foster a greater understanding of the issues surrounding motorcycle profiling and ensure our roads and highways are safe for all to enjoy.

RECOGNIZING THE MAITLAND FAMILY

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jim and Cheri Maitland of Jackson, Michigan. The Maitlands recently made history by becoming the first family to visit all 418 national parks and units. From Alaska to the River Raisin National Battlefield Park in Monroe, Michigan, they have logged more than 300,000 miles over the span of 8 years. The Maitland children, Jamison and Gerald, each have an impressive collection of Junior Ranger badges from learning about all the parks.

The family earned the nickname the "Parkbound Maitlands" after watching a documentary series on America's national parks, which then sparked a desire on their part to see the beauty across our great land.

When the Maitlands are not exploring in their RV, you might find them volunteering at River Raisin National Battlefield Park in Monroe, Michigan. It is a wonderful park and destination in our community where the family has spent more than 1,000 volunteer hours.

Their philosophy is to leave each park a little bit better than how they found it.

Madam Speaker, I share the Maitlands' love of the outdoors and our national park system. This is truly a remarkable accomplishment and one that makes me pretty jealous.

Congratulations to the Maitland family on your incredible journey. I am

grateful for your commitment to keeping our parks in pristine shape.

PROMISE OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise today to reflect on the promise of America.

What is the promise of America? What has it meant for us? And what does it mean for us today?

America has been around for a few hundred years. That is really not that long. In that short time, our dreams have informed the imaginations of people around the globe.

It all started when our Founding Fathers drafted and signed the Declaration of Independence. It set us on a path for our Nation to be the greatest experiment in self-governance that the world has ever known. Our Founders were our first innovators who risked it all for America to be free.

I am sure there are times when we have fallen short, but our experiment has been overwhelmingly for the good. It is here in America that we have led and cultivated history's greatest breakthroughs. We fought a war to end slavery. We liberated Europe from the Nazis. We invented flight; put men on the Moon; split the atom; and invented the microchip, the internet, and more.

At great expense, all this was accomplished by maintaining fleets and armies for America to be a beacon of hope for freedom-loving people around the world. We have done more to lift people out of poverty and raise the standard of living than any nation in the history of the world.

Madam Speaker, I am sure our Founders never dreamed that any of this would be possible, but it was because they made their vision for America a reality rooted in the promise that our rights are self-evident, sacred, and undeniable.

America was born with purpose. It says it right here in the Declaration of Independence. We all know the words, or at least we should know the words: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

These are more than just words. It is a faith statement, a distinctive national credo. The moment we fail to believe it, the experiment is over and this Nation will fade away like all nation-states that have lost belief in themselves and forgotten their identity.

If we forget our purpose and let the promise of America be broken, then we are lost. The future is lost.

It is our job and our highest responsibility to transmit the promise of America to our children and to all who are a part of this great experiment. It is not enough that we merely assert these

as ideas. We must live them as truths and show the world that they work.

America is where freedom has made its greatest mark. It is where creativity is unmatched by any time in history. It is where justice flowers more generously than anyplace on Earth.

The torch must be passed to the next generation. That is what President John F. Kennedy said, and, Madam Speaker, we must do just that.

I will keep coming back to this floor, to the people's House, to make this case that the promise of America is for every person in our country.

There is a battle going on right now for the heart and soul of America, so it is worth repeating that we must never forget our purpose. That is what unites us as Americans, and it is where I find hope that we can come together around shared values that built our great Nation.

I am committed more than ever to restore trust and confidence in the promise of America. It is a promise that will keep us free, empower our children in the next generation to shine, and strengthen the moral fabric where our identity rests.

CELEBRATING 140TH ANNIVERSARY OF 28TH INFANTRY DIVISION OF U.S. ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 28th Infantry Division of the United States Army National Guard as it recently celebrated the anniversary of its 140th year of serving this Nation.

Its roots in American history were planted long before our Nation's founding. The 28th Infantry's lineage traces all the way back to when Benjamin Franklin formed a militia known as the Pennsylvania Associators. The first meeting of the Associators occurred on November 21, 1747. Franklin organized units to defend the city of Philadelphia against the French and Spanish privateers.

The 28th Infantry Division is the oldest continuously serving division in the United States Army. It wasn't until 1879 when the 28th ID was officially established by Governor Henry Hoyt and designated a red keystone as its symbol.

Throughout history, the 28th Infantry Division has answered our country's call to serve in nearly every war. The 28th ID soldiers fought side by side in the Spanish-American War. They earned the nickname "Iron Division" in the First World War by General John Pershing after a chivalrous stand in France. This decorated division still goes by this storied nickname.

The infantrymen stepped ashore at Omaha Beach and were the first American division to parade through Paris

after its liberation. They were also deployed for duty during the Korean war. In present day, its operations have continued in places like Bosnia, Kosovo, Kuwait, Iraq, and Afghanistan.

I had the distinct pleasure of meeting these members of the 28th Division last November in Kuwait, joining them in the mess hall for Thanksgiving dinner. The division stationed in Kuwait was part of Operation Spartan Shield. This operation sought to strengthen U.S. partnerships in the Middle East and support ongoing operations to defeat ISIS.

Just a few weeks ago, I got to reunite with the 28th ID in Hershey, Pennsylvania, to celebrate the 140th anniversary. The dinner and ceremonies were a fitting tribute for a historic part of the United States military.

Madam Speaker, these men and women continue to build upon the Iron Division legacy. They are brave, resilient, and well-trained to support each other in combat and defend our great Nation.

So I say to the men and women of the 28th Infantry Division: Roll on, 28th. Roll on.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate the 28th Infantry Division for 140 years of service, sacrifice, and valor.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 14 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Send us Your spirit, enlighten the hearts of the Members of this people's House. Uphold all of our commitments to live according to Your revealed truths and the constitutional law of this great Nation.

Let freedom flourish in the lives of Your people who seek justice and prove themselves trustworthy.

Shape virtuous leadership in government at every level. May all citizens know with confidence the diligence of their representatives, and may this body prove creative in facing the issues of the day.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LAMALFA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

ASSYRIAN NEW YEAR

(Mr. HARDER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARDER of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to wish the Assyrian community in the Central Valley and across the world a Happy New Year.

One of my fondest memories growing up in Turlock was spending afternoons with my Assyrian neighbor, who was like a grandmother to me. Her name was Nana Bitpera.

Every day, she would pick grape leaves in her backyard while she made rice, so my brother and I could enjoy fresh, homemade dolmas after school.

She would tell me stories about the incredible contributions of the Assyrian culture to art and literature: how Assyrians built the first human cities, were the first to domesticate crops, and how they literally invented the wheel.

She also told me about the centuries of persecution that Assyrians faced that caused so many to come for a new future in America.

Madam Speaker, as we celebrate the year 6769, I want to tell the Assyrian community how grateful I am to be their neighbor, and may this new year bring their families joy and happiness.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my serious concern with the inappropriately and euphemistically named "Paycheck Fairness Act." In reality, this legislation should be called the "Leave No Lawyer Behind Act."

I am sure everyone in this room believes that equal work deserves equal

pay. In fact, Congress passed the Equal Pay Act in 1963 to ensure that. But that is not what Democrats have put this legislation on the floor for. Instead, they wanted something to benefit trial lawyers and to make it nearly impossible for job creators to defend against frivolous, unlimited lawsuits.

In fact, this legislation is actually harmful to women in the workforce by creating a mandatory opt-out system for class action lawsuits that will ultimately limit legal options when there actually is workplace discrimination.

This legislation is all about litigation, and that is not right. Enforce existing laws effectively. That will protect women, and everyone, in the workplace.

The number of working women in the U.S. is higher than ever—nearly 75 million—with more women entering the workforce in the last 2 years than men. That is the type of fairness we should continue to strive for.

I support policies that help more women become their own boss, not unlimited paydays for trial lawyers.

WOMEN'S HALL OF FAME COMMEMORATIVE COIN

(Mr. MORELLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, in honor of the final week of Women's History Month, I am proud to join a group of bipartisan colleagues in introducing the National Women's Hall of Fame Commemorative Coin Act.

As the National Women's Hall of Fame celebrates its 50th anniversary, this will help ensure the financial viability and longevity of this iconic historical landmark for years to come.

I am especially pleased that our very own Louise Slaughter will be inducted into the hall of fame this year: a fitting tribute for one of the most inspiring women I have had the privilege of knowing.

Louise will take her place alongside some of our Nation's trailblazers in the city that forever altered the course of women's rights in our Nation.

I am delighted that this legislation will help ensure that Louise, and so many other remarkable women in the hall of fame, will continue to inspire generations to come.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to diligently working toward its passage, and I encourage my colleagues to support this important bill.

SOCIAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

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

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to advocate for an appropriation request I have put forward to provide adequate funding to the Social Security Administration.

Social Security enables millions of Americans to make ends meet, including retired and disabled workers, and the families of deceased workers. It is a program that working folks have been paying into their entire working lives.

Despite the agency's effectiveness, funding cuts have created a massive, and in some cases life-threatening, backlog.

The national average wait time for a Social Security Disability Insurance benefits hearing is 535 days. And last year, Philadelphia, in my State, had the longest average wait time in the country: 26 months. One West Philadelphia woman with multiple sclerosis waited 878 days before getting a favorable ruling.

Given this reality, I am truly alarmed that, rather than fully funding Social Security, the President's budget is consistently hundreds of millions of dollars less than what Congress enacted the previous year.

This sums up why people are fed up with Washington: powerful politicians keeping everyday Americans from the benefits they have earned. The injustice needs to stop. We must stand with working families and help them obtain their benefits.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7, PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.RES. 124, OPPOSING BAN ON TRANSGENDER MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 252 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 252

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-8 modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a

substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 124) expressing opposition to banning service in the Armed Forces by openly transgender individuals. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WILD). The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

□ 1215

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, on Monday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 252, providing for consideration of two bills: H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act; and H. Res. 124, expressing opposition to banning service in the Armed Forces by openly transgender individuals.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 7 under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor. It self-executes a manager's amendment. It also makes in order nine amendments.

The rule provides for consideration of H. Res. 124 under a closed rule, and it provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Madam Speaker, 56 years ago, President John F. Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act. He referred to this law as a "structure basic to democracy"—equal pay for equal work, in essence, equality. But the sad reality is that, over 56 years later, women are still paid less than their male counterparts for the same work. I know, because it happened to me.

One of my first jobs was in a male-dominated industry selling steel. It didn't matter if I performed as well, if not better, than my male colleagues; I was still paid less. I had to leave that job, which I loved, because I wasn't getting my fair share. It was a shame then, and it is a shame now.

In the sixties, women made 60 cents on the dollar. Now the average woman makes 80 cents compared to her male counterpart—80 cents. For women of color, the gender wage gap is even more severe:

For every dollar made by her non-Hispanic White male counterpart, an African American woman makes 61 cents, a Native American woman makes 58 cents, and women who look like me, Latinas, make 53 cents on the dollar for similar work. That is less than the average woman made in the 1960s.

Do I not work just as hard as my male counterparts?

Do I deserve to make 53 cents on the dollar?

Do I not have to support my household as much as a man?

Latinas lose, on the average, \$28,386 every year. That amounts to more than \$1 million over her career.

What would an extra \$1 million mean for the working woman or for her children? That she never has to choose between paying for childcare or buying groceries or not worrying about how to send her kids to college. Maybe she could even fulfill the American Dream of purchasing a home.

Some people brush this off by arguing that women choose different or easier jobs than men, like being a teacher or a nurse. To those people, I ask: Who sets those salaries? When was the last time you were underpaid to teach 40 children in a classroom setting?

Nursing assistants each suffer roughly three times—three times—the rate of back and other injuries as construction workers. Are you going to tell me that the nurse who spends 12 hours on her feet taking care of those most in need doesn't deserve higher pay, or the 911 dispatcher who is working the graveyard shift, fielding call after call after call, coordinating an effective emergency response so that they themselves can save lives or the first responders can save lives?

Don't tell me women's work is easier. We need equality—in practice, not just in law.

H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act will make equal pay a reality. It addresses the many complicated facets of sex-based discrimination.

Even when it is crystal clear, it is incredibly difficult to win a lawsuit to prove that employers are discriminating on the basis of sex. The Paycheck Fairness Act requires employers to demonstrate that wage disparity is based on a bona fide factor other than sex, such as education, training, or experience.

In workplaces where women are empowered to know how much they are making compared to their male colleagues, the gender gap shrinks by 7 percent; however, some workplaces penalize employees for discussing their salaries. The Paycheck Fairness Act would prevent retaliation against employees for wage transparency.

Sex discrimination causes women to make 6.6 percent less than equally qualified male counterparts on their first job. Over time, as raises and bonuses are decided based on a woman's prior salary history, this gap is made even worse. The Paycheck Fairness Act prevents employers from asking for a salary history.

Another factor that contributes to gender pay disparity is that women are less likely to negotiate for a higher salary. Studies show that men are expected to negotiate, but when women ask for more money, they are penalized and still paid less. The Paycheck Fairness Act creates a grant program to fund negotiation and skills training.

Currently, employees must opt in to class action lawsuits brought under the Equal Pay Act, running contrary to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. This makes it more difficult for women to use the courts to correct equal pay disparities. The Paycheck Fairness Act allows them to opt out, removing barriers to participate in class action lawsuits and, therefore, addressing systematic gender-based inequality.

I have offered two amendments to the Paycheck Fairness Act bill to highlight the serious effects of the gender pay gap on women of color.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is a step in the right direction. Women who look like me should not make 53 cents on the dollar for the same work as our White male colleagues, and even less than the average woman made 60 years ago. It is wrong, and it is unjust. That is why it is crucial we pass H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Now, I would like to turn your attention to H. Res. 124, expressing opposition to banning service in the Armed Forces by openly gay transgender individuals.

For me, this issue hits close to home. I am a proud mother of an Air Force veteran.

It wasn't a decision they made lightly. It was one made with great personal sacrifice, and the U.S. Government made a promise to them that they would be safe to be themselves.

Imagine how their mothers and fathers must feel knowing that our Na-

tion has broken a promise to their children. This doesn't make us safer.

We should welcome every qualified person who is willing to stand up to deploy and enlist in our Armed Forces to serve alongside people like my son.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, today we are considering H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act. This legislation seeks to prevent wage discrimination on the basis of sex, but this is already prohibited under current law.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is a false promise made by the majority that would not provide the outcomes that we all seek as Americans. This legislation will empower trial lawyers and offers no new protections against pay discrimination.

According to the Equal Pay Act of 1963, Federal law currently prohibits all discrimination in pay or other employment practices based upon sex or any other nonjob-performance-related issue.

In 1964, Congress enacted comprehensive antidiscrimination civil rights protection based on race, color, national origin, religion, and sex under title 7 of the Civil Rights Act.

Together, these laws protect against sex discrimination and provide a range of remedies for victims. As a result, sex-based wage disparity is in direct violation of not one, but two current Federal laws.

It is important to acknowledge that there are bad actors. A small number of managers may practice pay discrimination, but their actions are illegal, and this opens their businesses to lawsuits and to heavy fines.

I could not agree more that such discrimination has no place in those businesses or in society in general. However, those who perpetuate these illegal acts are the exception and not the rule.

Congress must not ignore the positive trends our Nation has seen in the last 26 months:

Since 2017, the Trump administration has made significant strides in reining in Federal overreach, improving opportunities and results for Americans in the past 2 years;

The Tax Cut and Jobs Act has given all Americans greater opportunity, regardless of sex, leading to an improved economy;

Unemployment is at its lowest level in nearly half a century;

Median wages across all demographic groups are rising faster now than at any time in recent history.

According to a recent Wall Street Journal article, the United States economy added jobs for 100 consecutive months. The current labor market is not only benefiting the low-skilled services, but also high-skilled workers and those with advanced degrees.

In both low-skill and high-skill sectors, there remains a short supply of willing or qualified workers, driving up wages for both. Across the spectrum, all workers are benefiting from the current economy.

Our former colleague Jack Kemp used to describe a situation where "a rising tide lifts all boats." We may very well be in that "rising tide" period.

But despite the good news, the majority has crafted legislation that would place a greater burden on employers and reduce the privacy of employees and increase Federal spending.

H.R. 7 does little to protect the wages of American workers. In fact, it makes it harder for employers to defend legitimate differentials in pay.

Currently, employers may pay different wages due to factors other than sex, such as education, training, or experience.

Let's say that again. Under current law, you must pay equal wages for equal work. That means all other things being equal, a woman cannot be paid differently than a man.

When an employee brings different qualifications to the job, such as an advanced degree or more years of experience, the factors used to evaluate employee pay are no longer equal. This preserves the flexibility for employers to make the best decision for their business, including hiring the most qualified employees, regardless of their gender.

□ 1230

H.R. 7 would now require that non-sex reasons for any wage disparity would have what is termed a "business necessity." Now, "business necessity," this is a term that goes undefined in the legislation. Proving a gender-based business necessity that accounts for the entire differential in pay is sometimes a nearly impossible standard to defend.

Employers would no longer be able to hire or pay employees based on qualifications, unless that qualification is being one sex or the other, a standard that is defined in very few jobs. In addition, employers would not be able to consider market or economic factors of their particular business sector that might account for a wage disparity.

This change to what is called a "bona fide factor defense" does not take into account the reality of the labor market. Employees are often willing to accept lower pay for greater control over their work location, their schedule, or how they aggregate their leave. Studies have shown this is particularly true for women, but it is also true for men.

With the threat of a lawsuit hanging over the heads of employers, they are less likely to allow for flexibility in the workplace. Instead of allowing employees to negotiate their own pay and their work arrangements, employers will be incentivized to transform jobs that were once negotiable and flexible into jobs where one size must fit all.

H.R. 7 also limits an employer's ability to pay its employees based on performance. If a woman were to earn a performance-based bonus or salary that her male coworker did not receive, that man could file a suit against the employer on the basis that the bonus is not a business necessity, due to the vagueness of the term in H.R. 7.

With this threat in mind, employers may be less likely to use performance-based pay and bonuses, despite studies showing such pay models actually increase employee pay. As approximately 40 percent of employers now use performance-based compensation, this bill and the vague definitions in this bill could potentially lead to a stagnation or a decrease in wages.

Under current law, employers are prohibited from pay discrimination whether it is intentional or not. If such pay discrimination is intentional, employees can sue the employer in a class action suit for up to \$300,000 in compensation and punitive damages.

The Paycheck Fairness Act would remove the threshold to this liability and would require that workers be included in class action lawsuits. It would require that they be included in class action lawsuits unless they opt out, but many people may not be aware of that requirement that they must opt out. Otherwise, they are automatically included.

In addition, there are no limits on the fees charged by trial lawyers. There were amendments offered at the Rules Committee hearing to do just that, but they were not accepted as part of this rule.

One of those amendments, in fact, limited the compensation for litigation attorneys to \$2,000 per hour. That was the cap placed on attorneys' fees, \$2,000 an hour. That is a phenomenal sum of money. It was rejected by the Rules Committee. Apparently, they felt that their litigation attorneys were worth more than \$2,000 an hour or are required to earn more than \$2,000 an hour in order to put food on the table for their families. It just doesn't make sense. There should be reasonable limitations on those fees.

While legitimate claims do exist, and I hope that all employees who have experienced discrimination seek a legal remedy, the changes in H.R. 7 would significantly increase the size and the profitability of lawsuits, making unnecessary lawsuits even more likely for trial lawyers looking for new cash flows.

The Paycheck Fairness Act would also have a substantial impact on the rights of both employers and employees. The bill would prohibit employers from requesting information regarding an employee's pay history, which is likely an unconstitutional limit on the employer's freedom of speech.

Furthermore, the bill reduces the right to privacy for employers and employees as it removes any recourse should an employee make public the wages of other employees, even with-

out the consent of those employees or their employer.

H.R. 7 also requires employers to provide disaggregated employee information to the Department of Labor without delineating mechanisms to keep that information safe.

We saw just that last week with the Federal Emergency Management Agency data breach. The government is not always the best steward of a citizen's private information, and we should limit the data received by agencies until those capabilities are improved and verified.

Let me be clear: Wage discrimination certainly has no place and is illegal in the United States of America. But I believe this bill places undue and unnecessary restrictions on otherwise lawful business practices and is based upon unsubstantiated findings. Therefore, I cannot support H.R. 7.

The path that Congress must take is not to increase opportunities for trial lawyers but to continue focusing on strong economic policy that expands opportunities for all Americans.

Last year, 2.8 million jobs were added to the United States' economy. Fifty-eight percent of those jobs were taken by women. Nearly 75 million women are participating in the workforce today, more than at any time in our Nation's history. A robust and resilient economy will provide the jobs and wage gains Americans expect and deserve.

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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to inform my colleague from Texas that the women in Texas make \$0.72 to their male counterparts. I think Texas women deserve to have equal pay.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act, long overdue legislation to close the gender wage gap and ensure equal pay for equal work.

Too many Americans are not making enough to make ends meet, living paycheck to paycheck. We need to focus on strategies to raise family incomes. H.R. 7 does just that.

H.R. 7 would limit pay secrecy, expand pay data collection, and create more employer accountability for pay differences. This legislation will build upon and improve the work of President Kennedy, who signed the Equal Pay Act, and President Obama, who signed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act.

Despite the progress we have made over the last 50 years, women are still earning less than their male counterparts across age, race, and socioeconomic groups. This stubborn wage gap, often exacerbated by employer-imposed pay secrecy policies, makes it

clear that we must be intentional in our efforts to address persistent pay disparity.

On average, women working full time lose a combined total of more than \$900 billion every year due to the wage gap. If the annual gender gap were closed, a working woman would have enough money for an additional 13 months of childcare, a year of college tuition, more than 1 year's worth of food, or an additional 10 months of rent.

Equal pay is not simply a women's issue. It is a family issue. When women bring home less money each day, it means they have less to take care of their family, including for groceries, rent, childcare, and healthcare.

Opponents of this legislation argue—we just heard it—that this is a gift to attorneys representing employees and that their fees should be severely limited. Remember, rights are easily disregarded and violated if you don't have the ability to enforce those rights.

This argument made by opponents is simply an attempt to avoid talking about the pervasiveness of wage discrimination. It is an attempt to decrease enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act and to lessen the penalties for employers who engage in discriminatory practices. If nothing else, we should call it out for what it is.

We know that when women succeed, our country thrives. The Paycheck Fairness Act will take us forward to ensuring economic security for working women.

I want to end by acknowledging the extraordinary leadership of ROSA DELAURO, the Congresswoman from Connecticut who has spent so much of her life dedicated to this issue.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 7.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

In almost every election cycle in which I have participated since 2002, people on the Democratic side of the aisle have talked about wanting to rebuild the middle class. I will submit to you, over the last 26 months, this administration, this President, has rebuilt the middle class.

Let me just quote to you from an article in *The Wall Street Journal* from March 1 of this year, a very recent article. "All sorts of people who have previously had trouble landing a job are now finding work. Racial minorities, those with less education, and people working in the lowest-paying jobs are getting bigger pay raises and, in many cases, experiencing the lowest unemployment rate ever recorded for their groups."

Continuing to quote here: "They are joining manufacturing workers, women in their prime working years, Americans with disabilities, and those with criminal records, among others, in finding improved job prospects after years of disappointment."

It is incongruous to me that we would want to roll-back those gains that this administration has made in the last 26 months.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TRAHAN).

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to offer my strong support for the rule and for H. Res. 124. We should approve both and send a powerful message that Congress will not tolerate such a cruel and self-defeating policy.

Last month, the Armed Services Committee's Military Personnel Subcommittee held a hearing that was the first of its kind. The chairwoman, my colleague from California, invited transgender servicemembers to testify. We heard from an impressive panel of five dedicated servicemembers. They asked for nothing more than to be permitted to continue to serve their Nation honorably.

Before the hearing, I met Staff Sergeant Patricia King. Patricia grew up on Cape Cod. She is a combat-tested and decorated infantry soldier who has served nobly for over 20 years in the Army. Her life was turned upside down by a tweet nearly 2 years ago, one that put her military career in jeopardy.

We should never treat our servicemembers so callously. But if Patricia's story isn't sufficiently convincing, consider how shortsighted this ban is as well.

The DOD's total cost for transition-related care in fiscal year 2017 was \$2.2 million, which is one-tenth of 1 percent of DOD's annual healthcare budget for the Active component. Yet the cost to train a single fifth-generation fighter pilot is \$11 million. The retraining cost of losing just one transgender military pilot would be five times more than the entire transition-related care for the military for a year.

Meanwhile, the Army missed its recruitment goal for the first time in more than a decade last year. Now is certainly not the time to turn away well-qualified and patriotic soldiers.

Let's approve the rule and the resolution and say "no" to discrimination.

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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Speaker, this is a great day in America. I am so proud to say that as the Congress considers these bills that protect and advance human rights.

I rise today, specifically, to talk about the Paycheck Fairness Act, because men and women should be able to be paid the same for doing the same work.

I thank my colleagues, ROSA DELAURO and the committee chairman, BOBBY SCOTT, for their advancement of this great legislation.

Madam Speaker, I want to tell you a story, the story of a young lawyer who worked in the public defender's office. Her job was to represent people accused of crimes like murder and robbery. She

was a free lawyer for them. It was very high pressure, and it was very grueling, but she loved it.

When she got the job, she was told a rule: Nobody talks about salary in this office.

But one day, she found out that a male colleague was doing the same job, and he had similar credentials, but he made much more money. She was making \$18,000 a year. He was making \$20,000.

When she asked her boss why, she was told that he, the male attorney, had a wife and children to take care of.

Madam Speaker, that was me. That happened to me 40 years ago.

□ 1245

It was then and still today is a very common experience to millions of women who are still earning 80 cents on the dollar that men make, and actually much less for women of color. It still makes me angry to think about my own experience, but I am not complaining about my own life journey. Fortunately, I have a job now that pays me the same as my male colleagues. I am so happy I am in a position to do something about this today.

As a result of lower lifetime earnings and different work patterns, women are hit hard in retirement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Florida an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. FRANKEL. I am too excited, Madam Speaker.

This is why so many women end up in poverty. I want to just say this over and over: women go to work for the same reason men go to work, and that is to take care of their families. Regardless of the circumstance's agenda, we deserve to be paid equally. This Paycheck Fairness Act is going to allow workers to talk openly about their pay. It is going to prohibit asking about salary histories. It is going to require bosses to prove disparities exist for discrimination.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill because when women succeed, America succeeds.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, I would just like to remind the Speaker and colleagues in the House that when the President came and delivered his State of the Union message, he was significantly proud of the fact that right now more women are working in the workforce than any time in our country's history.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, having more women enter the workforce does not mean that women are earning equal pay for equal work.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying bill, and I particularly thank my colleague, ROSA DELAURO, for decades of work in support of H.R. 7.

In 1963, Congress passed the Equal Pay for Equal Work Act prohibiting an employer from paying men and women different wages for the same work. It helped, but 56 years later, the typical woman working full-time year-round is still paid only 80 cents for every dollar paid to her male coworker. That amounts to more than \$10,000 each year.

The gap is even worse for women of color. African American women make only 61 percent of a White man's earnings. Native American women make just 58 percent, and Latina women a mere 53 percent.

But let's be clear. Pay discrimination doesn't just hurt women. It hurts entire families and the overall economy. Women are the sole or primary breadwinners in half of U.S. households with children. So passing this bill would not just help women and families, it would help our entire economy. According to some estimates, equal pay could cut poverty among working women and their families by more than half and add over half a trillion dollars to the U.S. economy.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is simple and straightforward. It protects all employees' right to free speech by ending the unfair prohibitions that can make it a firing offense for someone to simply tell a coworker how much they make. It strengthens workers' ability to challenge gender-based wage discrimination.

It is long overdue, and it is fair. When women succeed, America succeeds, and our overall economy succeeds.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on my side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 17½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate Congresswoman MALONEY, the previous speaker's, comments. She and I served on the Joint Economic Committee together back in 2010. The country just lost a very wise economist, Alan Krueger. I remember Alan Krueger coming in and testifying to our Joint Economic Committee; he testified about—of course, at the time in 2010, the description was that we were in a low-pressure labor market. He contrasted that with the high-pressure labor market of the 1960s. I don't recall if there were specific suggestions how to move from that low-pressure labor market back to a high-pressure labor market, but I don't think there can be any misunderstanding that we are back in a high-pressure labor market. That is a good thing.

I quoted a few minutes ago from an article in *The Wall Street Journal*. Let me just read a little deeper from that article:

One face of the red-hot job market is Cassandra Eaton, 23, a high school graduate who was making \$8.25 an hour at a daycare center near Biloxi, Mississippi, just a few months ago. Now she earns \$19.80—that is almost \$20 an hour—as an apprentice at a shipyard in nearby Pascagoula.

The article continues:

“It’s amazing that I am getting paid almost \$20 an hour to learn how to weld, says Ms. Eaton, the single mother of a young daughter. When she finishes the 2-year apprenticeship, her wage will rise to more than \$27 per hour.”

Madam Speaker, such is the strength of a high-pressure labor market, and I include this article from *The Wall Street Journal* in the RECORD.

[From the *Wall Street Journal*, Mar. 1, 2019]

INSIDE THE HOTTEST JOB MARKET IN HALF A CENTURY

A LOOK AT WHO’S GETTING AHEAD, WHO COULD BE LEFT BEHIND AND HOW LONG THE BOOM CAN LAST

(By Erie Morath and Lauren Weber)

The job market doesn’t get much better than this. The U.S. economy has added jobs for 100 consecutive months. Unemployment recently touched its lowest level in 49 years. Workers are so scarce that, in many parts of the country, low-skill jobs are being handed out to pretty much anyone willing to take them—and high-skilled workers are in even shorter supply.

All sorts of people who have previously had trouble landing a job are now finding work. Racial minorities, those with less education and people working in the lowest-paying jobs are getting bigger pay raises and, in many cases, experiencing the lowest unemployment rate ever recorded for their groups. They are joining manufacturing workers, women in their prime working years, Americans with disabilities and those with criminal records, among others, in finding improved job prospects after years of disappointment.

There are still fault lines. Jobs are still scarce for people living in rural areas of the country. Regions that rely on industries like coal mining or textiles are still struggling. And the tight labor market of the moment may be masking some fundamental shifts in the way we work that will hurt the job prospects of many people later on, especially those who lack advanced degrees and skills.

But for now, at least, many U.S. workers are catching up after years of slow growth and underwhelming wage gains.

One face of the red-hot job market is Cassandra Eaton, 23, a high-school graduate who was making \$8.25 an hour at a daycare center near Biloxi, Miss., just a few months ago. Now she earns \$19.80 an hour as an apprentice at a Huntington Ingalls Industries Inc. shipyard in nearby Pascagoula, where she is learning to weld warships.

The unemployment rate in Mississippi, where Huntington employs 11,500 people, has been below 5 percent since September 2017. Prior to that month, the rate had never been below 5 percent on records dating back to the mid-1970s. In other parts of the country, the rate is even lower. In Iowa and New Hampshire, the December jobless rate was 2.4 percent, tied for the lowest in the country. That’s helped shift power toward job seekers and caused employers to expand their job searches and become more willing to train applicants that don’t meet all qualifications.

“It’s amazing that I’m getting paid almost \$20 an hour to learn how to weld,” says Ms. Eaton, the single mother of a young daughter. When she finishes the two-year apprenticeship, her wage will rise to more than \$27 per hour.

It’s no surprise to economists that many people who were previously left behind are now able to catch up. It’s something policymakers have been working toward for years. Obama administration economists debated how to sustain an unemployment below 5 percent. Now Trump administration officials are considering how to pull those not looking for jobs back into the labor force.

“If you can hold unemployment at a low level for a long time there are substantial benefits,” Janet Yellen, the former chairwoman of the Federal Reserve, said in an interview. “Real wage growth will be faster in a tight labor market. So disadvantaged workers gain on the employment and the wage side, and to my mind, that’s clearly a good thing.”

This was one of Ms. Yellen’s hopes when she was running the Fed from 2014 to 2018; keep interest rates low and let the economy run strong enough to keep driving hiring. In the process, the theory went, disadvantaged workers could be drawn from the fringes of the economy. With luck, inflation wouldn’t take off in the process. Her successor, Jerome Powell, has generally followed the strategy, moving cautiously on rates.

“This is a good time to be patient,” Mr. Powell told members of Congress Tuesday.

The plan seems to be paying big dividends now, but will it yield long-term results for American workers?

Two risks loom. The first is that the low-skill workers who benefit most from a high-pressure job market are often hit hardest when the job market turns south. Consider what happened to high-school dropouts a little more than a decade ago. Their unemployment rate dropped below 6% in 2006 near the end of a historic housing boom, then shot up to more than 15% when the economy crumbled. Many construction, manufacturing and retail jobs disappeared.

The unemployment rate for high-school dropouts fell to 5 percent last year. In the past year, median weekly wages for the group rose more than 6 percent, outpacing all other groups. But if the economy turns toward recession, such improvement could again reverse quickly. “The periods of high unemployment are really terrible,” Ms. Yellen said.

The second risk is that this opportune moment in a long business cycle might be masking long-running trends that still disadvantage many workers. A long line of academic research shows that automation and competition from overseas threaten the work of manufacturing workers and others in mid-skill jobs, such as clerical work, that can be replaced by machines or low-cost workers elsewhere.

The number of receptionists in America, at 1.015 million in 2017, was 86,000 less than a decade earlier, according to the Labor Department. Their annual wage, at \$29,640, was down 5 percent when adjusted for inflation.

Tougher trade deals being pushed by the Trump Administration might help to claw some manufacturing jobs back, but economists note that automation has many of the same effects on jobs in manufacturing and the service section as globalization, replacing tasks that tend to be repeated over and over again.

Andrew McAfee, co-director of the MIT Initiative on the Digital Economy, said the next recession could be the moment when businesses deploy artificial intelligence, machine learning and other emerging technologies in new ways that further threaten mid-skill work.

“Recessions are a prime opportunity for companies to reexamine what they’re doing, trim headcount and search for ways to automate,” he said. “The pressure to do that is less when a long, long expansion is going on.”

With these forces in play, many economists predict a barbell job market will take hold, playing to the favor of low- and high-skill workers and still disadvantaging many in the middle.

The U.S. is adding jobs in low-skilled services sectors. Four of the six occupations the Labor Department expects to add the most jobs through 2026 require, at most, a high-school diploma. Personal-care aide, a job that pays about \$11 an hour to help the elderly and disabled, is projected to add 778,000 jobs in the decade ended in 2026, the most of 819 occupations tracked. The department expects the economy to add more than half a million food-prep workers and more than a quarter million janitors.

Those low-skill workers are reaping pay gains in part because there aren’t a lot of people eager to fill low-skill jobs anymore. Only about 6 percent of U.S. workers don’t hold a high school diploma, down from above 40 percent in the 1960s, according to research by MIT economist David Autor.

James O. Wilson dropped out of high school in the 10th grade and started selling drugs, which eventually led to a lengthy incarceration. When Mr. Wilson, 59, was released in 2013 he sought out training at Goodwill, where he learned to drive a forklift. Those skills led him to a part-time job at a FedEx Corp. facility at an Indianapolis airport. He was promoted to a full-time job in 2017 and is now earning more than \$16 an hour. He has a house with his wife and enjoys taking care of his cars, including a prized Cadillac.

“I wanted to show FedEx you can take a person, and he can change,” he said. “I want FedEx to say, ‘Do you have any more people like him?’”

Skilled workers in high-tech and managerial positions are also benefiting from the high-pressure labor market, particularly in thriving cities. Of 166 sectors that employ at least 100,000 Americans, software publishing pays the highest average wages, \$59.81 an hour in the fourth quarter of 2018. Wages in the field grew 5.5 percent from a year earlier, well outpacing 3.3 percent overall growth in hourly pay. The average full-time employee in the sector already earns more than \$100,000 a year.

Other technical industries, scientific research and computer systems design, were also among the five best paying fields. Some of the hottest labor markets in the U.S.—including Austin, Texas; San Jose, Calif.; and Seattle—have more than twice the concentration of technical jobs as the country on average.

A *Wall Street Journal* analysis of Moody’s Analytics data found Austin to be the hottest labor market in the country among large metros. It ranked second in job growth, third for share of adults working and had the sixth-lowest unemployment rate last year, among 53 regions with a population of more than a million. San Jose, the second-hottest labor market, had the lowest average unemployment rate last year and the second-best wage growth.

While a strong economy is conveying benefits to a broad swath of Americans, those in rural areas aren’t experiencing the same lift from the rising tide.

In metro areas with fewer than 100,000 people and in rural America, the average unemployment last year was half a percentage point higher compared to metro areas with more than a million people, according to an analysis by job search site Indeed.com.

“Finding work can be challenging for rural job-seekers because rural workers and employers both have fewer options,” said Indeed economist Jed Kolko. “Many rural areas have slow-growing or shrinking populations.”

Bradley Cox lives in Vevay, Ind., a rural community of fewer than 2,000 people. The 23-year-old graduated with a bachelor’s degree in business administration and liberal arts from Indiana University East in December, but said he had found opportunities limited in his region.

After years working in hourly positions at a casino, he took a job last summer as a cashier at a CVS Health Corp. drug store, making about \$12 an hour. He hoped to work at a bank, or perhaps in a traveling sales role, making use of his business degree. “But to be honest, for me to do that, I would have to move to one of the cities or commute to one of the cities, at least,” he says. “I don’t have the opportunity around where I live.”

Other workers are employed—but need to string together two or more jobs to make ends meet.

Michelle Blandy, 48, had a full-time digital marketing job in Phoenix but hasn’t been able to find steady work since moving to Harrisburg, Pa., to be closer to her family. Instead she’s pieced together some freelance projects, occasionally drives for Lyft and sells refurbished jewelry boxes on Etsy. “I have applied for full-time jobs, I just didn’t have any luck,” she said. “Harrisburg is tiny compared to Phoenix. There’s not as many tech companies or big companies here that are hiring.”

The good news is this long run of low unemployment could last for a while. Economic theory holds that when unemployment is very low, it stirs inflation, which causes the Federal Reserve to raise short-term interest rates and short-circuit growth and hiring. That kind of cycle ended the 1960s period of low unemployment, but inflation in this period remains below the Fed’s target of 2 percent.

That has allowed the Fed to keep rates low. By January 1970, when the unemployment rate was 3.9 percent, the Fed had raised its target short-term interest rate to more than 8 percent to fight inflation. By contrast, when the jobless rate fell below 4 percent last year, the Fed kept its target rate below 2.5 percent thanks to low inflation.

“It may turn out that lower unemployment proves to be more sustainable than it was in the 1960s,” says Ms. Yellen. “I think we don’t know yet.”

Mr. BURGESS. Again, I would point out that since the inauguration of Donald Trump, our labor market has, in fact, experienced a resurgence that a rising tide is indeed lifting all boats. It is incumbent upon us not to damage the economy that has brought the benefit to so many people—so many of those forgotten Americans—who were denied that benefit before, those very Americans to whom President Trump committed at the time of his inauguration in January 2017.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time to close.

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

Madam Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the resolution.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) to explain the amendment.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from Texas, Representative BURGESS, for yielding me time on this most important issue.

First, I would like to talk about the underlying bill. Equal work does deserve equal pay, regardless of the sex of the employee. In America, this is already the law of the land, and it has been since 1963 when Congress passed the Equal Pay Act. However, we stand here today debating a rule for a partisan Democrat bill that offers no protections against pay discrimination in the workplace. Instead, the bill makes it easier for trial lawyers to score unlimited paydays while dragging working women through never-ending legal dramas.

This bill also prevents women from utilizing their expertise, skills, talents, and education to their advantage. It effectively ties employers’ hands from considering factors that would allow them to potentially give employees better working environments or for employees to negotiate a higher salary.

According to Camille Olson, who testified as a witness in the House Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Human Services and on the House Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, there can indeed be unintended negative consequences from this bill.

Let me read an example from her written testimony. This is her statement, and she gave an example.

It basically says: In this example an employer has chosen to pay a higher salary to a female law firm office administrator who has a J.D. degree. The job duties for that position do not include legal work. Nevertheless, in the employer’s judgment, the performance of those job duties will be enhanced by the additional qualifications of a J.D., justifying the higher salary.

In this example, the male employee had a lesser degree. So in this example—because in this bill it requires business necessity—the male could sue. Even though he doesn’t have as high a degree as the woman, he could say: I want equal pay.

So, what I am trying to say is because of the wording of this bill, I believe—and the witness in the committees believes—there are unintended consequences that could actually hurt women.

The employee may have a claim even if the advanced degree does actually improve performance or serve another legitimate business goal where it was

not absolutely required for the job, because of the business necessity requirement in the bill.

This example may not be the exception. As our economy and culture shifts, we are finding ourselves in a world where women are attending and graduating college far more often than men. According to the U.S. Department of Education data, nearly 60 percent of those who graduated with a bachelor’s degree were women. So, certainly, we do not want the unintended consequences of an employer not being able to consider the advanced education of a woman under this business necessity language in the bill.

H.R. 7 is more of the same from the new majority: government knows best. It will tie the hands of employers and prevent employees—especially female employees—from negotiating a salary and working environment that works for them and their family. It is already against the law to discriminate, and commonsense approaches to amending the law were summarily rejected by my colleagues from the other side of the aisle.

Madam Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, we would amend this rule to include a simple change. It provides working parents more flexibility so that they can go to baseball games and science fairs; in other words, to be better parents.

I would like to read a portion of that amendment:

Notwithstanding the other provisions of the subsection, an employee and an employer may voluntarily negotiate compensation and benefits to provide flexibility to best meet the needs of such employee and employer consistent with other provisions of this act.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Mrs. LESKO. We all know that the greatest benefit working parents with young children want and value is flexibility. Our concern is that this radical proposal which is called paycheck fairness would actually limit the flexibility employers can give to working parents, so parents can go to their activities.

This amendment is a very simple amendment. It simply restates the law and makes it clear that if you run a dry cleaner with five people in it, you don’t have to hire a lawyer to define a job for an employee with a child in such a way that the employee can go to the science fair or a baseball game.

Instead of being about more litigation and trial lawyers, it is about giving more flexibility for working parents. Working Americans should have the freedom to choose what is best for them and their families, not the Federal Government. Hardworking men and women need more flexibility to balance work, life, and family. This amendment seeks to provide additional relief in this area.

Madam Speaker, I urge “no” on the previous question and “no” on the underlying measure.

□ 1300

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

Madam Speaker, while this resolution attempts to increase protections against wage discrimination based on sex, it does not significantly improve what already exists in current law.

I agree with my Democratic friends that there should be no tolerance for wage discrimination based on sex or for any other factor protected under the Equal Pay or Civil Rights Act, but this bill is not the way to do so.

So, Madam Speaker, as we conclude, I urge a “no” on the previous question, “no” on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The smart and innovative women of Arizona’s Eighth Congressional District deserve to have a voice in this debate, and I am going to give it to them.

They earn 80 cents to every dollar that their male counterpart earns. They deserve to have fair wages for the equal work that they are performing.

Before I begin my closing statement, I would like to take a moment to honor a valuable member of my staff: Justin Vogt.

Justin has been my legislative director for 2 years. During that time, he has been a phenomenal member of my team, designing innovative legislative initiatives, providing wise counsel, and serving as a generous mentor to my junior staff.

Now he will move on to be an excellent staff director for the Economic Opportunity Subcommittee of the Veterans’ Affairs Committee. We are sad to see our waffle maker, Justin, leave our office, but we are so proud of all that he has accomplished.

Madam Speaker, 60 years from now, I hope that we have moved forward as a Nation. I hope that our daughters and granddaughters grow up in an America that recognizes their value through the quality of their work and not their gender. Imagine that.

The Paycheck Fairness Act gets us closer to securing a future for them.

A recent McKinsey study found that, if women’s full potential in the labor market was reached, \$4.3 trillion would be added to the labor market in 2025. Our economy would benefit from that woman power.

There has been enough talk about lawyer fees. Women attorneys deserve equal pay for equal work, too. This argument is nothing more than an attempt to avoid talking about the pervasiveness of wage discrimination in this country.

The policies in the Paycheck Fairness Act work. Just look at California. In 2017, Californian women made a median of 89 cents to every dollar made by their male counterparts.

In just a few years, we decreased gender pay disparity by more than any other State.

I have heard it said that addressing wage equity is bad for moms. What is

bad about getting fair pay? Equal pay for equal work.

Mothers make 71 cents for every dollar earned by fathers in similar jobs. If we paid women fairly, maybe they would get a chance to spend more time with their kids.

If my colleagues care about moms spending time with their kids, let’s pass National Paid Family Leave Act standards. Let’s create better working conditions for pregnant women. Let’s fund programs for affordable childcare.

This is just the beginning. The cost for American women, their families, and our economy is much too high to wait any longer.

Madam Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the rule and a “yes” vote on the previous question.

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

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 4 shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution if offered by Representative Lesko of Arizona or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

SEC. 4. The amendment referred to in section 3 is as follows: after section 3 insert the following:

SEC. 3A. FLEXIBILITY FOR WORKING PARENTS.

Section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (3) through (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) Notwithstanding the other provisions of this subsection, an employee and an employer may voluntarily negotiate compensation and benefits to provide flexibility to best meet the needs of such employee and employer, consistent with other provisions of this Act.”

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 192, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

YEAS—231

Adams	Beatty	Bonomici
Aguilar	Bera	Boyle, Brendan
Allred	Beyer	F.
Axne	Bishop (GA)	Brindisi
Barragan	Blumenauer	Brown (MD)
Bass	Blunt Rochester	Brownley (CA)

Bustos	Higgins (NY)	Pascarell
Butterfield	Hill (CA)	Payne
Carbajal	Himes	Perlmutter
Cárdenas	Horn, Kendra S.	Peters
Carson (IN)	Horsford	Peterson
Cartwright	Houlihan	Phillips
Case	Hoyer	Pingree
Casten (IL)	Huffman	Pocan
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Porter
Castro (TX)	Jayapal	Pressley
Chu, Judy	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Ciulline	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Cisneros	Johnson (TX)	Raskin
Clark (MA)	Kaptur	Rice (NY)
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Richmond
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Rose (NY)
Cleaver	Kennedy	Rouda
Clyburn	Khanna	Roybal-Allard
Cohen	Kildee	Ruiz
Connolly	Kilmer	Ruppersberger
Cooper	Kim	Rush
Correa	Kind	Ryan
Costa	Kirkpatrick	Sánchez
Courtney	Krishnamoorthi	Sarbanes
Cox (CA)	Kuster (NH)	Scanlon
Craig	Lamb	Schakowsky
Crist	Langevin	Schiff
Crow	Larsen (WA)	Schneider
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Schrader
Cummings	Lawrence	Schrier
Cunningham	Lawson (FL)	Scott (VA)
Davids (KS)	Lee (CA)	Scott, David
Davis (CA)	Lee (NV)	Sewell (AL)
Davis, Danny K.	Levin (CA)	Shalala
Dean	Levin (MI)	Sherman
DeFazio	Lewis	Sherrill
DeGette	Lieu, Ted	Sires
DeLauro	Lipinski	Slotkin
DelBene	Loebsock	Smith (WA)
Delgado	Lofgren	Soto
Demings	Lowenthal	Spanberger
DeSaulnier	Lowey	Speier
Deutch	Lujan	Stanton
Dingell	Luria	Stevens
Doggett	Lynch	Suozi
Doyle, Michael	Malinowski	Swalwell (CA)
F.	Maloney,	Takano
Engel	Carolyn B.	Thompson (CA)
Escobar	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	Matsui	Titus
Espallat	McAdams	Tlaib
Evans	McBath	Tonko
Finkenauer	McCollum	Torres (CA)
Fletcher	McEachin	Trahan
Foster	McGovern	Trone
Frankel	McNerney	Underwood
Fudge	Meeks	Van Drew
Gabbard	Moore	Vargas
Gallego	Morelle	Veasey
Garamendi	Moulton	Vela
Garcia (IL)	Mucarsel-Powell	Velázquez
Garcia (TX)	Murphy	Vislitzky
Golden	Nadler	Wasserman
Gomez	Napolitano	Schultz
Gonzalez (TX)	Neal	Waters
Gottheimer	Neguse	Watson Coleman
Green (TX)	Norcross	Welch
Grijalva	O’Halloran	Wexton
Haaland	Ocasio-Cortez	Wild
Harder (CA)	Omar	Wilson (FL)
Hastings	Pallone	Yarmuth
Hayes	Panetta	
Heck	Pappas	

NAYS—192

Abraham	Burchett	Dunn
Aderholt	Burgess	Emmer
Allen	Byrne	Estes
Amash	Calvert	Ferguson
Armstrong	Carter (GA)	Fitzpatrick
Arrington	Carter (TX)	Fleischmann
Babin	Chabot	Flores
Bacon	Cheney	Fortenberry
Baird	Cline	Fox (NC)
Balderson	Cloud	Fulcher
Banks	Cole	Gaetz
Barr	Collins (GA)	Gallagher
Bergman	Collins (NY)	Gianforte
Biggs	Comer	Gibbs
Bilirakis	Conaway	Gohmert
Bishop (UT)	Cook	Gonzalez (OH)
Bost	Crawford	Gooden
Brady	Crenshaw	Gosar
Brooks (AL)	Curtis	Graves (GA)
Brooks (IN)	Davidson (OH)	Graves (LA)
Buchanan	Davis, Rodney	Graves (MO)
Buck	Diaz-Balart	Green (TN)
Bucshon	Duffy	Griffith
Budd	Duncan	Grothman

Guest	Massie	Scott, Austin	Delgado	Larsen (WA)	Rice (NY)	Mast	Roby	Taylor
Guthrie	Mast	Sensenbrenner	Demings	Larson (CT)	Richmond	McCarthy	Rodgers (WA)	Thompson (PA)
Hagedorn	McCarthy	Shimkus	DeSaulnier	Lawrence	Rose (NY)	McCaul	Roe, David P.	Thornberry
Harris	McCaul	Simpson	Deutch	Lawson (FL)	Rouda	McClintock	Rogers (AL)	Timmons
Hartzler	McClintock	Smith (MO)	Dingell	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard	McHenry	Rogers (KY)	Tipton
Hern, Kevin	McHenry	Smith (NE)	Doggett	Lee (NV)	Ruiz	McKinley	Rooney (FL)	Turner
Herrera Beutler	McKinley	Smith (NJ)	Doyle, Michael	Levin (CA)	Ruppersberger	Meadows	Rose, John W.	Upton
Hice (GA)	Meadows	Smucker	F.	Levin (MI)	Rush	Meuser	Rouzer	Wagner
Higgins (LA)	Meuser	Spano	Engel	Lewis	Ryan	Miller	Roy	Walberg
Hill (AR)	Miller	Staubert	Escobar	Lieu, Ted	Sánchez	Mitchell	Rutherford	Walden
Holding	Mitchell	Stefanik	Eshoo	Lipinski	Sarbanes	Moolenaar	Scalise	Walker
Hollingsworth	Moolenaar	Steil	Espallat	Loeb	Scanlon	Mooney (WV)	Schweikert	Walorski
Hudson	Mooney (WV)	Steube	Evans	Lofgren	Schakowsky	Mullin	Scott, Austin	Waltz
Huizenga	Mullin	Stewart	Finkenauer	Lowenthal	Schiff	Newhouse	Sensenbrenner	Watkins
Hunter	Newhouse	Stivers	Fletcher	Lowey	Schneider	Norman	Shimkus	Weber (TX)
Hurd (TX)	Norman	Taylor	Foster	Lujan	Schrader	Nunes	Simpson	Webster (FL)
Johnson (LA)	Nunes	Thompson (PA)	Frankel	Luria	Schrier	Olson	Smith (MO)	Wenstrup
Johnson (OH)	Olson	Thornberry	Fudge	Lynch	Scott (VA)	Palazzo	Smith (NE)	Westerman
Johnson (SD)	Palazzo	Timmons	Gabbard	Malinowski	Scott, David	Pence	Smith (NJ)	Williams
Jordan	Palmer	Tipton	Gallego	Maloney,	Serrano	Perry	Smucker	Womack
Joyce (OH)	Pence	Turner	Garamendi	Carolyn B.	Sewell (AL)	Posey	Spano	Woodall
Joyce (PA)	Perry	Upton	Garcia (IL)	Maloney, Sean	Shalala	Ratcliffe	Staubert	Wright
Katko	Posey	Wagner	Garcia (TX)	Matsui	Sherman	Reed	Stefanik	Yoho
Kelly (MS)	Ratcliffe	Walberg	Golden	McAdams	Sherrill	Reschenthaler	Steil	Young
Kelly (PA)	Reed	Walden	Gomez	McBath	Sires	Rice (SC)	Stewart	Zeldin
King (IA)	Reschenthaler	Walker	Gonzalez (TX)	McCollum	McEachin	Riggelman	Stivers	
King (NY)	Rice (SC)	Walorski	Gottheimer	McGovern	McNerny			
Kinzinger	Riggelman	Waltz	Green (TX)	McGowan	Meeks			
Kustoff (TN)	Roby	Watkins	Grijalva	McNey	Meng			
LaHood	Rodgers (WA)	Weber (TX)	Haaaland	Moore	Morelle			
LaMalfa	Roe, David P.	Webster (FL)	Golden	Moore	Moulton			
Lamborn	Rogers (AL)	Wenstrup	Hastings	Moore	Mucarsel-Powell			
Latta	Rogers (KY)	Westerman	Hayes	Morelle	Murphy			
Lesko	Rooney (FL)	Williams	Heck	Moulton	Nadler			
Long	Rose, John W.	Womack	Higgins (NY)	Mucarsel-Powell	Napolitano			
Loudermilk	Rouzer	Woodall	Hill (CA)	Murphy	Neal			
Lucas	Roy	Wright	Horn, Kendra S.	Nadler	Neguse			
Luetkemeyer	Rutherford	Yoho	Horsford	Napolitano	Norcross			
Marchant	Scalise	Young	Houlihan	Neal	Ocasio-Cortez			
Marshall	Schweikert	Zeldin	Hoyer	Neguse	Omar			
			Huffman	Pallone	Panetta			
			Jackson Lee	Pappas	Pascrell			
			Jayapal	Pascrell	Payne			
			Jeffries	Perlmutter	Peters			
			Johnson (GA)	Peters	Peterson			
			Johnson (TX)	Phillips	Pingree			
			Kaptur	Porter	Pocan			
			Keating	Pressley	Welch			
			Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)	Wexton			
			Kennedy	Quigley	Wild			
			Khanna	Raskin	Wilson (FL)			
			Kildee		Yarmuth			
			Kilmer					
			Kim					
			Kind					
			Kirkpatrick					
			Krishnamoorthi					
			Kuster (NH)					
			Lamb					
			Langevin					

NOT VOTING—8

Amodei	Serrano	Wittman
DesJarlais	Torres Small	
Granger	(NM)	
Meng	Wilson (SC)	

□ 1331

Messrs. SMITH of Nebraska, STIVERS, MCCAUL, JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 190, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

YEAS—232

Adams	Butterfield	Cooper
Aguilar	Carballo	Correa
Allred	Cárdenas	Costa
Axne	Carson (IN)	Courtney
Barragán	Cartwright	Cox (CA)
Bass	Case	Craig
Beatty	Casten (IL)	Crist
Bera	Castor (FL)	Crow
Beyer	Castro (TX)	Cuellar
Bishop (GA)	Chu, Judy	Cummings
Blumenauer	Cicilline	Cunningham
Blunt Rochester	Cisneros	Davids (KS)
Bonamici	Clark (MA)	Davis (CA)
Boyle, Brendan	Clarke (NY)	Davis, Danny K.
F.	Clay	Dean
Brindisi	Cleaver	DeFazio
Brown (MD)	Clyburn	DeGette
Brownley (CA)	Cohen	DeLauro
Bustos	Connolly	DelBene

Delgado	Larsen (WA)	Rice (NY)
Demings	Larson (CT)	Richmond
DeSaulnier	Lawrence	Rose (NY)
Deutch	Lawson (FL)	Rouda
Dingell	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Doggett	Lee (NV)	Ruiz
Doyle, Michael	Levin (CA)	Ruppersberger
F.	Levin (MI)	Rush
Engel	Lewis	Ryan
Escobar	Lieu, Ted	Sánchez
Eshoo	Lipinski	Sarbanes
Espallat	Loeb	Scanlon
Evans	Lofgren	Schakowsky
Finkenauer	Lowenthal	Schiff
Fletcher	Lowey	Schneider
Foster	Lujan	Schrader
Frankel	Luria	Schrier
Fudge	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Gabbard	Malinowski	Scott, David
Gallego	Maloney,	Serrano
Garamendi	Carolyn B.	Sewell (AL)
Garcia (IL)	Maloney, Sean	Shalala
Garcia (TX)	Matsui	Sherman
Golden	McAdams	Sherrill
Gomez	McBath	Sires
Gonzalez (TX)	McCollum	Slotkin
Gottheimer	McEachin	Smith (WA)
Green (TX)	McGovern	Soto
Grijalva	McNey	Spanberger
Haaaland	Meeks	Speier
Golden	Meng	Stanton
Hastings	Moore	Stevens
Hayes	Morelle	Suozzi
Heck	Moulton	Swalwell (CA)
Higgins (NY)	Mucarsel-Powell	Takano
Hill (CA)	Murphy	Thompson (CA)
Horn, Kendra S.	Nadler	Thompson (MS)
Horsford	Napolitano	Titus
Houlihan	Neal	Tlaib
Hoyer	Neguse	Tonko
Huffman	Norcross	Torres (CA)
Jackson Lee	Ocasio-Cortez	Trahan
Jayapal	Omar	Trone
Jeffries	Pallone	Underwood
Johnson (GA)	Panetta	Van Drew
Johnson (TX)	Pappas	Vargas
Kaptur	Pascrell	Veasey
Keating	Payne	Vela
Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter	Velázquez
Kennedy	Peters	Visclosky
Khanna	Peterson	Wasserman
Kildee	Phillips	Schultz
Kilmer	Pingree	Waters
Kim	Porter	Watson Coleman
Kind	Pressley	Welch
Kirkpatrick	Price (NC)	Wexton
Krishnamoorthi	Quigley	Wild
Kuster (NH)	Raskin	Wilson (FL)
Lamb		Yarmuth
Langevin		

NAYS—190

Collins (NY)	Guthrie
Comer	Hagedorn
Conaway	Harris
Cook	Hartzler
Crawford	Hern, Kevin
Crenshaw	Herrera Beutler
Curtis	Hice (GA)
Davidson (OH)	Higgins (LA)
Davis, Rodney	Hill (AR)
Diaz-Balart	Holding
Duffy	Hudson
Duncan	Huizenga
Dunn	Hunter
Emmer	Hurd (TX)
Estes	Johnson (OH)
Ferguson	Johnson (SD)
Fitzpatrick	Jordan
Fleischmann	Joyce (OH)
Flores	Joyce (PA)
Fortenberry	Katko
Fox (NC)	Kelly (MS)
Fulcher	Kelly (PA)
Gaetz	King (IA)
Gallagher	King (NY)
Gianforte	Kustoff (TN)
Gibbs	LaHood
Gohmert	LaMalfa
Gonzalez (OH)	Lamborn
Gooden	Latta
Gosar	Lesko
Graves (GA)	Long
Graves (LA)	Loudermilk
Graves (MO)	Lucas
Green (TN)	Luetkemeyer
Griffith	Marchant
Grothman	Marshall
Guest	Massie

NOT VOTING—9

DesJarlais	Johnson (LA)	Wilson (SC)
Granger	Kinzinger	Wittman
Himes	Torres Small	
Hollingsworth	(NM)	

□ 1340

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, on March 27, 2019, I was unable to be present for the vote on the motion to agree to H. Res. 252, offered by Rep. TORRES of California. Had I been present for rollcall No. 131, I would have voted “yea.”

Stated against:

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 131.

Mr. KINZINGER. Madam Speaker, earlier today I was not present to cast a vote on the Combined Rule. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 131.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I was not present for Roll Call Vote No. 130 on ordering the previous question of H. Res. 252 and Roll Call No. 131 on adoption of the rule, H. Res. 252. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 130 and No 131.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. GOODEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, a bill which has the full support of the Republican Conference and the majority of the American people, as it would save the lives of liveborn infants that have survived late-term abortions, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been

cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. GOODEN. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GOODEN. Madam Speaker, it is my understanding that the Republican Conference is in full agreement. Is the Democratic conference not onboard with saving lives?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As indicated, a unanimous consent request for the consideration of that measure would have to have received clearance ahead of time by the majority and minority floor and committee leaderships.

The Chair is unaware of such clearance; therefore, the Chair cannot entertain the request at this time.

Mr. GOODEN. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GOODEN. Madam Speaker, I would ask that we schedule a vote immediately. The Republican Conference is fully onboard, and I would encourage the Democrats to join us in protecting the infant lives that are born.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a proper parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman is not recognized.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. 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. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 252 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 7.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1345

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes, with Ms. NORTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for her decades of leadership fighting for working women.

In 1963, the Equal Pay Act codified the right to "equal pay for equal work regardless of sex." In fact, the Equal Pay Act was enacted 1 year prior to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that, for the first time, provided for the enforcement of antidiscrimination laws. Over the past 55 years, the Equal Pay Act, in combination with title VII of the Civil Rights Act, has produced substantial progress toward addressing inequities for women in the workplace.

Yet, loopholes and insufficient enforcement have allowed gender-based wage discrimination to persist. Today, women earn, on average, 80 cents on the dollar compared to White men in similar jobs. The wage gap is even worse for women of color. It exists in every sector, regardless of education, experience, occupation, industry, or job title.

Drawn out over a lifetime, the persistent wage gap could cost a woman anywhere from \$400,000 to \$2 million. For many, this is the difference between financial stability and poverty. In fact, we know that achieving pay equity would actually cut the poverty rate for working women more than 50 percent.

That is why we are considering this historic legislation today. After decades of failing to address persistent wage inequity, the Paycheck Fairness Act is our opportunity to strengthen the Equal Pay Act, bolster the rights of working women, lift families out of poverty, and, finally, align our remedies for gender discrimination with other established antidiscrimination laws by eliminating caps on damages when employers act with malice or reckless indifference, consistent with the laws governing discrimination based on race or national origin, treating attorney fees consistent with title VII of the Civil Rights Act, and restricting an employer's inquiry and reliance on a prospective employee's previous salary. This is consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Genetic Information Non-discrimination Act, and similar restrictions regarding an applicant's marital or pregnancy status.

As chair of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I urge my colleagues to join me in casting a vote for final passage of the Paycheck Fairness Act and making equal pay for equal work a reality for working women across this country.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, my friend, the chairman, is a diligent and thoughtful colleague, and I believe his heart is in the right place.

Everyone in this House is in agreement that pay discrimination on the basis of sex is wrong, no matter how you look at it. The law is very clear about this. But this bill doesn't do anything to help working women. This is a bill for trial lawyers, plain and simple. That is what shows a fundamental difference in outlook and principle. Democrats want women to sue their bosses; Republicans want women to become the bosses.

Republicans have favored strong economic policies that will empower and enable women to keep driving the economy forward and build the lives they want for themselves. Instead of looking for ways to line the pockets of trial lawyers, we stand with working women.

I am proud, Madam Chair, to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), one of the hardest working women I know.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Chair, I would like to start by thanking my dear friend and colleague, Ms. FOXX, the Republican leader of the House Education and Labor Committee, for her tremendous work and leadership on behalf of all American women and families.

Madam Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 7, the so-called Paycheck Fairness Act. This should be called the "Pay the Trial Lawyers Act."

Madam Chair, my State of Wyoming launched the fight for women's equality and rights when we became the first jurisdiction in the world to grant women the right to vote 150 years ago. Here in this Chamber, 100 years ago, the House agreed that women should have the right to vote on a national basis. Leaders of the women's suffrage movement were fighting on behalf of women's rights. They were not fighting to provide greater payouts to trial lawyers. We should honor those women, and the generations of women who came after them, by defeating this sham bill.

The bill my Democratic colleagues have put on the floor today offers no new protections for women in the workplace. It paints job creators, many of whom in the Trump economy are increasingly women, as evil. Republicans know that economic policies that generate growth, create jobs, and increase wages benefit women and men. Our policies empower women and facilitate the success of women-owned businesses, which account for roughly 9 million jobs and \$1.7 trillion in revenue.

Madam Chair, today's bill is just the latest example of the misguided and damaging policies Democrats in this

body are attempting to pursue. They claim to be “for the people,” but in the nearly 3 months that they have been in charge, they have embraced socialism; they have enabled anti-Semitism; they have passed legislation that violates the First Amendment and the Second Amendment; and they have repeatedly refused to take steps necessary to protect the lives of babies after those babies are born.

Now, Madam Chair, they are telling us they are fighting for women when really they are simply fighting for trial lawyers. We have seen this movie before. The Democrats are not really for the people. They are for the government and for the special interest groups that support them. The American people know better, and we deserve better.

Madam Chair, I urge a “no” vote on this bill, and I call on my Democratic colleagues to come together with us, to work with us, so that we can actually make real progress for America’s women and their families.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the sponsor of the bill.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

It is a historic day on the House of Representatives floor, and we are going to pass paycheck fairness, equal pay for equal work, in this United States of America.

Madam Chair, I thank the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee for getting this bill through the committee and onto the floor today. We have waited 8 years to be able to vote on this issue.

The United States Congress has a rich history of making a difference in the lives of the American people: Social Security, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the GI Bill, Medicare, and the Affordable Care Act, to name but a few.

Today, we can make a difference for working women and their families. Today, we can address the biggest economic challenge of our time, that Americans are in jobs that do not pay them enough to live on. We can address their economic struggle. And, yes, this is a bill that the majority is passing today to address that economic need for families.

I cannot tell you how difficult it has been to break through on something so simple: Men and women in the same job deserve the same pay. But now, the issue and the environment have collided. Equal pay is at the center of our public discourse, and paycheck fairness is ready for passage today.

A bipartisan bill supported by every member of the Democratic Caucus, the Paycheck Fairness Act toughens remedies in the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to give America’s working women the opportunity to fight wage discrimination and to receive the paycheck that they have earned.

Under existing law, damages are too insubstantial to provide women with

full restitution or provide bad-acting companies a meaningful deterrent.

Paycheck fairness puts gender-based discrimination sanctions on equal footing with other forms of wage discrimination by allowing women to sue for compensatory and punitive damages. It better protects employees from being fired for sharing their salary with co-workers. It establishes a grant program to provide salary negotiation training for girls and for women. It ensures that employers are not reliant on wage history when they hire an employee.

Over 60 years ago, after Republican President Dwight Eisenhower called for equal pay legislation during his 1956 State of the Union Address on the floor of this House, and more than 55 years after President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act, pay discrimination is very much still a reality in our country. In 2017, there were almost 26,000 charges of unlawful, sex-based pay discrimination filed with the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and 996 Equal Pay Act charges.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Women continue to earn 20 percent less than men, on average, according to Census data. Women earn less regardless of the choices they make in their career or education. Across industries, whether you are a financial manager, a registered nurse, a schoolteacher, or an executive, a pay gap exists between men and women.

Ten years ago, we passed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. It reopened the courtroom door but did not address the underlying issue at hand today.

We have an opportunity to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act. It is a matter of right and wrong. Discrimination is unacceptable, and we are all diminished when we fall short.

President Kennedy said, when he signed the Equal Pay Act, that this would “add to our laws another structure basic to democracy” and “affirm our determination that when women enter the labor force, they will find equality in their pay envelope.”

We can do this today on the floor of this House. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for the Paycheck Fairness Act and make sure that we guarantee equal pay for equal work.

□ 1400

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), my distinguished colleague.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Chair, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 7. It is a deeply flawed bill that offers false promises while empowering lawyers and bureaucracy, not empowering women.

In fact, I agree with my colleague from Wyoming who said a minute ago it should not be called the Paycheck

Fairness Act; it should be called the pay the trial lawyers act.

If there exists residual bias and discrimination against women in the workplace, it is wrong, and it needs to end. Since 1963, equal pay for equal work has been the law of the land under the Equal Pay Act.

Let me say that again. Since 1963, equal pay for equal work has been the law of the land. It is currently illegal for employers to pay different wages based on gender, and as the bill sponsor just said, there are currently mechanisms to address any wrongs that may be there.

While I appreciate the sentiment of the bill before us, I cannot support its flawed approach. The pay the trial lawyers act does not build on the Equal Pay Act. It does not offer women new protections against discrimination in the workplace. Instead, it encourages lawsuits against employers by offering the prospect of unlimited monetary damages.

The pay the trial lawyers act also creates an impossibly high burden of proof for job creators defending themselves in lawsuits.

Furthermore, the pay the trial lawyers act handicaps job creators, including women-owned businesses, by adding onerous compensation reporting requirements. The Federal bureaucracy will heap yet another burden on hard-working Americans if this passes.

So, Madam Chair, the pay the trial lawyers act does not build on the Equal Pay Act’s success. Instead, it encourages lawsuits, hurts job creators, and empowers lawyers. Sadly, it also misses an opportunity to truly help women.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this deeply flawed bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him also for his extraordinary leadership in matters that relate to the education of the American people, employment preparedness, fairness in our workforce, and, of course, today.

Madam Chair, I thank the chairman for giving us this opportunity on this day of the House of Representatives. This is a day that God has made. Let us rejoice and be glad. And let us make the most of it in a very joyous way. It is a day of celebration.

Madam Chair, the gentleman, BOBBY SCOTT, has been a supporter of this initiative for a long time, and I thank him for making today possible.

And it happens on a day when we are honored to have, in the Speaker’s chair, Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, a champion to end discrimination in every way in our country, including discrimination in the paycheck.

Madam Chair, today I rise in support of the Paycheck Fairness Act. It reaffirms our Nation's sacred promise that equal pay deserves equal work.

I do so in saluting Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO, Madam Chair, the guardian angel of this legislation and the godmother of so many initiatives in this House to support progress for America's working families.

The ability to balance work, to balance work and home is a challenge that many families face, men and women alike, but ROSA DELAURO has been a constant champion for America's working families.

While we are talking today about equality in the paycheck, she has also been a champion for paid sick leave and affordable childcare. The list goes on and on. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman—guardian angel, godmother—for making today possible.

I am very excited about this. It is historic. It should happen at a time when we have over 100 women serving in the House of Representatives, and it should happen in the same Congress that we will also observe the 100th anniversary of the passing of the amendment to have women have the right to vote.

It is all very historic. It is all about progress, and that progress on this bill began in this Congress 2 months ago. House Democrats stood with Lilly Ledbetter on the 10th anniversary of President Obama signing the Lilly Ledbetter Act, exactly 10 years ago, signing that Fair Pay bill into law.

It was a magnificent achievement, it, too, being led by George Miller, the chair of the committee Mr. SCOTT now chairs. ROSA DELAURO, of course, played a hand in that.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) then introduced the equal pay bill, and then we passed it in the House. It didn't pass the Senate—60 votes needed in the Senate—but she has persisted, and we are fortunate for that.

We are grateful to her and to Lilly Ledbetter and the groups, so many outside groups that have worked so hard to mobilize and make this difference—some of them include the American Association of University Women, the National Women's Law Center, National Partnership for Women and Families, National Organization for Women, National Committee for Pay Equity, MomsRising, UltraViolet, Center for Law and Social Policy, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, NAACP, League of Women Voters, U.S. Women's Chamber of Commerce, the list goes on and on, the Anti-Defamation League, the American Psychological Association, and many more—because that outside mobilization will be important in passing this legislation and turning it into law, into an improvement in the lives of America's working families.

Now we are proud to pass this bill before Equal Pay Day, which is on April 2, next week—April Pay Day, which

symbolizes when a woman's wages catch up to a man's earnings from the previous year. In other words, the first 3 months of the year, most women are working for free compared to what a man will make in the overall year.

So April 2 is that day. By then, we will have already been celebrating for a few days.

We pass this legislation during Women's History Month as we serve with a woman Speaker of the House and with more than 100 women in the same Congress, as I said before, marking 100 years since women won the right to vote.

So this is about respect. It is about respect, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, respect for women and the work that they do. And if they do equal work, why wouldn't they get equal pay?

Would you, my colleague, like to get less than your colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle?

Would you, any of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, like to work for less than our male counterparts?

Well, why should women and the rest of the workforce then be subjected to that discrimination?

Paycheck fairness is about respect. It is about justice for women, finally closing the wage gap that robs women of more than \$400,000 over the course of their working lives. And for women of color, it is even a bigger difference.

And this not only has an impact on their pay, it has an impact on their pensions and on their retirement. So this is very, very important.

This legislation advances progress for families because it is about equal pay for women. It is about how that equality of paycheck affects their families, ensuring that women can earn the wages they have earned so they can pay for their family's everyday needs, such as rent, groceries, childcare, healthcare—the list goes on.

Two-thirds of moms are either the primary breadwinners or co-breadwinners in their households in our country. This legislation strengthens America, unleashing the full power of women in our economy and upholding the value of fairness.

Do you believe in fairness in our democracy?

When President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act into law in 1963, he celebrated equal pay as a "structure basic to democracy"—equal pay, a structure basic to democracy—enlarging the issue to our great democracy.

We are proud to take this step to fully and finally secure the paycheck fairness that is fundamental to our democracy because it will implement the Equal Pay Act, make it enforceable.

Yet, securing paycheck fairness is only the first step that House Democrats will take. We will continue to unlock the full economic power of women in our workplace with paid sick leave, led by Congresswoman DELAURO, affordable childcare, led by Congresswoman DELAURO, as well as a fair wage

because we know that, in our economy and in our country, when women succeed, America succeeds.

I, therefore, urge a bipartisan vote for this legislation for women to succeed and to have equality in our society as they have equality in their paychecks.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I believe all my colleagues can agree that women deserve equal pay for equal work. However, the bill considered today takes the wrong approach to ensure that current equal protections, protections that have been in place since 1963, are reaffirmed and fortified.

This bill offers no new protections for women in the workforce. Instead, it makes it more difficult for employers and employees to have an open and informative discussion about hiring and other employment decisions.

Perhaps worst of all, it is designed in a way that helps increase the bottom line for lawyers. That is right. The only paychecks that this legislation will increase are paychecks for lawyers.

It is unfair to women; it is unfair to the workforce; and it is unfair to businesses.

It may come as a surprise to many people that the so-called Paycheck Fairness Act offers no new protections against pay discrimination.

Let me repeat that. The legislation being debated today offers no new protections against pay discrimination. Instead, it imposes a one-size-fits-all mandate to one of the most varied and complex workforces in the world.

Rather than allowing for informal discussions, the Paycheck Fairness Act strictly limits communications between employers and employees on key hiring decisions. Under this bill, the burden is laid on the backs of employers, and the lack of clarity for employees is simply unworkable.

I don't see how limiting the discussion between employers and employees, particularly on hiring decisions, is going to help anybody; and I certainly don't see how opening the gates to limitless, frivolous lawsuits is going to help anybody.

It should be noted, the Lilly Ledbetter Pay Act that the Speaker just alluded to was signed 10 years ago with the promise that it would alleviate pay discrimination in the workplace. Yet, if you look at pay discrimination charges filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, they have remained steady each year since 1997, both before and after the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act became law. I am hearing that same kind of overpromising when it comes to H.R. 7.

In an effort to improve the bill and ensure the damages actually go to the women impacted instead of lawyers, I offered an amendment that would cap

attorney's fees for any judgment to 20 percent of the judgment. Sadly, this commonsense amendment was blocked by the Rules Committee.

Why don't my colleagues want to join me in ensuring that money actually gets to victims of pay discrimination instead of simply padding the wallets of lawyers?

It is a real shame this amendment was not made in order. I think we can all agree that the idea of discrimination against someone based on sex is absolutely unacceptable, and it is inconsistent with the values we hold as Americans.

This issue is not partisan. In 1944, Republican Congresswoman Winifred Stanley introduced a precursor to the Equal Pay Act, which, since passing years later, has been the law of the land for the past 55 years.

The Equal Pay Act of 1963 specifically made it illegal to pay different wages to employees of the opposite sex for equal work. In addition, title 7 of the Civil Rights Act made it illegal for employers to discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, and sex.

Yet, as I said before, despite these protections on the books, there are bad actors who continue to practice pay discrimination. Based on laws existing for decades, it is unacceptable, and we must hold these bad actors accountable.

Unfortunately, the Paycheck Fairness Act, as written, fails to improve employment protections.

□ 1415

We have a responsibility to the American people to craft strong policies that support women in the workplace, not merely offer weak lip service that, in fact, cripples employers and employees alike.

I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing this phony bill, and, instead, let's work together in a bipartisan way to actually ensure women continue to thrive in the workforce.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, today women make up nearly half of our workforce. Sixty-four percent of mothers in the United States work outside the home. Many are the sole family wage earner. Their wages pay for rent, for groceries, for childcare, for healthcare. But even though it is 2019, too often, equal pay for equal work is not a reality.

On average, White women earn 80 cents on the dollar compared with White men in substantially equal jobs. The wage gap is even more pronounced for women of color in nearly every line of work, regardless of education, experience, occupation, industry, or job title.

This has severe and long-term consequences for the lives of working women, families, and for our economy. With the Equal Pay Act, title VII of

the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and more recently, the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, we have made some progress in reducing inequities for women in the workplace. But, unfortunately, loopholes and insufficient enforcement tools have allowed wage discrimination to persist.

For example, a lack of easily accessible data on hiring and wages has made it difficult to detect, let alone prevent, wage discrimination. And even when wage discrimination is discovered, working women face significant barriers to fulfilling the heavy burden of proof for holding discriminating employers accountable.

Last month, I was honored to chair the hearing on persistent, gender-based wage discrimination. We heard witnesses describe the barriers to detecting wage discrimination and holding employers accountable. But most importantly, we heard how the Paycheck Fairness Act will provide workers with the tools they need to help close the gender pay gap and achieve wage equality.

Several States have already acted to address pay inequities, including bipartisan efforts in my home State of Oregon. It is time for Congress to step up and address persistent wage discrimination nationwide.

By passing the Paycheck Fairness Act, we have the opportunity to end discriminatory pay practices that contribute to keeping women and families in poverty. We have the opportunity to finally make equal pay for equal work a reality.

Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter from AARP outlining support for the Paycheck Fairness Act because the bill will strengthen financial security for women while in the workforce, and later enhance retirement income security.

AARP,

Washington, DC, March 26, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Republican Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: On behalf of our 38 million members and all Americans age 50 and older, AARP is writing to express our support for the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7). This bill would strengthen financial security for women both while in the workforce and later in retirement, and it would provide an important protection for all workers against age discrimination in hiring.

Pay discrimination against women jeopardizes their financial security, both while working and in retirement. The roughly 20 percent pay gap between women and men who work full-time, year-round means women's median earnings are more than \$10,000 a year less than men's, with an even bigger shortfall for women of color. Because all elements of retirement income—Social Security, pensions, and savings—are based on one's earnings while in the workforce, lower earnings during women's work lives follow them into retirement. As a result, women age 65 and older are 80 percent more likely than men to live below the poverty level in

retirement. By strengthening the law against pay discrimination, H.R. 7 would help address women's lower pay and lower incomes in retirement.

In addition, AARP supports the Paycheck Fairness Act's provision on salary history. While asking about a job applicant's prior salary history has long been recognized as a barrier to equal pay it has also proven to be a barrier to employment for older workers. A majority (56 percent) of all older workers age 50 plus have been prematurely pushed out of longtime jobs before they choose to retire. Once displaced, older workers have great difficulty finding reemployment, and most are unable to find a job with wages comparable to the job they lost. It is quite common for prospective employers to use a prior higher salary level to disqualify an older applicant from consideration because they simply assume that the worker will require the same wage. However, there are many reasons why an older worker might be willing to accept a lower salary, including better benefits or work hours; a more desirable job/firm; a career change; or simply desperation to find a new job. In these cases, the ability of the employer to ask about and rely on salary history in considering an older applicant often results in age discrimination in hiring.

In conclusion, H.R. 7 will help prevent one of the age-related assumptions that hinder equal opportunity for older workers, as well as enhance retirement income security for women. For these reasons, we urge support for the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Sincerely,

NANCY A. LEAMOND,
Executive Vice President and Chief Advocacy
& Engagement Officer.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, I also include in the RECORD a letter from the AAUW in support of the Paycheck Fairness Act.

AAUW,
March 25, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the more than 170,000 members and supporters of the American Association of University Women (AAUW), I urge you to vote in support of the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7) and to oppose harmful amendments when the bill comes to the House floor as soon as this week. Despite federal and state equal pay laws, gender pay gaps persist. The Paycheck Fairness Act offers a much needed update to the Equal Pay Act of 1963 by providing new tools to battle these pervasive pay gaps and to challenge discrimination.

In January, we celebrated the 10th anniversary of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. This vital law rectified the Supreme Court's harmful decision in *Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company*. The law helps to ensure that individuals subjected to unlawful compensation discrimination are able to bring a case of ongoing pay discrimination regardless of when it began. Despite the importance of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, this law's enactment only restored decades of prior law—it did not give women new tools to receive equal pay for equal work.

There is no more fitting way to mark this historic milestone than making real, concrete progress in ensuring all women receive fair pay. While the gap has narrowed since passage of the Equal Pay Act of 1963, progress has largely stalled in recent years. Data from the U.S. Census Bureau once again revealed that women working full-time, year-round are typically paid only 80 cents for every dollar paid to men. The pay gaps have grown even wider for women of color. African American women and Latinas make, respectively, 61 and 53 cents on the dollar as compared to non-Hispanic, white men. The overall pay gap has only decreased

by a nickel during the 21st century and, unless action is taken, the pay gap between men's and women's earnings will not close until 2106.

Research indicates that the gender pay gap develops very early in women's careers. Controlling for factors known to affect earnings, such as education and training, marital status, and hours worked, research finds that college-educated women still earn 7 percent less than men just one year out of college. Over time, the gap compounds and widens, impacting women's social security and retirement.

Ensuring that women have equal pay would have a dramatic impact on families and the economy. Many companies have already recognized the benefits and the power of women's increased economic participation, and that is why business groups like the U.S. Women's Chamber of Commerce and Main Street Alliance have endorsed the Paycheck Fairness Act. According to a 2017 report from Institute for Women's Policy Research (IWPR), the poverty rate for all working women would be cut in half, falling from 8.0 percent to 3.8 percent, if women were paid the same as comparable men. The same study by IWPR indicates that the U.S. economy would have produced an additional \$512.6 billion in income if women had received equal pay for equal work. This is why I urge you to pass this important bill.

The Paycheck Fairness Act would update and strengthen the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to ensure that it provides effective protection against sex-based pay discrimination in today's workplace.

The bill takes several important steps, including:

Ensuring Non-Retaliation: The bill prohibits retaliation against workers for discussing or disclosing wages. Without the non-retaliation provisions of the Paycheck Fairness Act, many women will continue to be silenced in the workplace—that is, prohibited from talking about wages with coworkers due to the fear of being fired. This is an issue that keeps women—like it kept Lilly Ledbetter—from learning of pay discrimination against them.

Prohibiting Use of Salary History: The bill prohibits employers from relying on salary history in determining future pay, so that prior pay discrimination doesn't follow workers from job to job.

Ensuring Job-Relatedness: The bill closes loopholes that have weakened the Equal Pay Act over time by ensuring that disparities in pay are justified by a business necessity that is related to the job.

Equalizing Remedies: The bill ensures women can receive the same robust remedies for sex-based pay discrimination that are currently available to those subjected to discrimination based on race and ethnicity.

Providing Additional Assistance and Resources: The bill also provides technical assistance to businesses, requires wage data collection, and supports salary negotiation skills training programs to give workers the tools to advocate for higher wages.

Providing a Small Business Exception: The Equal Pay Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act have an exemption for small businesses that generate less than \$500,000 in annual revenues a year, and the Paycheck Fairness Act would keep that exemption intact. The bill would also support small businesses with technical assistance.

The pay gap is persistent and can only be addressed if women are armed with the tools necessary to challenge discrimination against them, and employers are provided with effective incentives and technical assistance to comply with the law. I urge you to take a critical step towards achieving pay equity by voting in support of the Paycheck

Fairness Act and opposing harmful amendments when the bill comes to the House floor for a vote as soon as this week.

We urge you to stand with women and families and vote yes on the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7). Cosponsorship and votes associated with this bill and amendments may be scored in the AAUW Action Fund Congressional Voting Record for the 116th Congress.

Sincerely,

DEBORAH J. VAGINS,
Senior Vice President, Public Policy and Research.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Chair, today, we have this opportunity. Let's pass the Paycheck Fairness Act and make equal pay for equal work a reality.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK).

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Chair, I thank my good friend, Ranking Member FOXX.

Madam Chair, there are nearly 75 million women working in the United States, the most in our Nation's history. Thanks to our strong economy, nearly 3 million jobs were created in the last year, and of those jobs, 58 percent went to women.

Women are graduating from college at a higher rate than their male counterparts and are increasingly their family's primary breadwinner. Despite all of these positive economic indicators, there remains evidence that in some cases women do not earn the same levels of compensation as men.

Republicans strongly support equal pay for equal work, and we owe it to women to constructively engage on this important issue and put forward solutions to strengthen existing law.

Democrats have put forth a bill that prioritizes trial attorneys and government regulation over women's economic empowerment. The Democratic bill, for the first time, would require data disclosure to the EEOC that collects compensation data broken down by the sex, race, and national origin of employees, while also tracking the hiring, termination, and promotion data of those employees.

These intrusions into the operations of private businesses would add compliance costs exceeding \$700 million per year. And on top of these onerous new requirements, H.R. 7 is a giveaway to trial attorneys by changing class action formation from opt in, to opt out.

America's businesses will need to prepare for an onslaught of frivolous lawsuits which now will be open to unlimited compensatory and punitive damages.

The bill establishes an impossibly high burden of proof for employers defending the legitimacy of any pay differentials between employees. We need to recognize that in today's modern economy, 40 percent of small businesses are run by women. This bill would make it harder for these women business leaders.

This issue is far too important to leave to partisan solutions. That is why today I am proud to introduce the

Wage Equity Act with over 40 of my colleagues, which offers a stark contrast to the partisan approach laid out in H.R. 7. We looked to innovation in the States to find consensus, bipartisan policies that were supported by both Republicans and Democrats, and signed by Republican Governors, proof that equal pay for equal work is not a partisan issue, and that Republicans are, indeed, leading the way on women's economic opportunity.

The Wage Equity Act is reflective of the modern workforce and supports the empowerment of women in today's economy. Specifically, my legislation allows employees to negotiate voluntary, flexible work arrangements. These dynamic compensation models empower the individual to seek the work arrangement that works best in their own life and for their own family.

America's businesses, in particular our small businesses, which are the backbone of our economy, they seek to do right by their employees. In recognition of this, the Wage Equity Act creates a self-audit system for voluntary pay analysis by businesses.

Under our proposal, a business could and should undergo a pay analysis to proactively rectify pay disparity should it exist. By creating this environment of consistent self-reflection, we can further empower businesses to do what they already seek to do, doing right not only for their employees, but following the law.

Madam Chair, I believe that an individual should be able to negotiate employment based upon their qualifications and merit for the position. I also believe that the victim of wage discrimination at any point in their career should not have to have this discrimination follow them to their next job and compound throughout the rest of their career.

That is why my bill protects the employee's right to not disclose their salary history during the job interview process unless they wish to voluntarily disclose it.

We must acknowledge the compounding impact of wage discrimination on a person's career and be willing to discuss ideas to free employees from this burden.

At the same time, we cannot erode the necessary negotiation that takes place in a job interview or ignore the role wage figures can play in advancement of an individual through their career.

The Wage Equity Act protects the ability for an employee and their perspective employer to have a wage expectation conversation, an important part of any negotiation.

My legislation protects an employee's ability to discuss compensation with their colleagues, while giving the employers the ability to set reasonable limitations on the time, location, and manner of this activity to protect employees from harassment.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Chair, furthermore, the Wage Equity Act seeks to put women on equal footing with men as they start their careers.

The legislation provides for a grant program targeted toward women in college and career tech programs to provide negotiation skills education.

Lastly, my bill directs the GAO to study the manager's gap. We know that the wage gap greatly expands for women after they return to the workforce following parental leave. We must have a clear sense of the impact that leave during this time will have on an employee's future earning and opportunity potentials.

These are commonsense proposals that are supported by Democrats and Republicans. I encourage my colleagues to reject Big Government overreach, and find practical, bipartisan solutions that improve and strengthen the existing law of the land: equal pay for equal work.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS).

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Chair, I want to thank Chairman SCOTT for his leadership and Representative DELAURO for bringing this bill to the floor.

I rise today in strong support of the Paycheck Fairness Act because, like Fannie Lou Hamer and Representative DELAURO, I am sick and tired of being sick and tired of paycheck inequity.

For three decades, from the North Carolina House to the United States Congress, I have been fighting to close the gender wage gap. As the new chair of the Education and Labor Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, I am very proud to support this bill. It takes the average woman an additional 91 days to earn what her male peers earned in 2018, and that is unacceptable.

In my district in North Carolina, women still only make about 82 cents for every dollar a man makes. It is even worse for women of color, who are even less likely to make as much as their male counterparts working the same job. Black women earn only 61 cents for every dollar a man makes; Hispanic women only 53 cents.

When we shortchange women, we shortchange our children, our families, and our economy. In fact, women are shortchanged \$500 billion every year. Fifty-six years have passed since the Equal Pay Act was signed into law, and it has been 10 years since President Obama signed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act.

Yet, our work remains unfinished. Today, the U.S. House of Representatives speaks loud and clear, and we will no longer wait while women continue to do the same work and not get the same pay. The time is up for that.

Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter from AFSCME which

states that the Paycheck Fairness Act is integral to ensuring women earn the same amount as men for equal work.

AFSCME,

Washington, DC, March 25, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I am writing in support of the "Paycheck Fairness Act" (H.R. 7). This legislation is integral to ensure that women earn the same amount as men for equal work.

To date, women make up almost 47 percent of the workforce in America. Their participation has steadily climbed since the 1970s, and they are completing college and university education at higher rates. The range of occupations women workers hold has also expanded with women making notable gains in professional and managerial occupations. Yet with more than 74.6 million women in the civilian workforce, there is still a gender pay gap between men and women. That's why passage of this bill is necessary. Even with the enormous progress made by women over many decades, women continue to face discrimination that limits their ability to succeed and advance at work.

Fifty-six years after former President John F. Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act into law, women earn less than men. While that law along with other civil rights legislation like Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act have helped to narrow the wage gap, it still exists across all occupations, industries, and trade and educational attainment. This shortchanges many working families and creates little upward mobility in compensation to meet basic household needs. Currently, women make only 80 percent of every dollar a man makes in nearly every occupation where there is enough earnings data to compare. This gap in earnings translates into \$10,169 less per year in average earnings. This percentage is even lower for women of color. Black women earn 61 cents, Latina women 53 cents, Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander women 62 cents, Native women 58 cents, and Asian women 58 cents for every dollar paid to a white man. This trend is not only troubling for women's career and financial success, but it also limits their ability to save for retirement.

Stronger equal pay protections and enforcement measures are essential to ensure that our workplaces treat women fairly and operate free of discrimination on the job. AFSCME strongly supports the "Paycheck Fairness Act" (H.R. 7) and encourages swift passage to alleviate gender-based wage discrimination, and ensure women receive equal pay for equal work.

Sincerely,

SCOTT FREY,

Director of Federal Government Affairs.

Ms. ADAMS. By passing the Paycheck Fairness Act, we will strengthen the Equal Pay Act. We will bolster the rights of working women, and finally, we will put an end to gender-based wage disparity.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, before I recognize the next speaker, I include in the RECORD a chart which shows that pay discrimination charges filed per year with the EEOC have remained statistically consistent during the George W. Bush, Obama, and Trump administrations.

EEOC EQUAL PAY ACT STATISTICS

EQUAL PAY ACT (EPA) CHARGES FILED WITH
EEOC (AVERAGE PER YEAR)

George W. Bush Administration (FY 2001–2008): 1,036.

Obama Administration (FY 2009–2016): 999.
Trump Administration (FY 2017–2018): 1,031.

EEOC EPA CHARGES RESOLVED* (AVERAGE PER
YEAR)

Bush Administration (FY 2001–2008): 959.

Obama Administration (FY 2009–2016): 1,078.

Trump Administration (FY 2017–2018): 1,220.

* EEOC resolves charges in a number of different ways: negotiated settlement, withdrawal of charge upon receipt of desired benefits, successful conciliation, unsuccessful conciliation, a finding of no reasonable cause, or closure for administrative reasons.

LAWSUITS FILED BY EEOC WITH EPA CLAIMS (AVERAGE PER YEAR) (NOTE: NUMBERS DO NOT INCLUDE PRIVATE LITIGATION)

Bush Administration (FY 2001–2008): 9.

Obama Administration (FY 2009–2016): 3.

Trump Administration (FY 2017–2018): 8.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Chair, I rise today to speak out against H.R. 7, legislation that places unprecedented restrictions and liability on job creators that will harm the very women it claims to protect.

As a small business owner with over 40 years of experience creating jobs, I know just how hard it can be for employers to find skilled and qualified workers.

With 7.6 million available jobs throughout our Nation, the last thing we need to do is overregulate our businesses, especially when Federal law already makes it illegal to pay different wages to women for equal work.

H.R. 7 dramatically increases liability for employers, eliminates a business owner's ability to contest gender-based pay discrimination cases, expands damages, and encourages frivolous lawsuits.

Furthermore, this partisan bill offers no new protections against pay discrimination in the workplace. Rather, H.R. 7 directly benefits trial lawyers at the expense of working women. Taken as a whole, this bill will very likely limit or obstruct an employer's efforts to recruit, hire, promote workers, and to increase their pay—once again, empty partisan promises from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

□ 1430

However, after passing historic tax reform under the Republican-led Congress and eliminating burdensome red tape under the leadership of President Trump, our businesses are continuing to empower women across this country at unprecedented levels.

We have more women working in the U.S. than ever before, nearly 75 million. Women filled nearly 60 percent of the 2.8 million jobs created in the last year. One in five employer businesses nationwide is owned by women, including by my wife of 45 years, Robin.

I need to keep this momentum going, not obstruct employers' efforts to recruit, hire, and promote workers.

Madam Chair, I urge a “no” vote today on H.R. 7.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, as vice chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, I am so proud that our committee made it a top priority this year to bring the Paycheck Fairness Act to the floor, and I congratulate Chairman SCOTT for his leadership.

This is an issue where the evidence could not be clearer. In Michigan’s Ninth District, which I represent, for example, women’s median annual wage is more than \$10,000 lower than men’s. I don’t care how many jobs are created or how many women are working, we need to do something to, at long last, make women’s pay equal to men’s.

If we allow this gap to persist, we are not just telling women they aren’t worth as much as men. We are doing real damage to entire families and to our economy. Failure to tackle the pay gap isn’t just discriminatory; it is shockingly shortsighted.

The Paycheck Fairness Act will finally align our treatment of gender discrimination with other established antidiscrimination policies. This is an opportunity to realize equal pay for equal work that we simply cannot afford to miss.

I regret that my good friends across the aisle did not introduce a single bill to strengthen the Equal Pay Act across the 20 years they held the gavel in this Chamber. I hope they will join us today to lift up America’s women and families to full equality at long last.

Finally, I include in the RECORD a strong letter of support for H.R. 7 from the AFL–CIO.

AFL–CIO,
March 25, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The AFL–CIO strongly urges your support of the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7) when it comes to the House floor this week.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is a long overdue remedial measure that responds to the demonstrated inadequacies of the 1963 Equal Pay Act. Although the Equal Pay Act made it illegal for employers to pay unequal wages to male and female employees who perform the same work, wage disparities between men and women persist in both the private and public sectors, at every educational level, across the country. Women working full time are paid only 80 cents for every dollar paid to men, and this gap is greater for women of color. While belonging to a union is the surest way to guarantee equal pay on the job—unionized women earn some 27 percent more than do their non-union counterparts—the Paycheck Fairness Act would provide new effective tools to close the wage gap.

The Paycheck Fairness Act provides targeted remedies designed to update the 1963 Equal Pay Act. It requires employers to demonstrate that wage gaps between men and women doing the same work truly result from factors unrelated to gender. It prohibits employers’ use of prior salary history in setting pay for new hires and employer retaliation against workers who discuss their pay with coworkers. Last, H.R. 7 brings Equal Pay Act remedies and class action proce-

dures into conformance with those available for other civil rights claims, and strengthens the government’s ability to identify and remedy systematic wage discrimination by requiring employers to report pay data to the EEOC.

When women endure pay discrimination, entire families suffer. We urge you to support final passage of the Paycheck Fairness Act (S. 84), and to oppose any amendment that would weaken this important and long overdue legislation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,
Director, Government Affairs.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, while I believe belonging to a union is the surest way to guarantee equal pay on the job, the Paycheck Fairness Act will provide effective new tools to close the wage gap.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER. Madam Chair, I rise today to speak in opposition to H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act. I am a mother and a grandmother. I have raised two boys and one husband. I have owned businesses, managed employees, made payroll, served in the State legislature, and herded buffalo. I don’t need any more men trying to tell me that they need to protect me from being paid less. I am perfectly capable of negotiating a fair wage for a fair day’s work and choosing exactly what is important to me when making my own decisions.

The bill proposed by my colleagues across the aisle tells young women entering the workforce that they are unable to negotiate for their own jobs or take control of their own life and that they need to be coddled by the government in order to succeed. What arrogance.

We are not some delicate and helpless group that needs men to tell us just how bad we have it and just how much they need to make sure that we are looked after. I can take care of myself, thank you, and so can every single woman in this country. This bill is nothing more than a trial lawyer’s dream and a job creator’s nightmare.

The Equal Pay Act already makes it illegal to pay unequal wages for equal work. The men can go try to find somebody else who needs their help. In the meantime, I am going to focus on actually helping women earn more by creating good-paying jobs, by growing our economy, and by building a system that allows for flexible work schedules and nurtures entrepreneurship.

We can’t legislate respect any more than we can legislate common sense. Women know real respect is earned. We don’t need the men’s help, and we don’t need the government’s help. We just need them both to get out of our way. I wholly oppose this legislation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON).

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 7,

the Paycheck Fairness Act. I thank Representative DELAURO for her efforts in continuing to push this bill to fruition.

As chair of the HELP Subcommittee and as an African American woman, I feel very strongly about the issue of pay fairness. Our Nation cannot adequately improve labor conditions without addressing the stark inequities that exist along gender and racial lines. The fact that, on average, women currently earn just 80 cents for every dollar a man earns for the same position and amount of work is just plain wrong and is a disgrace.

By passing the Paycheck Fairness Act and promoting wage parity, we can lift families out of poverty and keep harmful biases out of the workplace. There are too many poor working people in America working two and three jobs to keep their families whole. Research has shown that a woman’s level of education and work experience or chosen industry do not necessarily shield her from unfair pay. This problem is widespread and can be found across all sectors of the economy, affecting even the most prepared women.

Economically disadvantaged women are hit extremely hard, as are women of color. There are two Americas, a rich and prosperous America and a poor and struggling America. Black and Latina women earn 61 cents and 53 cents, respectively, for every dollar earned by men who perform the same job—such a discrepancy, such a stark statistic, such a shame. The wage gap is too wide and narrowing much too slowly for Congress not to act.

I strongly support H.R. 7 as a positive step toward correcting this glaring injustice. I reiterate my strong support for H.R. 7, and I urge all my colleagues to vote “yes” for paycheck fairness.

Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter of support from the National Education Association.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
March 26, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our three million members and the 50 million students they serve, we urge you to VOTE YES on the Paycheck Fairness Act of 2019 (H.R. 7). Votes associated with this issue may be included in NEA’s Report Card for the 116th Congress.

Equal pay for equal work is NOT today’s reality.

The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that in 2017, the median weekly earnings of full-time, salaried female workers were 82 percent of those of full-time, salaried male workers.

According to AAUW, the pay gap is even bigger for women of color with African Americans earning 61 cents, American Indian/Alaskan natives 58 cents, and Latinas 53 cents for every dollar paid to white men.

The gender pay gap exists in all demographics, all parts of the country, and nearly all occupations—including female-dominated professions like teaching and nursing.

The Institute for Women’s Policy Research reports that closing the pay gap would cut the poverty rate for working single mothers in half and lift 2.5 million children out of poverty.

The Paycheck Fairness Act of 2019 would help by:

Requiring employers to demonstrate that gender is NOT the reason they pay employees different amounts to perform the same jobs.

Prohibiting employers from asking job candidates about their salary histories.

Protecting employees from retaliation if they discuss their pay with colleagues.

Strengthening enforcement of equal pay laws by requiring employers to provide to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) data on salaries, promotions, and dismissals, broken down by race and gender.

Putting in place robust remedies for discrimination.

For all of these reasons, we urge you to VOTE YES on H.R. 7.

Sincerely,

MARC EGAN,

Director of Government Relations.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, we have made it clear that we do not believe H.R. 7 is good for working women, but no one has to take our word for it. There are more working women today than ever before.

Here is what many of the job creators who have helped make that a reality have to say about H.R. 7.

The H.R. Policy Association said:

As written, the bill would penalize legitimate, nondiscriminatory pay decisions; impose an unworkable burden of proof on employers that even The Washington Post has said “potentially invites too much intrusion and interference with core business decisions”; and add to the confusing labyrinth of State and local pay history laws.

The National Federation of Independent Business said:

H.R. 7 requires the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to issue regulations providing for collection of employers’ compensation data. Most small business owners do not have a human resources department or a full-time staff member in charge of reporting and compliance. NFIB members report unreasonable government regulations as their second most important small business problem.

Americans for Tax Reform and the Center for Worker Freedom says: “Unfortunately, this bill would actually likely harm the women the Democrats are claiming to help. If signed into law, the legislation would likely lead to less flexible work schedules for women, fewer incentives for those who work hard, and lower pay for all.”

The National Taxpayers Union said:

Though well-intended, H.R. 7 would not resolve lingering issues of pay discrimination, particularly when safeguards are already available under the Equal Pay and Fair Labor Standards Acts. Instead, under H.R. 7, women could be perceived as a legal liability, ultimately reducing employment opportunities. Rather than impose new regulations that increase the cost of doing business and kill jobs, Congress should remove barriers that limit prosperity for both men and women.

This bill, as my colleagues have said, is a sham, and it simply doesn’t do what my colleagues across the aisle say it will do.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD).

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Chair, let me be very clear: Equal pay for equal work has never been a reality for women in America.

Congress recognized this for the first time 56 years ago, before I was even born, when the Equal Pay Act was passed. This was a foundational piece of civil rights legislation. But a half century later, it is clear that the Equal Pay Act isn’t working for everyone, and it isn’t working fast enough.

In my district, for every dollar that men in Naperville or Batavia or McHenry make, women make 71 cents. That is the worst pay gap in Illinois. It means we have to work at least 10 years longer to earn the same lifetime income. At this rate, every woman in America wouldn’t make equal pay for doing the same work for almost 200 years.

In my community in Illinois, the 14th Congressional District isn’t willing to wait that long, and neither are the House Democrats. That is why I am standing here today as a cosponsor and strong supporter of the Paycheck Fairness Act. There is no point in a woman’s life, from childhood to retirement, where the gender pay gap doesn’t hurt her. The Paycheck Fairness Act would take huge, critical steps to fix that.

The Committee on Education and Labor held hearings on the act, and we heard from experts how this bill would do things like lift children out of poverty, contribute billions of dollars to America’s economy, and make sure women have a safer, healthier retirement.

Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter signed by 315 State, local, and national organizations that support the Paycheck Fairness Act.

VOTE FOR THE PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

MARCH 25, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As members of a broad coalition of organizations that promote economic opportunity for women and vigorous enforcement of antidiscrimination laws, we strongly urge you to vote for the Paycheck Fairness Act when it comes to the House floor for a vote. Despite federal and state equal pay laws, gender pay gaps persist. This legislation offers a much needed update to the Equal Pay Act of 1963 by providing new tools to battle the pervasive pay gaps and to challenge discrimination.

In January, we celebrated two major accomplishments. First, an historic number of women were sworn into the 116th Congress, many of whom—along with their male colleagues—ran and won on issues central to the economic well-being of families. Second, on January 29, 2019, we commemorated the tenth anniversary of the enactment of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. That vital law rectified the Supreme Court’s harmful decision in *Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company*. The law helps to ensure that individuals subjected to unlawful compensation discrimination are able to have their day in court and effectively assert their rights under federal antidiscrimination laws. But the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, critical as it is, is only one step on the path to ensuring women receive equal pay for equal work.

There is no more fitting way to begin this historic Congress than by making real, concrete progress in ensuring all women receive fair pay. The Paycheck Fairness Act updates and strengthens the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to ensure that it provides robust protection against sex-based pay discrimination. Among other provisions, this comprehensive bill bars retaliation against workers who voluntarily discuss or disclose their wages. It closes loopholes that have allowed employers to pay women less than men for the same work without any important business justification related to the job. It ensures women can receive the same robust remedies for sex-based pay discrimination that are currently available to those subjected to discrimination based on race and ethnicity. It prohibits employers from relying on salary history in determining future pay, so that pay discrimination does not follow women from job to job. And it also provides much needed training and technical assistance, as well as data collection and research.

Women are increasingly the primary or co-breadwinner in their families and cannot afford to be shortchanged any longer. Women working full-time, year-round are typically paid only 80 cents for every dollar paid to men, and when we compare women of color to white, non-Hispanic men, the pay gaps are even larger. Moms are paid less than dads. And even when controlling for factors, such as education and experience, the pay gaps persist and start early in women’s careers and contribute to a wealth gap that follows them throughout their lifetimes. These pay gaps can be addressed only if workers have the legal tools necessary to challenge discrimination and when employers are provided with effective incentives and technical assistance to comply with the law.

It’s time to take the next step toward achieving equal pay. We urge you to vote for the Paycheck Fairness Act and encourage your colleagues to do the same, taking up the cause of Lilly Ledbetter and all those who have fought for equal pay.

Sincerely,

9to5, National Association of Working Women:

9to5 California; 9to5 Colorado; 9to5 Georgia; 9to5 Wisconsin.

A Better Balance

ACCESS Women’s Health Justice

Advocacy and Training Center

American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Unions (AFL-CIO):

PA AFL-CIO.

African American Ministers In Action

American Association of University Women (AAUW):

AAUW of Alabama; AAUW of Alaska; (AAUW Fairbanks (AK) Branch, AAUW Kodiak (AK) Branch); AAUW of Arizona; AAUW of Arkansas; AAUW of California; AAUW of Colorado; AAUW of Connecticut; AAUW of Delaware; AAUW of District of Columbia (AAUW Washington (DC) Branch, AAUW Capitol Hill (DC) Branch); AAUW of Florida; AAUW of Georgia; AAUW of Hawaii; AAUW of Idaho; AAUW of Illinois; AAUW of Indiana; AAUW of Iowa; AAUW of Kansas; AAUW of Kentucky; AAUW of Louisiana; AAUW of Maine.

AAUW of Maryland; AAUW of Massachusetts; AAUW of Michigan; AAUW of Minnesota; AAUW of Mississippi; AAUW of Missouri; AAUW of Montana; AAUW of Nebraska; AAUW of Nevada; AAUW of New Hampshire; AAUW of New Jersey; AAUW of New Mexico; AAUW of New York; AAUW of North Carolina; AAUW of North Dakota; AAUW of Ohio; AAUW of Oklahoma; AAUW of Oregon; AAUW of Pennsylvania; AAUW of Puerto Rico; AAUW of Rhode Island; AAUW of South Carolina; AAUW of South Dakota;

AAUW of Tennessee; AAUW of Texas; AAUW of Utah; AAUW of Vermont; AAUW of Virginia; AAUW of Washington; AAUW of West Virginia; AAUW of Wyoming.
 American Civil Liberties Union
 American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE), AFL-CIO
 American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)
 American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO
 American Psychological Association
 Americans for Democratic Action
 Anti-Defamation League
 Atlanta Women for Equality
 Bend the Arc: Jewish Action
 Bozeman Business & Professional Women
 California Employment Lawyers Association
 California Federation of Business & Professional Women
 Caring Across Generations
 Casa de Esperanza: National Latin@ Network for Healthy Families and Communities Catalyst
 Center for Advancement of Public Policy
 Center for American Progress
 Center for Law and Social Policy
 Central Conference of American Rabbis
 Citizen Action of New York
 Clearinghouse on Women's Issues
 Coalition of Labor Union Women:
 California Capital Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Chesapeake Bay Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Chicago Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Derby City Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Grand Prairie/Arlington Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Greater New Jersey Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Greater Oklahoma City Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Houston Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Ohio Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Kentucky State Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Los Angeles Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women.
 Metro Detroit Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Michigan Capitol Area Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Missouri State Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Neshaminy Bucks Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Philadelphia Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Rhode Island Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; San Diego Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Southwestern PA Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; St. Louis Metro Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Western New York Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women; Western Virginia Chapter, Coalition of Labor Union Women.
 Congregation of Our Lady of the Good Shepherd, US Provinces
 Connecticut Women's Education and Legal Fund (CWEALF)
 Disciples Women
 Ecumenical Poverty Initiative
 Equal Pay Today
 Equal Rights Advocates
 Feminist Majority Foundation
 Friends of the Delaware County Women's Commission
 Futures Without Violence
 Gender Equality Law Center
 Girls For Gender Equity
 Girls Inc.
 Grameen Development Society (GDS)
 Graphic Communications Conference/International Brotherhood of Teamsters Local 24M/9N
 Greater New York Labor Religion Coalition
 Hadassah, The Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc.
 Holy Spirit Missionary Sisters—USA—JPIC

Hope's Door
 Hudson Law PLLC
 Indiana Institute for Working Families
 Interfaith Worker Justice
 International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees
 International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers (IAMAW)
 International Association of Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Workers (SMART) Local 20
 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers—3rd District
 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers 29
 International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE)
 International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW)
 JALSA: Jewish Alliance for Law and Social Action
 Jewish Women International
 Justice for Migrant Women
 Lambda Legal
 The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights
 League of Women Voters of St. Lawrence County, NY
 Legal Aid At Work
 Main Street Alliance
 Maine Women's Lobby
 McCree Ndjatou, PLLC
 Methodist Federation for Social Action
 MomsRising
 Mississippi Black Women's Roundtable
 NAACP
 National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd
 National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum (NAPAWF)
 National Association of Letter Carriers (NALC), AFL-CIO
 National Center for Transgender Equality
 National Committee on Pay Equity
 National Council of Jewish Women
 National Domestic Workers Alliance
 National Education Association
 National Employment Law Project
 National Employment Lawyers Association
 NELA—Georgia; NELA—Houston; NELA—Indiana; NELA—New Jersey; NELA—New York; NELA—Pennsylvania; NELA—Texas.
 National Federation of Business and Professional Women Clubs
 National LGBTQ Task Force Action Fund
 National Organization for Women:
 Anne Arundel County NOW; Arlington NOW; Baton Rouge NOW; California NOW; Central Phoenix/Inez Casiano NOW; Charlotte NOW; Chester County NOW; Connecticut NOW; DC NOW; East End NOW; Florida NOW; High Desert NOW; Hollywood NOW; Illinois NOW; Indianapolis NOW; Jacksonville NOW; Louisiana NOW.
 Maryland NOW; Miami NOW; Michigan NOW; Minnesota NOW; Montana NOW; Morris County NOW; North Carolina NOW; Nevada NOW; New Orleans NOW; New York City NOW; New York State NOW; Northern New Jersey NOW; Northwest PA NOW; Oregon NOW; Pennsylvania NOW; Philadelphia NOW; Seattle NOW.
 Seminole County NOW; South Jersey NOW—Alice Paul Chapter; Southwest ID NOW; Southwest PA NOW; Sun Cities/West Valley NOW; Texas State NOW; Washington County NOW; Washington NOW; Washtenaw County NOW; West Pinellas NOW; West Virginia NOW; Westchester NOW; Will County NOW; Williamsport NOW; Wisconsin NOW; Worcester NOW.
 National Partnership for Women & Families
 National Resource Center on Domestic Violence
 National Women's Law Center

National Women's Political Caucus
 NC Women United
 NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice
 New York Paid Leave Coalition
 New York State Coalition Against Domestic Violence
 North Carolina Justice Center
 Oxfam America
 PathWays PA
 People For the American Way
 Planned Parenthood Pennsylvania Advocates
 PowHer NY
 Progressive Maryland
 Public Citizen
 Restaurant Opportunities Centers United
 Service Employees International Union (SEIU):
 SEIU Local 6686.
 SiX Action
 Southwest Women's Law Center
 Texas Business Women Inc.
 Transport Workers Union
 U.S. Women and Cuba Collaboration
 U.S. Women's Chamber of Commerce
 UltraViolet
 Union for Reform Judaism
 Unitarian Universalist Women's Federation
 UNITE HERE! Local 57
 United Church of Christ Justice and Witness Ministries
 United Mine Workers of America:
 United Mine Workers of America District Two.
 United Nations Association of the United States
 United State of Women
 United Steelworkers (USW):
 United Steelworkers, District 10; USW Local 1088; L.U. #1088 USW.
 UN Women USNC Metro New York Chapter UnidosUS
 Voter Participation Center
 Westminster Presbyterian Church
 Women Employed
 WNY Women's Foundation
 Women of Reform Judaism
 Women's All Points Bulletin, WAPB
 Women's Voices, Women Vote Action Fund
 WomenNC
 Women's Law Project
 Women's Rabbinic Network
 YWCA USA:
 YWCA Allentown; YWCA Alliance; YWCA Asheville; YWCA Berkeley/Oakland; YWCA Billings; YWCA of Binghamton & Broome County; YWCA Brooklyn; YWCA Cambridge; YWCA Central Alabama; YWCA Central Massachusetts; YWCA Clark County; YWCA Contra Costa/Sacramento; YWCA Corpus Christi; YWCA Gettysburg & Adams County; YWCA Great Falls; YWCA Greater Austin; YWCA Greater Baton Rouge; YWCA Greater Cincinnati; YWCA Greater Harrisburg; YWCA Greater Miami-Dade.
 YWCA of Greater Portland; YWCA of Kauai; YWCA Mahonini Valley; YWCA McLean County; YWCA Metropolitan Phoenix; YWCA Mount Desert Island; YWCA New Hampshire; YWCA of the Niagara Frontier; YWCA Oklahoma City; YWCA Olympia; YWCA Orange County; YWCA Pasadena-Foothill Valley; YWCA of the Sauk Valley; YWCA Seattle/King/Snohomish; YWCA South Hampton Roads; YWCA Southeastern Massachusetts; YWCA St. Paul; YWCA of Syracuse and Onondaga County; YWCA Tri-County Area; YWCA of the University of Illinois; YWCA of Van Wert County; YWCA of Watsonville; YWCA Western New York; YWCA Westmoreland County; YWCA Yakima.
 Zonta Club of Greater Queens
 Zonta Club of Portland
 Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Chair, I also want to acknowledge the hard

work and leadership of Chairman SCOTT, Representative DELAURO, and committee staff on the issue of equal pay.

This is a bipartisan bill with support from both parties. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting the Paycheck Fairness Act and take this important step toward ending gender-based discrimination at work.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, earlier, my colleagues presented some interesting numbers. The wage gap is a truly fascinating subject to study because there are statistics to show it is vast, and there are statistics to show, in many cases, it is virtually nonexistent.

We should note the numbers that really aren't up for debate. There are more working women today than ever before, 74.9 million. A record 2.8 million new jobs were created in the past year, and nearly 60 percent of those jobs are now filled by women. There are more women owning businesses and employing Americans than ever before. That was no accident. Women are the direct beneficiaries of strong economic policy.

They need strong economic policy. They don't want more ways to sue people. They want more freedom to work in the jobs they want.

We are here for women, Madam Chair, not their lawyers.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR).

Ms. OMAR. Madam Chair, I am honored to rise today to speak on H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act. I am proud to be part of a Congress that is finally taking action to close the gender pay gap. After so many years of inaction on this issue when our Republican colleagues were in the majority, I think it is fair to say that it is about time.

It is hard to imagine that, in this day and age, women could be paid less than a man for doing the same job. But it happens, and it happens often. Statistics show that pay disparity isn't a thing of the past; it is happening today. It isn't just holding women back; it is amplifying racial inequalities across the country.

We often hear the statistics that say women make 80 cents to every dollar that is paid to a man, but those figures are often worse for women of color. Black women are making only 61 cents on the dollar. For Latina women, that is 53 cents. For Native American women, it is 58 cents. Clearly, the pay gap is compounded by a racial gap.

It should be obvious to all of us that this problem extends beyond the workplace.

Madam Chair, you see the impact everywhere you look around our society. Women of color are less likely to have healthcare coverage. They are more

likely to experience hunger. They are less likely to own a home or be fully prepared for retirement.

□ 1445

At the end of the day, those pennies on the dollar add up, and that loss of income is putting women of color at a serious disadvantage.

The Paycheck Fairness Act will take aggressive action to remedy these inequalities and tear down the economic barriers that women of color face. It will do that, in part, by ensuring the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has the information it needs to detect pay discrimination and to identify those additional cross-section biases.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield the gentlewoman from Minnesota an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. OMAR. Madam Chair, I am proud to introduce an amendment with my colleague, Representative BEYER from Virginia, that will ensure that the major employers are required to report that information to that commission. That will go a long way to finally ending the systemic barriers that women and women of color face in this country.

I thank Chair SCOTT and Chair DELAURO. I am really excited to be part of this change-making Congress.

I include in the RECORD a letter from the NAACP in support of this legislation.

WASHINGTON BUREAU, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,

Washington, DC, March 25, 2019.

Re: NAACP Strong support for the immediate passage of H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

The Honorable,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the NAACP, our nation's oldest, largest and most widely-recognized grassroots-based civil rights organization, I strongly urge you to support and vote in favor of H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act. This critical legislation would update and strengthen the Equal Pay Act of 1963, which mandated that employers pay equal wages to men and women who perform substantially the same work. The Paycheck Fairness Act closes loopholes in the Equal Pay Act which have diluted its effectiveness in combating unfair and unequal pay. While the Equal Pay Act has helped to narrow the wage gap between men and women in our workforce, significant disparities remain and must be addressed.

Especially in today's economy, more women work outside of the home and their paycheck is a necessary part of their households' resources. Yet all too often women are forced to raise their families on incomes lower than that of male colleagues performing the same jobs. According to 2018 data, women in the United States are typically paid 80 cents for every dollar paid to men. The median annual pay for a woman who holds a full-time, year-round job is \$41,977 while the median annual pay for a man who holds a full-time, year-round job is \$52,146—a difference of \$10,169 per year. The statistics are even worse for women of color.

African-American women make only 61 cents, and Hispanic women only 53 cents, for every dollar earned by white, non-Hispanic men. These gaps translate into a loss of almost \$24,000 a year for African-American women and almost \$28,500 annually for Hispanic women.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is a responsible, steady yet aggressive bill. It will help remedy this inequity and close this unacceptable gap. In short, the legislation will protect women and families across America by: protecting against retaliation for discussing salaries with colleagues; prohibiting employers from screening job applicants based on their salary history or requiring salary history during the interview and hiring process; requiring employers to prove that pay disparities exist for legitimate, job-related reasons; providing plaintiffs who file sex-based wage discrimination claims under the Equal Pay Act with the same remedies as are available to plaintiffs who file race- or ethnicity-based wage discrimination claims under the 1964 Civil Rights Act; removing obstacles in the Equal Pay Act to facilitate plaintiffs' participation in class action lawsuits that challenge systemic pay discrimination; and creating a negotiation skills training program for women and girls.

I again urge you to do all you can to see that this important legislation is enacted as quickly as possible so that women can begin to have some parity for a day's work. This in turn will help hard working American women, their children and their families gain the economic stability they deserve. Please support the Paycheck Fairness Act and work to eliminate this unacceptable gap in pay.

Sincerely,

HILARY O. SHELTON,
Director, NAACP
Washington Bureau
& Senior Vice President for Policy and Advocacy.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, I am a businessman. I am also the father of three daughters.

I have managed people and managed compensation plans for more than 40 years, and I know that we cannot manage what we do not measure. I agree with my friend, the Republican congresswoman from New York, that men and women should be paid equally for equal work. This should be a bedrock principle of our democracy.

But if we don't gather the data, how will we ever know if there is paycheck fairness?

My middle daughter is a computer programmer—well paid. She was dismayed to learn around Christmastime that her male counterparts doing exactly the same work were making more money.

It is a fiction that this will be a burden on employers with more than 100 employees. Absolutely none of these employers have not digitized their paycheck process decades ago. The collection of this data requires a keystone; that is all. All the data, already there, already gathered.

Pay transparency is the most powerful way to achieve paycheck fairness.

Men and women together are outraged when they see actual measured pay unfairness. But where incomes are most fair, where they are most transparent—in the military and in government—paycheck inequity is small or even nonexistent.

This is not a bill for lawyers. This is a bill for business owners and business managers who want to do the right thing and now will have the data to do that right thing.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend for yielding.

I have left the chair, where I had been presiding, to speak on my bill, which is included in H.R. 7. My bill is Pay Equity for All, to bar an employer from asking about a person's prior pay.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank all of you who have led this bill to where we are today. I also am very much for the bill in which my bill is included, H.R. 7, which includes class actions, for example, the clarification for which has been most needed.

Expanding this bill is personal for me. I was the first woman to chair the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and enforce the Equal Pay Act, expanding it during my term at the commission.

I, therefore, am very grateful to my good friend ROSA DELAURO, a great champion of equal pay, for including my Pay Equity for All Act in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, many employers may not recognize that they are discriminating against women because they may not intentionally do so. But setting wages based on salary history is routinely done in the workplace, perhaps even by some in the Congress, and it reinforces the wage gap and may be the most important reason for the persistence of the wage gap that we have been unable to unlock.

What it means is that historically disadvantaged groups—women and minorities in particular—often start their careers with unfair and artificially low wages compared to their White male counterparts. This then gets imbedded—this discrimination—and compounded throughout their careers, so they never catch up with their male counterparts.

Job offers ought to be based on an applicant's skill and merit, not past salary or salary history.

My bill keeps an employer from asking applicants for their salary history or their salary in the last job during the interview process or as a condition of employment.

One study has shown, if you don't ask this question, wages are set at 9 percent higher. Therefore, this bill is a very important component of bridging the wage gap.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, the chairman of the full committee, I acknowledge the ranking member, and indicate that, as all of us who have come to the floor, this is an enormously historic day.

For those of us who know the history of equal pay for women in America, this is a journey long in coming and continuing—first with the Equal Pay Act of some 50-plus years ago; then with the Lilly Ledbetter Act 10 years ago; and now with this historic legislation, the Paycheck Fairness Act—to make good on the idea that women should not be getting less than their male counterparts: African American women earning 61 percent, Latina women earning 53 percent, and Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders earning 62 percent versus White, non-Hispanic men.

The most important part of this legislation is the protection given to women today, requiring employers to prove that pay disparities exist for legitimate, job-related reasons other than sex. It bans retaliation against workers who wish to discuss their wages. It removes obstacles in the Equal Pay Act to allow workers to participate in class-action lawsuits and improves the Department of Labor tools for enforcing the Equal Pay Act.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, it is important to note that no one, as a woman, can ask you what your previous pay was—how denigrating that is—and use it as a basis to not pay you what you really deserve in this new position.

Also, women are heads of household; they deserve the ability to provide for their family.

Madam Chair, this is not a lawsuit bill. This is an opportunity bill. This is a fairness bill. This is the ability to go into court to receive justice. And, yes, as part of justice, class-action lawsuits can work.

I believe that the Paycheck Fairness Act should be passed, promptly going to the other body, and be signed by the President of the United States, because women, too, have the responsibilities to serve and provide for their family.

This is an historic piece of legislation. I thank ROSA DELAURO.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, in 1963, when the Equal Pay Act was signed into law,

women earned 59 cents on the dollar compared to men.

In the 56 years since, that gap has only closed by 21 cents. Women still make only 80 cents on the dollar compared to their male counterparts and earn less than men in nearly every single occupation.

The pay gap is even more extreme for women of color. Over the course of an entire career, that gap results in women losing millions of dollars in earnings compared to their male counterparts.

In today's economy, in which women make up more than half of the workforce and are the sole or co-breadwinner in half of American families, that is simply unacceptable.

Being paid fairly for your work is a fundamental issue of fairness and freedom. Pay disparity can limit women's career choices and their financial independence, but equal pay enables women to save for retirement, to build careers, to buy homes, and to support their families.

Today, I am proud to vote for the Paycheck Fairness Act, legislation I have cosponsored in every Congress since 1997.

This legislation gets us closer, at last, to fulfilling the promise of equal pay for equal work and finally ensuring that women have the ability to fight back against wage discrimination and close the wage gap.

I wish to thank Chairman SCOTT for including language in this bill that mirrors legislation I introduced with Representative ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON to address how employers use salary history.

Many women and minorities start their careers with unfair and artificially low salaries compared to their White male counterparts. That discrepancy can be compounded from job to job, when employers rely heavily on salary history in compensation packages.

This change will help ensure that women's pay is based on their merit and not on the past discrimination of other employers.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and to finish the work of closing the wage gap.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I have worked for most of my life. I entered the workforce as a young woman, not because I wanted to but because I had to. I knew the burden of poverty well. If I didn't work to support myself, if I didn't contribute to my family income, we would go hungry.

Well, I have been enormously blessed to have gone from working for survival to working for pleasure and, I hope, a greater purpose. I know there are millions of women of all ages in this country today who must work to survive, just as I did.

When I entered the workforce, equal pay for equal work—equal pay for

women—was a demand, but not yet the law. Today, it is the law. The Equal Pay Act and the Civil Rights Act are clear that pay discrimination is wrong, it is unacceptable, and it is illegal.

Managers who discriminate on the basis of sex are breaking at least two Federal laws, and they have no excuses.

No one should operate under the assumption that women have reached their full potential in the workplace.

Over the years, I have experienced sexism and misogyny. I have seen unfairness. I have seen, also, remarkable advancement, and I have remained disappointed in many ways.

So, for the sake of all the working women I have known and know now, women who work because they choose to and women who work because they must, I looked for anything in this legislation worthy of their support. I found that this bill wasn't written for their sake at all.

This bill is a cynical political ploy that borders on paternalism. There is not a single new or strengthened legal protection against pay discrimination for working women in H.R. 7.

□ 1500

This bill is entirely designed for trial lawyers, and Democrats must think women are too dumb to understand what they have done.

It is an insult to women everywhere that Democrats are passing this bill off as something good for them. This bill is like every other cheap product in drugstores and supermarkets across America that has been covered in pink packaging, marketed as the solution women have been waiting for, and sold for twice what it is worth.

We know women are smarter than that. Democrats, who have assumed that women will always follow their agenda, realize they are running out of time, and that is why they have stooped to a stunt like H.R. 7.

Women in America are embracing their power and potential in ways they never have before. I am not talking about the record number of women in Congress. I am talking about the historic, groundbreaking number of women in the workforce.

More than half of the record number of new jobs created in the past year have gone to women. More women are stepping up to start and lead businesses, to be job creators themselves, than ever before.

Women need Representatives in Washington who will cheer for them, not their rich lawyers. If Democrats want to champion a bill to make life easier for trial lawyers, that is their choice, but they should be honest about it and, for once, bypass the opportunity to talk down to hardworking women everywhere.

For the women who work today because they must, I am glad they have the legal protections I didn't when I was in their shoes. It was women like them who paved the way for suffrage a

century ago. It was women like them who made equal pay for equal work the law of the land, and it is women like them, today and tomorrow, who will continue to clarify, to sharpen, and to exemplify what "a more perfect Union" was always supposed to look like. This House should follow their lead.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I would like to inquire how much time I have left.

The CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, I just want to make a couple of closing comments.

We have heard speaker after speaker complain that, if this bill passes, lawyers will get paid. Most lawyers, in fact, only get paid when they have a winning case; so if they want lawyers to stop getting paid, they could do this if we would stop discriminating.

The only way to enforce the laws against discrimination is to hire a lawyer and go to court, and that is when lawyers get paid. Stop the discrimination; stop the lawyers from getting paid.

There is also a suggestion that we ought to limit the amount of money that can be paid to lawyers. The fact is that no group supporting women support that limitation because the limitation sometimes can be so low that you can't hire a lawyer. It is only supported by groups supporting those representing people accused of discrimination.

It is also one-sided. There is no proposal to limit the amount of money that the guilty can pay their lawyers.

A comment was made about unlimited damages. The damages, in fact, in this bill are the same as you can get under race and religious discrimination, and the purpose of the bill is to conform the process for gender discrimination to the process for other forms of discrimination like race and religion.

The EEOC data, as my colleague from Virginia pointed out, is available, and if you do not report this data, you could have gross disparities. You could pay all the men one thing and all the women less, and until that is reported, nobody might notice.

Madam Chair, there are pay gaps. Discrimination still exists, and this legislation is one step in closing that pay gap. We need to pass the legislation.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, our Republican colleagues say the Paycheck Fairness Act is unnecessary, a boon for trial attorneys and a burden on employers, but once again the latest numbers tell a different story. American women continue to lag far behind fair pay for equal work.

The latest numbers from the U.S. Census Bureau once again revealed that American

women working full-time, year-round, are typically paid only 80 cents for every dollar paid to their male counterparts. The pay gaps are even more severe for women of color: 61 cents for African American women and 53 cents for Latina women.

Women take home less money than they have rightfully earned in every industry, no matter what they do, how high their level of education, or where they are from.

Not only is this a matter of basic equality, economic justice and freedom, it also compounds and is a significant issue impacting women's retirement security.

The Paycheck Fairness Act provides a long-overdue remedy to the 1963 Equal Pay Act. It will give women the tools needed to successfully challenge pay discrimination and to incentivize employers to comply with the law.

I urge all my colleagues to support its passage.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chair, I rise today to voice my support for H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act. The purpose of this legislation is simple: ensuring all women are rewarded with equal pay for equal work. The landmark Equal Pay Act of 1963 has helped us to achieve progress in this crucial policy area, but the Equal Pay Act, enacted over a half-century ago, is out of date and out of touch with today's business world. The Paycheck Fairness Act makes necessary and common-sense improvements to this historic law so that we can take another step toward eradicating gender-based wage discrimination.

Most importantly, this bill seeks to make equal pay a reality for women of color. Race and gender wage gaps harm not just the economic security of women but also of their families. A woman of color who works full time, year round, can lose more than \$1 million in income over a 40-year career because of the wage gap. Currently, black women earn \$0.60 for every dollar earned by their white male counterparts. Native American women earn \$0.57 to every dollar, and Latina women earn \$0.54. Meanwhile, white women and Asian women earn \$0.79 and \$0.87, respectively. This wage gap has not improved for years and continues to squeeze women's pocketbooks, erode their earning potential, and deprive them of the means to improve their own lives and support their families.

It is long past time to update the Equal Pay Act to give working women the legal tools they need to challenge sex-based pay discrimination and to encourage employers to comply with the law. The Paycheck Fairness Act sets forth a path toward achieving those goals.

I urge members of the House to pass this critical legislation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act—a modest, common-sense solution to the problem of pay inequity.

Equal pay for equal work is not only a core value of mine and others—it's the law. Full implementation of that principle, however, remains elusive.

The Paycheck Fairness Act, which was first introduced in 1997 and passed the House of Representatives with bipartisan support in 2009, is a serious initiative to realize the noble goal of true equality.

Among its provisions, this legislation would: Encourage businesses to rely on information about the market value of a position, industry standards, the duties of the job, and their

budgets in order to set salaries, by prohibiting reliance on the prior salary history of prospective employees.

Allow workers to share their personal salary information free from retaliation, with common-sense exceptions for FIR professionals.

Improve research on the gender pay gap by instructing Department of Labor (DOL) to conduct studies and review available research and data to provide information on how to identify, correct, and eliminate illegal wage disparities.

Assist the DOL in uncovering wage discrimination by requiring the collection of wage data from federal contractors, and direct the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) to conduct a survey of available wage information and create a system of wage data collection.

Support small businesses with technical assistance by providing support to all businesses to help them with their equal pay practices.

Momentum has continued to build, with more than 260 diverse organizations signing a letter in support of the bill, including the U.S. Women's Chamber of Commerce, which represents business associations and groups across the country, and the Main Street Alliance, a national network of small business owners.

Madam Chair, according to the National Partnership for Women and Families, if the disparity in median annual earnings for women and men working full-time, year-round were closed, women would have over \$10,000 more in earnings each year. For millennial women, closing this gender wage gap could add up to more than \$1,000,000 in lost income over a career.

This not only impacts these women immensely, but also directly impacts those with families. Over 62 percent of two-parent, married households with children, have both parents employed, which means these families would add \$10,000 more to their family's total earnings per year.

Madam Chair, this bill makes good economic sense. Companies are recognizing the benefits and the power of women's increased economic participation, and some have already enacted policies similar to those outlined in the Paycheck Fairness Act. Companies like Staples and Amazon have ended inquiries into job applicants' salary histories to avoid importing prior pay discrimination into their wage setting process. These moves are directly aligned with the Paycheck Fairness Act's provision banning reliance on salary history in determining future pay, so that prior pay discrimination doesn't follow workers from job to job.

We have also seen a movement, spearheaded by investors, to motivate companies to disclose their pay data. After a gender pay shareholder proposal from the investment management firm Arjuna Capital, Citigroup publicly released the results of its pay equity review in 2018 covering a third of its global workforce, and another, more comprehensive review, in 2019. This data release went even further than the Paycheck Fairness Act's provisions, which would only require that companies give this summary information to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), not the public.

According to a 2017 report from the Institute for Women's Policy Research, the poverty rate for all working women would be cut in half if

women were paid the same as men. The same study indicates the U.S. economy would have produced an additional \$512.6 billion in income if women had received equal pay for equal work. With 64 percent of mothers being the primary, sole, or co-breadwinners of their families, equal pay for women means America's families are better off.

Ensuring women have equal pay would have a significant positive impact on our families and our economy and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-8 modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 116-19. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 7

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 "Paycheck Fairness Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Women have entered the workforce in record numbers over the past 50 years.

(2) Despite the enactment of the Equal Pay Act of 1963, many women continue to earn significantly lower pay than men for equal work. These pay disparities exist in both the private and governmental sectors.

(3) In many instances, the pay disparities can only be due to continued intentional discrimination or the lingering effects of past discrimination. After controlling for educational attainment, occupation, industry, union status, race, ethnicity, and labor force experience roughly 40 percent of the pay gap remains unexplained.

(4) The existence of such pay disparities—

(A) depresses the wages of working families who rely on the wages of all members of the family to make ends meet;

(B) undermines women's retirement security, which is often based on earnings while in the workforce;

(C) prevents women from realizing their full economic potential, particularly in terms of labor force participation and attachment;

(D) has been spread and perpetuated, through commerce and the channels and instrumentalities of commerce, among the workers of the several States;

(E) burdens commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce;

(F) constitutes an unfair method of competition in commerce;

(G) tends to cause labor disputes, as evidenced by the tens of thousands of charges filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission against employers between 2010 and 2016;

(H) interferes with the orderly and fair marketing of goods in commerce; and

(I) in many instances, may deprive workers of equal protection on the basis of sex in violation of the 5th and 14th Amendments to the Constitution.

(5)(A) Artificial barriers to the elimination of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex continue to exist decades after the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000a et seq.).

(B) These barriers have resulted, in significant part, because the Equal Pay Act of 1963 has not worked as Congress originally intended. Improvements and modifications to the law are necessary to ensure that the Act provides effective protection to those subject to pay discrimination on the basis of their sex.

(C) Elimination of such barriers would have positive effects, including—

(i) providing a solution to problems in the economy created by unfair pay disparities;

(ii) substantially reducing the number of working women earning unfairly low wages, thereby reducing the dependence on public assistance;

(iii) promoting stable families by enabling all family members to earn a fair rate of pay;

(iv) remedying the effects of past discrimination on the basis of sex and ensuring that in the future workers are afforded equal protection on the basis of sex; and

(v) ensuring equal protection pursuant to Congress' power to enforce the 5th and 14th Amendments to the Constitution.

(6) The Department of Labor and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission carry out functions to help ensure that women receive equal pay for equal work.

(7) The Department of Labor is responsible for—

(A) collecting and making publicly available information about women's pay;

(B) ensuring that companies receiving Federal contracts comply with anti-discrimination affirmative action requirements of Executive Order 11246 (relating to equal employment opportunity);

(C) disseminating information about women's rights in the workplace;

(D) helping women who have been victims of pay discrimination obtain a remedy; and

(E) investigating and prosecuting systemic gender based pay discrimination involving government contractors.

(8) The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is the primary enforcement agency for claims made under the Equal Pay Act of 1963, and issues regulations and guidance on appropriate interpretations of the law.

(9) Vigorous implementation by the Department of Labor and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, increased information as a result of the amendments made by this Act, wage data, and more effective remedies, will ensure that women are better able to recognize and enforce their rights.

(10) Certain employers have already made great strides in eradicating unfair pay disparities in the workplace and their achievements should be recognized.

SEC. 3. ENHANCED ENFORCEMENT OF EQUAL PAY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) BONA FIDE FACTOR DEFENSE AND MODIFICATION OF SAME ESTABLISHMENT REQUIREMENT.—Section 6(d)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "No employer having" and inserting "(A) No employer having";

(2) by striking "any other factor other than sex" and inserting "a bona fide factor other than sex, such as education, training, or experience"; and

(3) by inserting at the end the following:

"(B) The bona fide factor defense described in subparagraph (A)(iv) shall apply only if the employer demonstrates that such factor (i) is not based upon or derived from a sex-based differential in compensation; (ii) is job-related with respect to the position in question; (iii) is consistent with business necessity; and (iv) accounts for the entire differential in compensation at issue. Such defense shall not apply

where the employee demonstrates that an alternative employment practice exists that would serve the same business purpose without producing such differential and that the employer has refused to adopt such alternative practice.

“(C) For purposes of subparagraph (A), employees shall be deemed to work in the same establishment if the employees work for the same employer at workplaces located in the same county or similar political subdivision of a State. The preceding sentence shall not be construed as limiting broader applications of the term ‘establishment’ consistent with rules prescribed or guidance issued by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.”

(b) **NONRETALIATION PROVISION.**—Section 15 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 215) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “employee has filed” and all that follows and inserting “employee—

“(A) has made a charge or filed any complaint or instituted or caused to be instituted any investigation, proceeding, hearing, or action under or related to this Act, including an investigation conducted by the employer, or has testified or is planning to testify or has assisted or participated in any manner in any such investigation, proceeding, hearing or action, or has served or is planning to serve on an industry committee; or

“(B) has inquired about, discussed, or disclosed the wages of the employee or another employee;”;

(B) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) to require an employee to sign a contract or waiver that would prohibit the employee from disclosing information about the employee’s wages.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) Subsection (a)(3)(B) shall not apply to instances in which an employee who has access to the wage information of other employees as a part of such employee’s essential job functions discloses the wages of such other employees to individuals who do not otherwise have access to such information, unless such disclosure is in response to a complaint or charge or in furtherance of an investigation, proceeding, hearing, or action under section 6(d), including an investigation conducted by the employer. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the rights of an employee provided under any other provision of law.”

(c) **ENHANCED PENALTIES.**—Section 16(b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 216(b)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after the first sentence the following: “Any employer who violates section 6(d) shall additionally be liable for such compensatory damages, or, where the employee demonstrates that the employer acted with malice or reckless indifference, punitive damages as may be appropriate, except that the United States shall not be liable for punitive damages.”;

(2) in the sentence beginning “An action to”, by striking “the preceding sentences” and inserting “any of the preceding sentences of this subsection”;

(3) in the sentence beginning “No employees shall”, by striking “No employees” and inserting “Except with respect to class actions brought to enforce section 6(d), no employee”;

(4) by inserting after the sentence referred to in paragraph (3), the following: “Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law, any action brought to enforce section 6(d) may be maintained as a class action as provided by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.”; and

(5) in the sentence beginning “The court in”—

(A) by striking “in such action” and inserting “in any action brought to recover the liability prescribed in any of the preceding sentences of this subsection”; and

(B) by inserting before the period the following: “, including expert fees”.

(d) **ACTION BY SECRETARY.**—Section 16(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 216(c)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence—

(A) by inserting “or, in the case of a violation of section 6(d), additional compensatory or punitive damages, as described in subsection (b),” before “and the agreement”; and

(B) by inserting before the period the following: “, or such compensatory or punitive damages, as appropriate”;

(2) in the second sentence, by inserting before the period the following: “and, in the case of a violation of section 6(d), additional compensatory or punitive damages, as described in subsection (b)”;

(3) in the third sentence, by striking “the first sentence” and inserting “the first or second sentence”; and

(4) in the sixth sentence—

(A) by striking “commenced in the case” and inserting “commenced—

“(1) in the case”;

(B) by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) in the case of a class action brought to enforce section 6(d), on the date on which the individual becomes a party plaintiff to the class action.”

SEC. 4. TRAINING.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, subject to the availability of funds appropriated under section 11, shall provide training to Commission employees and affected individuals and entities on matters involving discrimination in the payment of wages.

SEC. 5. NEGOTIATION SKILLS TRAINING.

(a) **PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Labor, after consultation with the Secretary of Education, is authorized to establish and carry out a grant program.

(2) **GRANTS.**—In carrying out the program, the Secretary of Labor may make grants on a competitive basis to eligible entities to carry out negotiation skills training programs for the purposes of addressing pay disparities, including through outreach to women and girls.

(3) **ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.**—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, an entity shall be a public agency, such as a State, a local government in a metropolitan statistical area (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget), a State educational agency, or a local educational agency, a private nonprofit organization, or a community-based organization.

(4) **APPLICATION.**—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, an entity shall submit an application to the Secretary of Labor at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary of Labor may require.

(5) **USE OF FUNDS.**—An entity that receives a grant under this subsection shall use the funds made available through the grant to carry out an effective negotiation skills training program for the purposes described in paragraph (2).

(b) **INCORPORATING TRAINING INTO EXISTING PROGRAMS.**—The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education shall issue regulations or policy guidance that provides for integrating the negotiation skills training, to the extent practicable, into programs authorized under—

(1) in the case of the Secretary of Education, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.), the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.), the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), and other programs carried out by the Department of Education that the Secretary of Education determines to be appropriate; and

(2) in the case of the Secretary of Labor, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.), and other programs carried

out by the Department of Labor that the Secretary of Labor determines to be appropriate.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall prepare and submit to Congress a report describing the activities conducted under this section and evaluating the effectiveness of such activities in achieving the purposes of this section.

SEC. 6. RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND OUTREACH.

Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and periodically thereafter, the Secretary of Labor shall conduct studies and provide information to employers, labor organizations, and the general public concerning the means available to eliminate pay disparities between men and women, including—

(1) conducting and promoting research to develop the means to correct expeditiously the conditions leading to the pay disparities;

(2) publishing and otherwise making available to employers, labor organizations, professional associations, educational institutions, the media, and the general public the findings resulting from studies and other materials, relating to eliminating the pay disparities;

(3) sponsoring and assisting State, local, and community informational and educational programs;

(4) providing information to employers, labor organizations, professional associations, and other interested persons on the means of eliminating the pay disparities; and

(5) recognizing and promoting the achievements of employers, labor organizations, and professional associations that have worked to eliminate the pay disparities.

SEC. 7. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL AWARD FOR PAY EQUITY IN THE WORKPLACE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established the Secretary of Labor’s National Award for Pay Equity in the Workplace, which shall be awarded, on an annual basis, to an employer to encourage proactive efforts to comply with section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)), as amended by this Act.

(b) **CRITERIA FOR QUALIFICATION.**—The Secretary of Labor shall set criteria for receipt of the award, including a requirement that an employer has made substantial effort to eliminate pay disparities between men and women, and deserves special recognition as a consequence of such effort. The Secretary shall establish procedures for the application and presentation of the award.

(c) **BUSINESS.**—In this section, the term “employer” includes—

(1)(A) a corporation, including a nonprofit corporation;

(B) a partnership;

(C) a professional association;

(D) a labor organization; and

(E) a business entity similar to an entity described in any of subparagraphs (A) through (D);

(2) an entity carrying out an education referral program, a training program, such as an apprenticeship or management training program, or a similar program; and

(3) an entity carrying out a joint program, formed by a combination of any entities described in paragraph (1) or (2).

SEC. 8. COLLECTION OF PAY INFORMATION BY THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION.

Section 709 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-8) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f)(1) Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Commission shall provide for the collection from employers of compensation data and other employment-related data (including hiring, termination, and promotion data) disaggregated by the sex, race, and ethnic identity of employees.

“(2) In carrying out paragraph (1), the Commission shall have as its primary consideration the most effective and efficient means for enhancing the enforcement of Federal laws prohibiting pay discrimination. For this purpose, the Commission shall consider factors including the imposition of burdens on employers, the frequency of required reports (including the size of employers required to prepare reports), appropriate protections for maintaining data confidentiality, and the most effective format to report such data.

“(3)(A) For each 12-month reporting period for an employer, the compensation data collected under paragraph (1) shall include, for each range of taxable compensation described in subparagraph (B), disaggregated by the categories described in subparagraph (E)—

“(i) the number of employees of the employer who earn taxable compensation in an amount that falls within such taxable compensation range; and

“(ii) the total number of hours worked by such employees.

“(B) Subject to adjustment under subparagraph (C), the taxable compensation ranges described in this subparagraph are as follows:

“(i) Not more than \$19,239.

“(ii) Not less than \$19,240 and not more than \$24,439.

“(iii) Not less than \$24,440 and not more than \$30,679.

“(iv) Not less than \$30,680 and not more than \$38,999.

“(v) Not less than \$39,000 and not more than \$49,919.

“(vi) Not less than \$49,920 and not more than \$62,919.

“(vii) Not less than \$62,920 and not more than \$80,079.

“(viii) Not less than \$80,080 and not more than \$101,919.

“(ix) Not less than \$101,920 and not more than \$128,959.

“(x) Not less than \$128,960 and not more than \$163,799.

“(xi) Not less than \$163,800 and not more than \$207,999.

“(xii) Not less than \$208,000.

“(C) The Commission may adjust the taxable compensation ranges under subparagraph (B)—

“(i) if the Commission determines that such adjustment is necessary to enhance enforcement of Federal laws prohibiting pay discrimination; or

“(ii) for inflation, in consultation with the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

“(D) In collecting data described in subparagraph (A)(ii), the Commission shall provide that, with respect to an employee who the employer is not required to compensate for overtime employment under section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207), an employer may report—

“(i) in the case of a full-time employee, that such employee works 40 hours per week, and in the case of a part-time employee, that such employee works 20 hours per week; or

“(ii) the actual number of hours worked by such employee.

“(E) The categories described in this subparagraph shall be determined by the Commission and shall include—

“(i) race;

“(ii) ethnic identity;

“(iii) sex; and

“(iv) job categories, including the job categories described in the instructions for the Equal Employment Opportunity Employer Information Report EEO-1, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this subsection.

“(F) The Commission shall use the compensation data collected under paragraph (1)—

“(i) to enhance—

“(I) the investigation of charges filed under section 706 or section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)); and

“(II) the allocation of resources to investigate such charges; and

“(ii) for any other purpose that the Commission determines appropriate.

“(G) The Commission shall annually make publicly available aggregate compensation data collected under paragraph (1) for the categories described in subparagraph (E), disaggregated by industry, occupation, and core based statistical area (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget).”.

SEC. 9. REINSTATEMENT OF PAY EQUITY PROGRAMS AND PAY EQUITY DATA COLLECTION.

(a) BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS DATA COLLECTION.—The Commissioner of Labor Statistics shall continue to collect data on women workers in the Current Employment Statistics survey.

(b) OFFICE OF FEDERAL CONTRACT COMPLIANCE PROGRAMS INITIATIVES.—The Director of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs shall ensure that employees of the Office—

(1)(A) shall use the full range of investigatory tools at the Office's disposal, including pay grade methodology;

(B) in considering evidence of possible compensation discrimination—

(i) shall not limit its consideration to a small number of types of evidence; and

(ii) shall not limit its evaluation of the evidence to a small number of methods of evaluating the evidence; and

(C) shall not require a multiple regression analysis or anecdotal evidence for a compensation discrimination case;

(2) for purposes of its investigative, compliance, and enforcement activities, shall define “similarly situated employees” in a way that is consistent with and not more stringent than the definition provided in item 1 of subsection A of section 10–III of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Compliance Manual (2000), and shall consider only factors that the Office's investigation reveals were used in making compensation decisions; and

(3) shall implement a survey to collect compensation data and other employment-related data (including hiring, termination, and promotion data) and designate not less than half of all nonconstruction contractor establishments each year to prepare and file such survey, and shall review and utilize the responses to such survey to identify contractor establishments for further evaluation and for other enforcement purposes as appropriate.

(c) DEPARTMENT OF LABOR DISTRIBUTION OF WAGE DISCRIMINATION INFORMATION.—The Secretary of Labor shall make readily available (in print, on the Department of Labor website, and through any other forum that the Department may use to distribute compensation discrimination information), accurate information on compensation discrimination, including statistics, explanations of employee rights, historical analyses of such discrimination, instructions for employers on compliance, and any other information that will assist the public in understanding and addressing such discrimination.

SEC. 10. PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO PROSPECTIVE EMPLOYEES' SALARY AND BENEFIT HISTORY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 7 the following new section:

“SEC. 8. REQUIREMENTS AND PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO WAGE, SALARY, AND BENEFIT HISTORY.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be an unlawful practice for an employer to—

“(1) rely on the wage history of a prospective employee in considering the prospective employee for employment, including requiring that a prospective employee's prior wages satisfy minimum or maximum criteria as a condition of being considered for employment;

“(2) rely on the wage history of a prospective employee in determining the wages for such prospective employee, except that an employer may

rely on wage history if it is voluntarily provided by a prospective employee, after the employer makes an offer of employment with an offer of compensation to the prospective employee, to support a wage higher than the wage offered by the employer;

“(3) seek from a prospective employee or any current or former employer the wage history of the prospective employee, except that an employer may seek to confirm prior wage information only after an offer of employment with compensation has been made to the prospective employee and the prospective employee responds to the offer by providing prior wage information to support a wage higher than that offered by the employer; or

“(4) discharge or in any other manner retaliate against any employee or prospective employee because the employee or prospective employee—

“(A) opposed any act or practice made unlawful by this section; or

“(B) took an action for which discrimination is forbidden under section 15(a)(3).

“(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘wage history’ means the wages paid to the prospective employee by the prospective employee's current employer or previous employer.”.

(b) PENALTIES.—Section 16 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 216) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f)(1) Any person who violates the provisions of section 8 shall—

“(A) be subject to a civil penalty of \$5,000 for a first offense, increased by an additional \$1,000 for each subsequent offense, not to exceed \$10,000; and

“(B) be liable to each employee or prospective employee who was the subject of the violation for special damages not to exceed \$10,000 plus attorneys' fees, and shall be subject to such injunctive relief as may be appropriate.

“(2) An action to recover the liability described in paragraph (1)(B) may be maintained against any employer (including a public agency) in any Federal or State court of competent jurisdiction by any one or more employees or prospective employees for and on behalf of—

“(A) the employees or prospective employees; and

“(B) other employees or prospective employees similarly situated.”.

SEC. 11. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

(b) PROHIBITION ON EARMARKS.—None of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for purposes of the grant program in section 5 of this Act may be used for a congressional earmark as defined in clause 9(e) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 12. SMALL BUSINESS ASSISTANCE.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date that is 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE MATERIALS.—The Secretary of Labor and the Commissioner of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission shall jointly develop technical assistance material to assist small enterprises in complying with the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(c) SMALL BUSINESSES.—A small enterprise shall be exempt from the provisions of this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, to the same extent that such enterprise is exempt from the requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) pursuant to clauses (i) and (ii) of section 3(s)(1)(A) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 203(s)(1)(A)).

SEC. 13. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act, or in any amendments made by this Act, shall affect the obligation of employers and employees to fully comply with all applicable immigration laws, including being

subject to any penalties, fines, or other sanctions.

SEC. 14. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, an amendment made by this Act, or the application of that provision or amendment to particular persons or circumstances is held invalid or found to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, or the application of that provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 116-19. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX OF NORTH CAROLINA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 116-19.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 8.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 252, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In 2016, the Obama administration proposed adding employee pay data to the EEO-1 report, which is filed by certain employers specifying employee data by job category, ethnicity, race, and sex.

After strong concerns were raised about this misguided proposal by congressional Republicans, the Office of Management and Budget stopped it from going forward in August 2017. A Federal district court recently overturned OMB's stay on the data collection, which the administration will likely appeal.

The Obama administration scheme would have imposed an extremely costly and uniquely burdensome mandate on business owners, providing reams of proprietary data to the government for uses which were never adequately explained.

The Obama EEO-1 mandate would have increased the data fields provided by employers in each EEO report twentyfold, from 180 to 3,660. It was also estimated that adding employee pay data to the EEO-1 form would have brought the overall cost to employers of submitting the report to approximately \$700 million annually.

It is appropriate to compare the pay data collection provisions in H.R. 7 to the 2016 Obama scheme because H.R. 7, as modified by the Scott amendment printed in part A of the Rules Committee report, codifies much of the 2016 Obama administration mandate. In fact, H.R. 7 now includes 12 pay bands, the same number as in the Obama mandate, at the exact dollar amounts that were part of the Obama mandate.

Incredibly, H.R. 7's employee pay data mandate is even more extreme than the Obama proposal. In addition to collecting reams of employee pay data, the bill requires the EEOC to collect hiring, termination, and promotion data. How the EEOC would collect this kind of data and how business owners would comply is anyone's guess.

As with the previous scheme to expand the EEO-1, H.R. 7's provision raises many concerns. For one, H.R. 7 would pose significant threats to the confidentiality and privacy of employee pay data. For instance, the EEOC shares the EEO-1 data with the Department of Labor, which, in certain situations, might release data even if the EEOC would not.

Moreover, time and again we have seen massive and harmful data breaches of Federal agencies. Requiring the EEOC to collect pay data would create yet another valuable target, and H.R. 7 fails to adequately address the need for protection of employee data.

As with the Obama EEO-1 scheme, I also have concern regarding the data's lack of usefulness and whether the EEOC would be able to appropriately manage and interpret the massive amounts of employee pay data it would collect. I have already mentioned the burden of such a collection on employers.

For all these reasons, this amendment strikes the invasive, risky, and burdensome provision requiring the EEOC to collect employee compensation data from employers broken down by race, sex, and ethnicity. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Chair, before addressing the pending amendment, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for his leadership and also express my profound appreciation for my friend from Connecticut. She has been a tireless champion over the years for equal pay on behalf of those who have been discriminated against unfairly.

Madam Chair, I imagine that most of us agree that unfair pay discrimination needs to be stopped. Unfortunately, despite the progress we have made in offering greater opportunities to more and more Americans, pay discrimina-

tion persists, and, at times, it occurs in stealth ways that cannot be easily detected. That, in fact, is a key reason why I oppose this amendment.

Keeping this bill intact is necessary to prevent the kind of unfair discrimination that occurs when one employee is compensated less than another despite doing the same job just as well for just as long and with the same credentials.

I worked in the private sector for 13 years before coming to Congress. I know firsthand that unfair pay disparities still occur.

Across industries, I worked with employers to confront this inequality, to bring more women to the decision-making table and create work environments where people of any sex, gender, race, or ethnicity were truly empowered.

Pay discrimination derails a workplace. It holds back talent and undermines trust, a toxic mix for any business.

A key component of the Paycheck Fairness Act requires that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission collect wage data, disaggregated by sex, race, and national origin. This provision is particularly necessary to respond to the administration's attempt to block the EEOC from collecting data.

Earlier this month, the National Women's Law Center won an important case to reinstate the EEOC's ability to collect this data. Nevertheless, attacks on collecting data of this type continue. We should not make it easier to hide pay discrimination.

This provision is necessary to ensure that equal work does, in fact, lead to equal pay. It will reveal trends in hiring, compensation, and advancement, and it will expose sex-segregated jobs, and unequal salaries, benefits, or bonuses.

This provision is a critical component of the bill, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment and keep the bill intact.

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter from the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers in support of this legislation.

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF PROFESSIONAL & TECHNICAL ENGINEERS, AFL-CIO & CLC,

Washington, DC, March 26, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, On behalf of the 90,000 members represented by the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE), we are writing in support of H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act. Sponsored by Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro, this legislation will amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of gender-based discrimination in the payment of wages. With a floor vote scheduled this week, IFPTE urges you to vote for H.R. 7.

Today, women earn 80 cents to every one dollar earned by their male counterparts. It is even worse for African-American women, who earn only 61 cents on the dollar compared to white non-Hispanic men, while Hispanic and Latina women earn only 53 cents

on the dollar compared to white non-Hispanic men. While these glaring differences should be unacceptable in any day and age, the impact is even greater today with poverty rates among women recently reaching their highest peak in nearly two decades.

The problem of unequal pay for equal work spans every sector and all educational levels. According to a 2017 Department of Professional Employees (DPE, AFL-CIO) fact sheet, *Professional Women: A Gendered Look at Inequality in the U.S. Workforce*, women with a bachelor's degree or higher earned \$1,230 in median weekly wages in 2015, while men with a comparable education earned \$1,420. The DPE fact sheet also looked at wage disparities per occupational category and found that, without exception, women's wages lag far behind men. Despite comprising 55 percent of workers in professional and related occupations, women in those professions earn 28 percent less than men.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is aimed at closing the pay discrimination gap by strengthening the Equal Pay Act of 1963. This legislation will:

Clarify acceptable reasons for differences in pay to ensure that a wage gap is legitimate and truly a result of factors other than gender;

Allow for reasonable comparisons between employees to determine fair wages;

Prohibit employer retaliation against workers who inquire about employee wages in general, or disclose their own wage;

Provide women with the option to proceed in an opt-out class action lawsuit and allow women to receive punitive and compensatory damages for pay discrimination;

Increase training for Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) staff to better identify and handle wage disputes;

Require EEOC to develop regulations directing employers to collect wage data;

Require the Department of Labor to reinstate activities that promote equal pay (i.e. educational programs, technical assistance to employers, promoting research about pay disparities between men and women); and,

Establish salary negotiation skills training for women and girls.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is a long overdue bill to help close the pay gap suffered by women workers. IFPTE urges you to support H.R. 7.

Sincerely,

PAUL SHEARON,
President.

MATTHEW BIGGS,
*Secretary-Treasurer/
Legislative Director.*

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Chair, reporting this data allows the EEOC to see which employers have racial or gender pay gaps that differ significantly from the pay patterns of other employers in their industry and region.

To be clear, this pay data will not conclusively establish that any employer is violating the law, and it isn't intended to. What it will do is aggregate millions of data points to establish gender and racial pay patterns within job categories, industries, and localities, allowing identification of firms that significantly depart from those benchmarks that may warrant further analysis.

□ 1515

Simply put, we cannot end unfair pay discrimination if we don't have the data.

I join my colleague from North Carolina in celebrating a record number of

women entering the workforce, but let's compensate them fairly for their work, and let's use data to inform our decisions.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment and support the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 116-19.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 12, add at the end the following: "Pay disparities are especially severe for women and girls of color."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 252, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act, and I strongly support H.R. 7 and any effort to address the gender wage gap in this country.

A terrible disparity exists in our country. Women on average make 80 cents to every dollar made by their White male counterpart. What is worse is that it is not getting any better.

Last year, the gender wage gap actually grew for women of color. For every dollar made by their non-Hispanic White male counterpart, an African American woman makes 61 cents, a Native American woman makes 58 cents, and women who look like me, Latinas, make 53 cents on the dollar for similar work. That is less than the average woman in the 1960s.

Do I not work just as hard as my male counterparts? Do I deserve to make 53 cents on the dollar? And do I not have to support my family just as much as any man?

Because of the gender pay gap, Latinas lose an average of \$28,386. That amounts to more than \$1 million over her career.

To earn the same amount as her White non-Hispanic male colleagues, a Black woman must work until she is 86 years old. You cannot get those hours back, those years back, or those decades back.

The gender wage gap contributes to a wealth of disparity that makes it harder for people of color to get ahead.

In 2013, the median White household had about \$134,000 in total wealth. For the median Black household, it is \$11,000. That is a 13-to-1 ratio.

Addressing the gender wage gap is the first step to addressing larger

issues of pay parity among historically underserved groups.

My first amendment changes the findings section of the Paycheck Fairness Act to recognize the devastating impacts the wage gap has on women of color. We must acknowledge that the wage gap is not color blind. By failing to recognize the specific effect the wage gap has on women and girls of color, these impacts might go unnoticed.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, my colleague just said that Latina women are being paid 53 cents for every dollar a White man earns for the same work. That is currently illegal and should be reported.

My colleague may want to amend her statement on that, but I want to say again, paying a woman less than a man when they are both doing the same work is abhorrent and illegal.

Women deserve equal pay for equal work. That is why two Federal laws prohibit pay discrimination based on sex.

What Congress should be looking at are ways to expand opportunities for women in the workplace. H.R. 7, however, does nothing to help women. Instead, it is written to help trial lawyers.

Rather than treating sex discrimination charges with the seriousness they deserve, H.R. 7 is designed to make it easier for trial lawyers to bring more suits of questionable validity, which will siphon off money from settlements and jury awards to line the pockets of trial lawyers.

As we have said before, H.R. 7 offers no new or meaningful protections against pay discrimination.

The findings section in H.R. 7 to which this amendment is added already discusses women in the workplace and implies that the gender pay gap is largely caused by discriminatory acts. However, economic studies conducted by government and private entities alike consistently show that women make more holistic and discerning choices than men about managing work-life demands, placing an equal and sometimes higher value on life factors besides their paycheck as they make decisions about hours worked, overtime pursued, and promotions sought.

Those values and choices should be honored, Madam Chair. As such, the gender pay gap significantly shrinks when these choices and factors are taken into account.

Pay discrimination is a serious issue, but I do not believe this amendment will improve the bill or help to address pay discrimination in the workplace.

Madam Chair, I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Chair, I am prepared to close.

Madam Chair, my amendment shines a light on the plight of women and girls of color and sets the tone to take their struggle into account throughout the rest of the bill.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle might have never heard about retaliation, about blacklisting. When women have the courage to come forward and report these wage thefts and abuses, they are treated differently under current law. That is why this bill is important. That is why this amendment is important.

Madam Chair, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for introducing this bill, for her dedication to fair pay.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, again I say, Republicans abhor any type of discrimination, particularly pay discrimination against women.

Madam Chair, if H.R. 7 would help with the situation that my colleague described, we would be in favor of it. No woman should be discriminated against because she reports the fact that she is receiving unequal pay for work, but, again, H.R. 7 does nothing to help those situations. That is why we oppose it.

Madam Chair, H.R. 7 is not helping women; it is helping trial lawyers. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 116-19.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 14, line 3, insert “, with specific attention paid to women and girls from historically underrepresented and minority groups” after “disparities”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 252, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer a second amendment to H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

This amendment ensures that women and girls of color are included in the research, education, and outreach done by the Secretary of Labor.

The sad truth is that women, especially women of color, are still paid

less than their male counterparts for the same type of work. I know this because it happened to me.

One of my very first jobs was in a male-dominated industry, selling steel. It didn't matter that I performed as well, if not better, than my male colleagues. It didn't matter that I sold steel in three languages while they sold in just one. I would do my own data entry to get the job done, while they relied on an assistant. And when I needed to rush a shipment, I was not afraid to walk into the warehouse, pick the material, pack it, and send it to my customer. I was still paid less.

I had to leave that job that I loved because I wasn't getting my fair share. It was a shame then and it is a shame today.

On average, Latinas still get paid 53 cents to every dollar made by their White male colleagues for the same type of work.

Today, we can act to change this. By passing the Paycheck Fairness Act with my amendment, maybe young Latinas and other women of color will not have to suffer and share my experience.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, women deserve equal pay for equal work. In America, it is law codified in the Equal Pay Act and the Civil Rights Act.

Unfortunately, H.R. 7 is a false promise that creates opportunities and advantages for trial lawyers, not for working women, and the bill already requires new government studies.

□ 1530

H.R. 7 allows for undocumented compensatory and punitive damages, expands class actions, and makes it impossible to defend against a claim, when the pay difference at issue is legitimate. But the bill does not offer new protections for workers against pay discrimination.

Both government and nongovernment studies have shown that the gender pay gap significantly shrinks when certain choices and factors are included, such as choices made in managing work-life demands.

For example, a recent Harvard University study found that the gap in pay between female and male bus and train operators working for the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority was explained by the workplace choices that women and men make, rather than other factors such as discrimination. The Harvard study is noteworthy because the workplace characteristics of the female operators are entirely comparable to their male operators. All of the operators are represented by the same union, and all are covered by the same collective bargaining agreement.

We want to ensure the laws prohibiting pay discrimination are effective. However, this amendment, and the underlying provision in H.R. 7, are not going to be helpful in this regard.

We should strive to provide women and all workers more freedom, flexibility, and opportunities. I do not believe this amendment will help us achieve that goal.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Chair, my amendment will expand the Paycheck Fairness Act to ensure the Secretary of Labor is paying attention to specific issues and researching the wage gap; educating employers, the media, and labor organizations on these findings, specifically highlighting the impact on underrepresented groups; ensuring minorities are included in informational and educational outreach programs; and celebrating the accomplishments of employers who are leading the way to specifically address the gender gap issue for women of color.

By paying specific attention to women of color in their research, maybe, one day, we can fill that gap to recognize that diversity of perspective can be an asset.

I wonder how different my experience would have been if the Paycheck Fairness Act would have been in place at the time. Would I still have become a homeowner? Maybe. Would I still have been a successful mother of three sons? Maybe. Would I have been able to afford to pay for childcare? Maybe. These are the things that women in business and the workforce are having to deal with every single day.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Chair, I want to say, again: no one in the workplace should be discriminated against. No woman of color, no woman, should be discriminated against. Republicans are opposed to any discrimination, in pay or otherwise, but H.R. 7 is not going to fix that. If it were, we would be on board.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 116-19.

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amend section 3(a)(2) to read as follows:
(2) by striking “any other factor other than sex” and inserting “a bona fide business-related reason other than sex”; and
Page 6, strike lines 9 through 20.

Page 6, line 21, strike “(C)” and insert “(B)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 252, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, this amendment adds the language “a bona fide business-related reason” to make clear to the courts that the factor other than sex defense in the Equal Pay Act cannot be used as a loophole or excuse for using sex as a factor.

This amendment additionally strikes the remaining provisions of the underlying bill relating to applications of the factor other than sex defense.

These unnecessary provisions require that, even when an employer already shows the factor is other than sex, it must meet additional illogical and insurmountable burdens, effectively paving an unimpeded path to the promise of unlimited punitive and compensatory damages for trial lawyers.

In sum, this amendment strengthens current law and eliminates the new and untested concepts the underlying bill imposes on employers. It would make it impossible for an employer to defend any difference in pay, even when based on any number of legitimate job-related factors.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WILD. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the Byrne amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WILD. Madam Chair, don't be mistaken. This amendment is a clear attempt to undermine the fundamental objectives of the Paycheck Fairness Act, which are to engender pay disparity by, in part, further clarifying congressional intent so that courts can no longer dismiss meritorious claims.

The Paycheck Fairness Act fixes current employment discrimination and pay discrimination laws, laws that have proven insufficient, given that women still earn 80 cents on the dollar compared to similarly situated White men. And, of course, the disparity for women of color is even greater.

Under the current Equal Pay Act, an employer is not liable for gender pay disparity if the disparity is due to merit, seniority, quality of production or “a factor other than sex.” Some courts have interpreted the “factor other than sex” criteria so broadly that it frustrates the codified intent of the Equal Pay Act.

For instance, some courts have found that the “factor other than sex” need not be business related or even related to the particular job in question. Some courts have interpreted the “factor other than sex” defense to include “market forces,” or worse, accepted the argument that pay disparity can be explained by an employer's “random decision.”

Those interpretations are nothing more than a lifesaver for pretextual

discrimination. This amendment does the same thing.

My Republican colleagues' suggestion that the Paycheck Fairness Act eliminates the “factor other than sex” defense is contradicted by the text of this bill. An employer may still raise a “factor other than sex” defense provided that the “factor other than sex” be bona fide, job related, and required by business necessity.

This amendment's attempt to strike section (3)(a)(3), which explains what constitutes a bona fide factor, is an attempt to create ambiguity so that courts continue to interpret the act's protection in a narrow way.

This bill provides necessary clarity that this bona fide factor defense is only available when there is a real business necessity. This bill ensures that there is a connection between the pay disparity and the specific job in question. This amendment is contrary to the congressional intent of the underlying bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chair, I was listening to the gentlewoman talk and I don't know that she has read my amendment, because my amendment actually solves the problem that she poses. There are some circuits that have given opinions just exactly as she said. What my amendment does is substitute for those decisions the bona fide business-related reason, which has been decided by a number of circuits. It is very clear. There is nothing amorphous about it. Practitioners in this area, like myself, understand exactly what it means. It actually solves the problem posed by the gentlewoman and makes it a lot better than what is in the underlying bill.

The problem with the underlying bill is that it injects amorphous new things that we don't have any idea what they would mean. What my amendment does is it actually makes it clear and solves the very problem that she stated in her presentation.

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

Ms. WILD. Mr. Chairman, this bill clarifies that the “factor other than sex” is only available on a bona fide job-related and business necessary reason.

It clarifies that this defense is not available where the employee demonstrates that a reasonable alternative employment practice would serve the same business purpose without producing a pay disparity and that the employer refused to adopt such an alternative practice.

Carefully consider those words. This is a burden-shifting provision that would simply allow an employee to show a reasonable alternative. It adds nothing to an employer's existing burden. It only allows an employee to rebut that defense with evidence.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentlewoman had to say. I was listening very carefully to her. I think she does have it confused, however, because it does inject an additional burden for employers that is not in the law right now and it does provide a ton of unclarity with regard to what they are going to have to do to comply with it. And I think my use of the bona fide business-related reason is going to inject the clarity we need and actually protect plaintiffs more than what is in the bill.

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

Ms. WILD. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important, given that we are having a discussion here over who understands the text of the bill, to read it directly into the RECORD.

“The bona fide factor defense, described in subparagraph (A)(iv) shall apply only if the employer demonstrates that such factor (i) is not based upon or derived from a sex-based differential in compensation; (ii) is job related with respect to the position in question; (iii) is consistent with business necessity; and, (iv) accounts for the entire differential in compensation at issue.”

It is very clearly set forth in the text.

Mr. Chairman, I, therefore, continue to urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the Byrne amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the gentlewoman. I don't think she understands what that language actually means, how it has actually been interpreted by the courts, and how it may be totally misinterpreted against plaintiffs in these types of lawsuits.

What my amendment does is actually strengthen the hand of parties that have a clear understanding of what they are trying to accomplish there, either the plaintiffs or the defendants. It is an improvement in the bill for plaintiffs and defendants. We should all be for this, not against it. I don't want to go tit for tat with her on everything, but I do think she misunderstands both the amendment and the underlying bill.

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

Ms. WILD. Mr. Chairman, I think it is my colleague from Alabama who is confused about the wording of this text. His amendment would specifically eliminate the wording that I just read into the RECORD.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas). The gentleman from Alabama has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, once again, I heard what she read into the RECORD. I already read that. I understand exactly what it says. I think maybe I haven't made myself clear:

The underlying bill injects clarity into the law, which hurts plaintiffs in their cases. This will hurt women in bringing their cases. It will take years to try to get clarity through the court system, if we ever get clarity. That hurts plaintiffs in these lawsuits.

Defendants like to throw up unclarity. So I guess, perhaps, if you wanted to argue from that point of view, let's have a confusing bill. I am going to get clarity into the bill that actually helps women. And it is the irony of this whole proceeding that the bill that is supposed to help women, that they say is going to help women, hurts them. I am trying to help women with my amendment.

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

□ 1545

Ms. WILD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment eliminates clarity. It simply replaces it with the words "bona fide," with no additional definition or guidance, thereby ensuring that this defense will continue to be misunderstood, misused, and incorrectly applied by the courts.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, this language is consistent with how nearly all circuit courts of appeal have interpreted this factor.

"Bona fide business-related reason" is not an empty phrase. For example, in one case where the employer alleged that the difference in pay was based on the higher paid person's participation in a bona fide skills development program, the court carefully examined the program to determine whether it was legitimate and, in fact, found that it was not.

This amendment helps women. If you want to help women in the workforce, this amendment does it. Their bill doesn't.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 116-19.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee for Congresswoman WATERS to offer her amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 13, line 23, insert after "women" the following: "(including women who are Asian American, Black or African-American, Hispanic American or Latino, Native American or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and White American)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 252, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, what a moment of tremendous pride it is to be here in the 116th Congress under a Democratic majority as we finally pass the Paycheck Fairness Act.

I rise in strong support of this bill, and I thank Chairman SCOTT for his tremendous leadership in shepherding this bill to the floor.

I also thank the author of H.R. 7, Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO, who has been a champion for women's rights her entire career. The Paycheck Fairness Act is a testament to her tireless dedication to the eradication of the gender pay gap, and it is by her leadership that we are here today on the verge of obtaining a more equitable workforce.

I also thank Congresswoman WATERS, who has long advocated for and fought for pay equity and been a beacon of courage for women across this country.

We passed the Equal Pay Act in 1963, which made it illegal to discriminate based on sex when men and women are performing jobs that require substantially equal effort, skill, and responsibility. We followed that up with title 7 of the Civil Rights Act, which, among other things, made it illegal to discriminate based on sex. And then 10 years ago, we passed the Lilly Ledbetter Act, which made it clear that every single inadequate paycheck a woman receives is a new act of discrimination. And yet, inequality persisted.

Today, women are paid, on average, only 80 cents for every dollar paid to men, resulting in a gap of \$10,169 per woman, per year. And that pay gap doesn't discriminate. It exists in all occupations, locales, and regardless of education or work history.

The Paycheck Fairness Act seeks to eliminate this gap by picking up where the Equal Pay Act of 1963 left off and strengthening protections for women in the workplace against retaliation, discriminatory screening, and legal obstacles to justice. This amendment to H.R. 7 will ensure that the data collected on behalf of the legislation will be inclusive of all races and ethnicities.

Pursuant to section 6 of H.R. 7, the Secretary of Labor must conduct studies as well as provide information to employers and the general public concerning the means by which gender pay disparities can be eliminated. These studies are a critical step forward towards closing the pay gap.

This amendment would clarify that these Department of Labor studies mandated by section 6 of the underlying bill must include not just information regarding pay disparities between men and women generally, but specifically for women of every racial and ethnic background.

Mr. Chairman, in order to empower all women, we must continue to highlight the specific barriers faced by and

the needs of women of color in the workforce.

In 2017, the gender wage gap widened for women of color. While research found that women made 80 cents for every dollar paid to White, non-Hispanic men, women of color fared much worse than average: Black women were paid only 61 cents for every dollar paid to White men; Native American women were paid 58 cents; and Latina women were paid only 53 cents.

That means that this year, Equal Pay Day, the date that marks how long women have to work into the year to earn what their White male counterparts earned in the previous calendar year, falls on April 2. But for Black women, Equal Pay Day isn't until August 22. Native American women's Equal Pay Day falls on September 23, and Latinas have to work nearly 11 full months into 2019 before they will see their Equal Pay Day on November 20. That is true economic injustice.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, once again, it is wrong to discriminate, including with respect to pay, based on sex. It is also illegal to do so under both the Equal Pay Act of 1963 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Everyone, Republicans and Democrats alike, supports equal pay for equal work because, when workers thrive, America thrives, but H.R. 7 does not further this goal.

Democrats claim H.R. 7 will improve upon these existing and bipartisan laws to create new avenues for women to fight pay discrimination. What H.R. 7 actually does is create new avenues for trial lawyers to earn higher paychecks—while dragging countless women into unwanted lawsuits.

Of the 2.8 million jobs created in the past year, more than 58 percent have gone to women.

Today, there are 74.9 million working women in the United States, more than ever before; and one in five employer businesses, nationwide, is owned by women.

We celebrate workers who choose to give priority to professional success and promotion, but it is equally important to show that we value freedom and diversity of choice in the workplace.

It is not the job of Federal lawmakers to tell American workers of either sex what their priorities should be. A number of economic studies conducted by government and private entities alike consistently show that women make more holistic and discerning choices than men about managing work-life demands.

The new government studies mandated by H.R. 7 will likely tell us what we already know and that our colleagues will not acknowledge: that

work patterns and life decisions are key to explaining the wage gap, and that the wage gap shrinks considerably when factors such as hours worked per week, industry, occupation, work experience, job tenure, and preferences for nonwage benefits are considered.

In addition to opening countless avenues for trial lawyer payouts while limiting employer defenses, H.R. 7 mandates intrusive and elaborate data collection from employers, breaking down compensation, hiring, termination, and promotion data by sex, race, and national origin of employees—that will cost about \$700 million a year.

Rather than expending taxpayer dollars on expanding studies, Federal lawmakers should promote a continued focus on strong economic policy, education, and innovation that will create opportunities and expand options for all American workers.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, better information allows us to develop better policy solutions, and that is all this amendment does: collects more information to address an unacceptable inequality. By mandating that the studies conducted by the Department of Labor explicitly address and include women of color in particular, we can ensure that no one is left behind.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the gathering of this valuable information and vote “yes” on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it has been a long road to get here, but today, women across the country of every race and ethnicity can stand tall and know that we value their work equally.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, we believe women should not be discriminated against. We don't want women discriminated against, women of any category in this country, and this amendment is not necessary and neither is H.R. 7.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the amendment and “no” on the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that the amendment No. 6 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 116–19.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In subsection (f) of section 709 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–8), as pro-

posed to be added by section 8, add at the end the following:

“(3) The compensation data under paragraph (1) shall be collected from each employer that—

“(A) is a private employer that has 100 or more employees, including such an employer that is a contractor with the Federal Government, or a subcontractor at any tier thereof; or

“(B) the Commission determines appropriate.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 252, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as a small business owner and employer, I understand the value of data because you can't improve what you don't measure. So my amendment, which I offer with Representative ILHAN OMAR, exempts employers with fewer than 100 employees from reporting compensation data and only requires those with more than 100 to do so.

Employers already report workforce data by race, sex, and ethnicity across 10 different job categories in their annual EEO–1 submission to the EEOC. So collecting this data simply ensures equal pay for equal work. If employers value the standard, this is an easy start.

I am very grateful to Chairman SCOTT and the leadership on the amendments to strengthen pay data collection and to Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO for her years and years of effort on this.

Persistent pay gaps exist in the U.S. workforce to correlate with sex, race, and ethnicity. The Congress has found that 64.6 percent of the wage gap can be explained by three factors: experience, industry, and occupation, the things my good friend from North Carolina pointed out. But the remaining 35 percent can't be explained by these differences.

Federal law specifically prohibits men and women from being paid differently for work, but enforcement of this mandate is impeded by a lack of knowledge—no data, not reliable data, especially data by sex and by race. This is a barrier to closing the persistent pay gap for women and minorities.

All we are really asking here is to be able to provide the data so that business leaders can make the good decisions and so that employees can discover if they are being unfairly paid. They have a right, then, to ask.

For over 50 years, companies have used the EEO–1 form to report. Earlier today, we have heard that this will represent an unfair burden on businesses.

While virtually every business I know—even those with two, three, and four employees—find ways to outsource paycheck preparation, almost all of this has been digitized. But to be extra cautious and make sure that we are

not providing any burden on small business, this amendment would exempt those with 100 employees or less.

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

□ 1600

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I reserve the right to change my mind based on what I hear from my colleague from Virginia.

Mr. Chair, I do have great respect for my colleague from Virginia, and I appreciate the fact that this amendment recognizes the very serious problem with H.R. 7 by applying the expansive government data collection mandate only to business owners with 100 or more employees. However, the forced data collection scheme in the underlying bill, even with this amendment, is still extremely misguided.

H.R. 7 requires business owners to, for the first time ever, submit reams of pay data to the EEOC, broken down by job category, race, sex, and ethnicity. Moreover, the collection must also include hiring, termination, and promotion data, which even the Obama administration's 2016 pay data collection scheme did not include.

This data collection mandate raises several concerns.

First, it puts at risk volumes of highly confidential pay data involving millions of individual workers. We all know the widespread data breaches the Federal Government has suffered.

Second, the EEOC will not be able to manage or properly use this data. It has never been explained what exactly the EEOC will do with this data.

Third, this mandate is overly burdensome. The data cells required from business owners when they file an employer information report, EEO–1, with the EEOC will expand from 180 cells to 3,660. It has been estimated that the new reams of pay data added to the EEO–1 will cost business owners \$700 million annually.

Although this amendment would spare some business owners from the mandate, the serious flaws in this data collection mandate make the provision in the underlying bill not worth saving.

If the pay data collection mandate is not worth applying to smaller firms, then perhaps it should be reconsidered entirely. What is good for the goose is good for the gander.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wanted to speak during general debate, but I will take this time to speak on behalf of this legislation and also to rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the American people entrusted Democrats with the majority in part because we pledged to work hard on the issues they care about most, issues affecting their everyday lives.

I am the father of three daughters. They are all extraordinary people. I want them all treated based upon the content of their character, their performance, and the duties that they perform, not on the fact that they happen to be daughters and not sons.

One of the issues we pledged to address was raising wages, and that includes addressing the gender pay gap, which keeps women from earning their fair share and hurts families, children, and all people.

The last time I was the majority leader, which was from 2007 to 2011, we enacted the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act to make it easier for women who have faced discriminatory pay and benefits to seek justice.

Lilly Ledbetter had worked hard, and she did not know that she was being paid less than her counterparts doing exactly the same thing she was doing, with exactly the same responsibility and exactly the same expectations. There was no justice in that, but she didn't know it. The Supreme Court said, well, you didn't raise the issue quickly enough.

We also passed the Paycheck Fairness Act in that same Congress, but, unfortunately, the Senate failed to enact it as well.

Now we return to this important work of ensuring equal pay for equal work. Who, intellectually, can oppose that concept? Who, with any sense of fairness and fair play, could oppose that concept and precept?

It is shameful, Mr. Chairman, that, in 2019, 56 years after President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act, we are here fighting for equal pay. A half century later, women still earn, on average, 80 cents to a man's dollar, and, very frankly, minority women earn less than that. That gap is even worse for minorities. Two-thirds of women are now either the primary breadwinners or co-breadwinners in their households.

Make no mistake, this is an economic concern for families across our country. This is not a woman's issue. It is a fairness issue. It is an every family, every person issue.

Democrats ran on a platform of raising wages, as I said. We are focused on making sure that more working families can make it in America. That is what this bill will help achieve.

I am proud that every member of the Democratic Caucus—let me repeat that, every member—234 members of the Democratic Caucus have signed on as cosponsors of this bill because we believe it is fair; because we believe it is right; because we believe it is good for families; and, yes, because we believe it is good for the American economy.

ROSA DELAURO is on the floor, and I want to thank the gentlewoman. We

hear the phrase, "Keep the faith." ROSA DELAURO has kept the faith year after year, not only with women of America, but with the families and children of America who rely on women's wages for the quality of their lives, and their partners', and their spouses'.

I thank the gentlewoman, ROSA DELAURO, for all that she has done for our country in keeping the faith.

I also thank my dear friend and my colleague from my neighboring State of Virginia, Chairman BOBBY SCOTT, for his faithfulness, for his focus, and for his bringing this bill to the floor so early in our session.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to observe April 2, which is Equal Pay Day. It is a day symbolizing how far into the year women must work to earn what men earned in the previous year—essentially, 3 months of free labor. Not in this body, because we are all paid the same in this body. We comply with this bill. That is the good news.

The bad news is, women, on average, have to work not 12 months but 15 months to earn what men earn in 12 months. That is what that language meant.

I urge my colleagues to vote today to make this the last Equal Pay Day and pass this bill to ensure the promise of economic equality for all.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all—drop the "men"—that all are created equal. That view maybe self-evident, but it is not self-executing. Let us act upon it today.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire as to how much time I have remaining, and how much time the gentleman from Virginia has remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 2¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have said it I don't know how many times today. I will say it one more time. Republicans are opposed to pay discrimination. We have always been opposed to pay discrimination. We have always been for the rights of others.

The first Republican President in this country was the leader that ended slavery in this country. Republicans have been for civil rights. We have been for equal pay. We support the rights of all citizens to be treated equally. We have all said that, every Republican who has spoken here.

This bill does not do that. I believe that the gentleman from Virginia's amendment proves that this is a damaging bill, because he wants to spare smaller companies from the very damaging impacts of the pay data collection mandate.

That, in a way, is discriminatory in itself because there is a feeling that it is okay for big businesses to pay the cost of this, but it is not okay for small businesses to pay the cost of this. In a

way, this amendment itself damns the bill.

As our colleague from Maryland says, I hope that every business owner in America will note that every Democrat is a cosponsor of this bill. I hope that word gets out loud and clear across the country, particularly among business owners.

I will say that this amendment to spare smaller companies makes the teeniest, tiniest improvement to this bill, and, therefore, I will support it, although I don't believe the bill will go anywhere in the Senate.

It is my hope that, again, that points out the discriminatory nature and the terrible aspects of this bill to all business and industry in the country. It doesn't help the underlying bill in terms of the other businesses and industries.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from North Carolina for supporting this amendment, and I thank my friend from North Carolina for clearly stating a number of times today that Democrats and Republicans are both committed to equal pay for men and for women.

I think our differences just come down to how we accomplish that, because 50 years after the Equal Pay Act was signed, there are still significant differences, despite our joint commitment to equal pay.

If unequal pay continues to persist, how do we address it? We simply say that the collection of data to the EEO-1 is the best way to move forward. The employers with less than 100 have been exempted from the very beginning of the EEO-1 report, so this is simply consistent with that and recognizes that, to get meaningful data, sometimes you need more than a handful of people. That is, 6 or 10 or 12 people don't necessarily give you an apples-to-apples comparison. When you get more than 100, you can do it.

The government already collects the sensitive data. It has done it for years without privacy concerns. My friend pointed out there may be 3,200 or 3,600 categories. Right now, with deep learning and machine learning, this is something that takes a microsecond to do. This is very easy. We are now in an intellectual and digital world where we can have the EEO discover which companies have persistent patterns of pay inequity, and it really works.

All our offices have pay transparency. When I am trying to figure out how much to pay a legislative correspondent or legislative director or front office, I know that everyone can go online and figure out what everyone else is making. That is a powerful incentive for us to make sure that people are paid fairly and paid equally. All we are trying to do is bring the same transparency to American businesses across the country.

Mr. Chair, I thank my friend for her support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

□ 1615

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MRS. LAWRENCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 116–19.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In section 6, strike “Not later than” and insert “(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than”.

In section 6, add at the end the following:
(b) REPORT ON GENDER PAY GAP IN TEENAGE LABOR FORCE.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor, acting through the Director of the Women’s Bureau and in coordination with the Commissioner of Labor Statistics, shall—

(A) submit to Congress a report on the gender pay gap in the teenage labor force; and

(B) make the report available on a publicly accessible website of the Department of Labor.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(A) An examination of trends and potential solutions relating to the teenage gender pay gap.

(B) An examination of how the teenage gender pay gap potentially translates into greater wage gaps in the overall labor force.

(C) An examination of overall lifetime earnings and losses for informal and formal jobs for women, including women of color.

(D) An examination of the teenage gender pay gap, including a comparison of the average amount earned by males and females, respectively, in informal jobs, such as babysitting and other freelance jobs, as well as formal jobs, such as retail, restaurant, and customer service.

(E) A comparison of—

(i) the types of tasks typically performed by women from the teenage years through adulthood within certain informal jobs, such as babysitting and other freelance jobs, and formal jobs, such as retail, restaurant, and customer service; and

(ii) the types of tasks performed by younger males in such positions.

(F) Interviews and surveys with workers and employers relating to early gender-based pay discrepancies.

(G) Recommendations for—

(i) addressing pay inequality for women from the teenage years through adulthood, including such women of color;

(ii) addressing any disadvantages experienced by young women with respect to work experience and professional development;

(iii) the development of standards and best practices for workers and employees to ensure better pay for young women and the prevention of early inequalities in the workplace; and

(iv) expanding awareness for teenage girls on pay rates and employment rights in order

to reduce greater inequalities in the overall labor force.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 252, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would first like to thank Representative ROSA DELAURO for her hard work on H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act. This longstanding legislation which would ensure equal pay for equal work has been introduced in every single Congress since 1997.

As the chair of the Bipartisan Women’s Caucus, I am proud to support H.R. 7, meaningful legislation that would at a minimum ensure that workers are protected against gender-based pay discrimination, prevent retaliation against those who voluntarily discuss wages, eliminate loopholes which would allow institutional discrimination in pay; equalize remedies for gender-based discrimination; and prohibit salary history from dictating future pay.

Mr. Chair, my amendment is simple. While we debate the gender pay gap in the professional workplace, it is imperative that we understand how and when the pay gap begins. For women, the gender-based wage gap typically emerges in the teenage years and only increases with time. My amendment will require the Secretary of Labor and the Commissioner of Labor Statistics to submit a report to Congress that studies the teenage pay gap and provide recommendations to address it.

A 2018 study cited in The Washington Post reported that the gender-based wage gap emerges well before adulthood, leading to long-term effects on lifetime earnings and economic mobility. The economic impacts of the gender-based wage gap are even greater for women of color.

Teenagers are a substantial but often understudied part of our workforce. Many teenagers, not out of just wanting something to do, but out of necessity or because of their financial situation, work part-time while in school and sometimes enter the workforce, unfortunately, as early as 12 years old. To truly address the wage gap, we need to have a better way to identify the root of these gaps.

This report would provide the statistics necessary to uncover why this pay gap exists and the best ways to remedy the inconsistency. If women are raised in a culture where they believe they are not equal to men, the disparity that exists will never be broken. We must work to end that mindset now.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, in America, discriminating in pay based on sex is illegal as codified in the Equal Pay Act and the Civil Rights Act.

Democrats claim H.R. 7 will improve upon these bipartisan laws to create new opportunities for women to fight pay discrimination. What H.R. 7 actually does is create new opportunities for trial lawyers to earn higher paychecks. Similarly, while this amendment appears to be marketed as assisting young women, this paternalistic approach undermines young women’s abilities and pigeonholes them into stereotypical roles.

This amendment directs the Secretary of Labor to conduct a study on the gender pay gap in the teenage labor force and then to report recommendations to Congress, including recommendations to expand awareness, specifically for teenage girls, on pay grades and employment rights. I am tempted to call this the babysitting amendment because it additionally asks the Department of Labor to spend taxpayer dollars to compare amounts earned by men and women in informal jobs such as babysitting.

This amendment could also be called the in loco parentis amendment, because it is parents who should be teaching their children about the benefits of hard work and education and the importance of a first job, which is often a minimum wage job. We don’t need the government coming in and telling children and parents what their children should be doing. These initial jobs help to teach teenagers important skills that will stay with them their entire lives.

American women of all ages are skilled, they are smart, and today they are driving the American economy. Of the 2.8 million jobs created in the last year, more than 58 percent have gone to women. One in five employer businesses is owned by women; and we are seeing more young women than men earning college degrees.

I support equal pay for equal work, which is rightfully required under two Federal statutes. Congress should focus on policies that will continue to increase economic opportunity and expand options for all workers. This amendment and the underlying bill fails in this regard.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I would really feel challenged to think that my colleague is unaware that there are young girls who are teenagers who work in restaurants and in other capacities, not because their parents want them to have activities but because they are literally trying to survive and feed themselves and sometimes their brothers and sisters, and to say that it is not necessary for us to have data and not just stand at a mike as an elected official and make assumptions based on your own privilege of life.

I think it is imperative that we look at the data, and here I am saying that—before I can say and validate the status of teenage girls—I would want statistics and reports so that we can truly address the inequality that girls often get, and the mindset that a little boy who is out working, he needs the pay and often is given a larger amount of money versus a girl—and every girl is not a babysitter, but if we want to call this the babysitter amendment, I will accept it.

As we work to address the pay gap, it is important that we do not forget our new generation of leaders, and it is about breaking a cycle, about having a young girl who is working, and she understands that I have value and that I too should be paid an equal pay.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I know that my colleague was not on the floor earlier when I spoke and told of my need to work even before I was a teenager, and I worked for survival. So I know that she did not know that and did not know that I do not take lightly the fact that many young people in this country are like I was and working to help support their families so that they have food and they are able to survive.

I do not take lightly anyone's work in this country, not anyone. I worked hard all my life, and I have always wanted to be paid equally with men, and I know there were times I was not. So I understand that. I never want to see anyone discriminated against in this country. I particularly never want to see a woman discriminated against for equal pay when she is doing the job that a man is doing.

I wish with all my heart that we were improving on the Equal Pay Act and the Civil Rights Act and helping to make things better for women with H.R. 7. We are not. We are lining the pockets of trial lawyers and in many cases will be harming women. This amendment stereotypes young women because it mentions babysitting. That is where the stereotypes come in, in this amendment, and that is unfortunate.

We do have a younger generation, and we have women who can do any job that any man can do, and she should be paid equally for it. But neither this study nor this bill is going to guarantee that.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 116–19.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, line 23, insert after “employee” the following: “(such as by inquiring or discussing with the employer why the wages of the employee are set at a certain rate or salary)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 252, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me start by saying it is a privilege to be able to stand on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives in this year, in this term, and in this session of Congress to participate in the debate and the discussion and to offer an amendment on this historic bill, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

I would like to first thank my friend and colleague, the chairman of the committee, BOBBY SCOTT from Virginia, for his leadership on this issue and this bill. I want to recognize the decades' long work of my colleague from Connecticut, Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO, on the underlying bill and her efforts, along with many other women, including Maryland's former Senator Barbara Mikulski to finally ensure that women are paid and treated fairly in the workplace.

My amendment would enhance pay transparency protections in this bill. This amendment would make it unlawful for an employer to discriminate against an employee for simply discussing or inquiring why they are being paid a certain wage or salary.

Mr. Chairman, if you found out that you were being paid less than your colleagues for the same work, you would probably demand to be paid more. But for too long, it has been considered taboo to discuss your salary with your coworkers let alone confront your boss if you were being paid unfairly.

When pay is transparent, organizations must be able to justify each employee's salary, thus reducing or eliminating any type of bias.

That is why the Paycheck Fairness Act puts transparency front and center and why my amendment goes a little further and gives every employee the right to negotiate the higher pay.

Since Congress has not been able to act over the past several years, States have led the way in promoting pay transparency, including California, Illinois, Louisiana, and my State of Maryland. In Maryland we added very broad pay transparency protections to ensure employees the ability to discover and discuss disparities in pay, and we even expanded prohibitions against discriminatory pay practices to include gender identity, an item that I would hope that this Congress may take up later this session.

But my amendment today reiterates the importance of transparency in the

workplace. Every employee should be able to advocate and negotiate for themselves without fear of reprisal. According to the Carnegie Mellon study, men are four times more likely than women to ask for a raise, and when women do ask, they typically request 30 percent less than men do.

We should be encouraging employees, regardless of their gender, to inquire and discuss disparities in pay with their employers and advocate for themselves if they aren't being paid fairly or if it is simply time they received a well-deserved raise.

□ 1630

Mr. Chairman, at a time when wages are not rising fast enough, Congress must ensure every working American is paid equally and fairly and is empowered throughout their salary negotiation process.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Pay discrimination on the basis of sex is wrong, and it also, importantly, violates two Federal statutes.

Retaliation by an employer against an employee for pursuing reasonable discussion or inquiry regarding potentially discriminating compensation is wrong, and it, too, is illegal.

However, like the rest of this bill, the expanded nonretaliation provision in H.R. 7 goes too far, and this amendment takes it even further.

Under current law, those who inquire about, discuss, or disclose compensation information in a reasonable manner and with a good faith belief that an unlawful pay disparity may exist are protected from retaliation. However, the underlying provision in H.R. 7 regarding pay disclosures and discussion has no limits at all.

The inquiry, discussion, and disclosure allowed under this bill is not required to be reasonable nor related to any perceived pay disparity and raises serious privacy concerns for all employees, especially in the age of social media.

H.R. 7 takes away an employee's ability to control disclosure of information about their own pay. It also limits an employer's ability to protect what should be confidential information about employees.

Congress should focus on policies that promote opportunity and options for all workers. This amendment does not further this purpose.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to protect workers' privacy rights by opposing this amendment and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chair, unfortunately, historically, the cloak of confidentiality has often been the shield used by employers to discriminate against women when it comes to paycheck fairness.

I encourage all my colleagues to support my amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, once again, I reiterate my opposition to the underlying bill and to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 116-19 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 406, noes 24, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

AYES—406

Abraham	Castro (TX)	Doyle, Michael
Adams	Chabot	F.
Aderholt	Cheney	Duffy
Aguilar	Chu, Judy	Duncan
Allred	Cicilline	Dunn
Amash	Cisneros	Emmer
Armstrong	Clark (MA)	Engel
Arrington	Clarke (NY)	Escobar
Axne	Clay	Eshoo
Bacon	Cleaver	Españat
Baird	Cline	Estes
Balderson	Cloud	Evans
Banks	Clyburn	Finkenauer
Barr	Cohen	Fitzpatrick
Barragán	Cole	Fleischmann
Bass	Collins (GA)	Fletcher
Beatty	Collins (NY)	Flores
Bera	Comer	Fortenberry
Bergman	Conaway	Foster
Beyer	Connolly	Fox (NC)
Bilirakis	Cook	Frankel
Bishop (GA)	Cooper	Fudge
Bishop (UT)	Correa	Fulcher
Blumenauer	Costa	Gabbard
Blunt Rochester	Courtney	Gaetz
Bonamici	Cox (CA)	Gallagher
Bost	Craig	Gallego
Boyle, Brendan	Crenshaw	Garamendi
F.	Crist	Garcia (IL)
Brady	Crow	Garcia (TX)
Brindisi	Cuellar	Gianforte
Brooks (AL)	Cummings	Gibbs
Brooks (IN)	Cunningham	Gohmert
Brown (MD)	Curtis	Golden
Brownley (CA)	Dauids (KS)	Gomez
Buchanan	Davidson (OH)	Gonzalez (OH)
Buck	Davis (CA)	Gonzalez (TX)
Bucshon	Davis, Danny K.	González-Colón
Budd	Davis, Rodney	(PR)
Burgess	Dean	Gooden
Bustos	DeFazio	Gottheimer
Butterfield	DeGette	Graves (LA)
Byrne	DeLauro	Graves (MO)
Calvert	DelBene	Green (TN)
Carbajal	Delgado	Green (TX)
Cárdenas	Demings	Griffith
Carson (IN)	DeSaulnier	Grijalva
Carter (GA)	Deutch	Grothman
Cartwright	Diaz-Balart	Guest
Case	Dingell	Guthrie
Casten (IL)	Doggett	Haaland
Castor (FL)		Hagedorn

Harder (CA)	Marchant	Schiff
Harris	Marshall	Schneider
Hartzler	Massie	Schrader
Hastings	Mast	Schrier
Hayes	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Heck	McAdams	Scott, Austin
Herrera Beutler	McBath	Scott, David
Hice (GA)	McCarthy	Sensenbrenner
Higgins (LA)	McCaul	Serrano
Higgins (NY)	McClintock	Sewell (AL)
Hill (AR)	McCollum	Shalala
Hill (CA)	McEachin	Sherman
Himes	McGovern	Sherrill
Holding	McHenry	Shimkus
Hollingsworth	McKinley	Simpson
Horn, Kendra S.	McNerney	Sires
Horsford	Meadows	Slotkin
Houlahan	Meeks	Smith (MO)
Hoyer	Meng	Smith (NE)
Hudson	Meuser	Smith (NJ)
Huffman	Miller	Smith (WA)
Huizenga	Mitchell	Smucker
Hunter	Moolenaar	Soto
Hurd (TX)	Moore	Spanberger
Jackson Lee	Morelle	Spano
Jayapal	Moulton	Speier
Jeffries	Mucarsel-Powell	Stanton
Johnson (GA)	Mullin	Stauber
Johnson (LA)	Murphy	Stefanik
Johnson (OH)	Nadler	Steil
Johnson (SD)	Napolitano	Steube
Johnson (TX)	Neal	Stevens
Jordan	Neguse	Stewart
Joyce (OH)	Newhouse	Stivers
Joyce (PA)	Norcross	Suozzi
Kaptur	Norton	Swalwell (CA)
Katko	Nunes	Takano
Keating	O'Halleran	Taylor
Kelly (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez	Thompson (CA)
Kelly (MS)	Olson	Thompson (MS)
Kelly (PA)	Omar	Thompson (PA)
Kennedy	Palazzo	Thornberry
Khanna	Pallone	Timmons
Kildee	Panetta	Tipton
Kilmer	Pappas	Titus
Kim	Pascrell	Tlaib
Kind	Payne	Tonko
King (NY)	Pence	Torres (CA)
Kinzinger	Perlmutter	Torres Small
Kirkpatrick	Perry	(NM)
Krishnamoorthi	Peters	Trahan
Kuster (OH)	Peterson	Trone
Kustoff (TN)	Phillips	Turner
LaHood	Pingree	Underwood
LaMalfa	Pocan	Upton
Lamb	Porter	Van Drew
Lamborn	Posey	Vargas
Langevin	Pressley	Veasey
Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)	Vela
Larson (CT)	Quigley	Velázquez
Latta	Raskin	Visclosky
Lawrence	Reed	Wagner
Lawson (FL)	Reschenthaler	Walberg
Lee (CA)	Rice (NY)	Walden
Lee (NV)	Richmond	Walorski
Lesko	Roby	Waltz
Levin (CA)	Rodgers (WA)	Wasserman
Levin (MI)	Roe, David P.	Schultz
Lewis	Rogers (AL)	Watkins
Lieu, Ted	Rogers (KY)	Watson Coleman
Lipinski	Rooney (FL)	Weber (TX)
Loeb sack	Rose (NY)	Webster (FL)
Lofgren	Rose, John W.	Welch
Long	Rouda	Westerman
Loudermilk	Roybal-Allard	Wexton
Lowenthal	Ruiz	Wild
Lowe y	Ruppersberger	Williams
Lucas	Rush	Wilson (FL)
Luetkemeyer	Rutherford	Womack
Lujan	Ryan	Woodall
Luria	Sablan	Wright
Lynch	Sánchez	Yarmuth
Malinowski	Sarbanes	Yoho
Maloney,	Scalise	Young
Carolyn B.	Scanlon	Zeldin
Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky	

NOES—24

Allen	Gossar	Rice (SC)
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Rigglesman
Babin	Hern, Kevin	Rouzer
Biggs	King (IA)	Roy
Burchett	Mooney (WV)	Schweikert
Carter (TX)	Norman	Walker
Crawford	Palmer	Waters
Ferguson	Ratcliffe	Wenstrup

NOT VOTING—7

DesJarlais	Radewagen	Wittman
Granger	San Nicolas	
Plaskett	Wilson (SC)	

□ 1702

Messrs. SCHWEIKERT, MOONEY of West Virginia, FERGUSON, RIGGLEMAN, and PALMER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. COLE, BUCSHON, GIBBS, BISHOP of Utah, GAETZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Messrs. BROOKS of Alabama, WEBER of Texas, LAMBORN, and CLOUD changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "YEA" on rollcall No. 132.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE) having assumed the chair, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 252, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, in its present form, I am.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Foxx of North Carolina moves to recommit the bill H.R. 7 to the Committee on Education and Labor with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

In section 3(c)(5)—

(1) strike “and” at the end of subparagraph (A);

(2) redesignate subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(3) insert after subparagraph (A), the following:

(B) by inserting after “defendant” the following: “(except that any contingent attorney’s fees shall not exceed 49 percent of any judgment awarded to the plaintiff or plaintiffs)”; and

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I am here to offer a motion to recommit that is about honesty.

It is about making sure this bill does what my Democrat colleagues say it will do, and that is help victims of wage discrimination on the basis of sex.

It is about making sure that any woman who experiences unfair and illegal wage discrimination just because she is a woman doesn’t go through all the hardship of a legal battle only to see her lawyer walk away with even more of her money.

With this motion to recommit, if a plaintiff has entered into a contingency fee arrangement in Equal Pay Act litigation, the attorney’s contingency fee, including costs, will not exceed 49 percent of the judgment awarded to the plaintiff.

If adopted, it will ensure that the individual who has brought the claim actually receives a majority of the judgment and that the attorney doesn’t collect the lion’s share.

The authors of H.R. 7 failed to include in the text any new legal protections for workers against discrimination. Instead, the bill alters the Equal Pay Act to allow unlimited compensatory damages even when there is no intentional discrimination, and unlimited punitive damages. It also expands class action lawsuits.

H.R. 7 makes it impossible in many cases for employers to defend against Equal Pay Act claims even when there is a legitimate business reason for a pay differential.

H.R. 7 creates special incentives and awards for trial lawyers.

For working women who have been taken advantage of by their bosses, it sets them up to lose out again.

H.R. 7 encourages trial lawyers to file more lawsuits of questionable validity and to drive workers into the suits without their knowledge for the purpose of siphoning off the new pool of unlimited compensatory and punitive damages created by H.R. 7, lining their own pockets at the expense of plaintiffs.

A similar amendment capping lawyers’ contingency fees at 15 percent was offered by Mr. BYRNE when H.R. 7

was considered in committee. Every Democrat on the Education and Labor Committee opposed this modest change.

If this amendment is adopted, trial lawyers will have to somehow make due with 49 percent of the overall judgment, and we all know that trial lawyers siphon off more than this amount in many of their class action cases.

Victims of true pay discrimination should be the true beneficiaries of any judgment in their favor. This amendment will help ensure this outcome in Equal Pay Act cases.

Madam Speaker, supporters of H.R. 7 say the bill is about helping victims of pay discrimination. If that is true, then all Members should support this reasonable proposal.

All we are asking is that if our colleagues are so intent on giving trial lawyers a bigger piece of the pie, then consider giving working women more than a few crumbs.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, I am opposed to all caps on attorney’s fees in this type of case.

The only criteria for the amount of attorney’s fees charged should be reasonableness in the context of the case itself.

I have spent more than 30 years in courtrooms, most of that time representing the defense in civil matters, almost always for companies; in other words, against the very trial lawyers we speak of.

So I have no bias in favor of those lawyers, but let me tell you this: representing plaintiffs in employment cases is a very hard job. These lawyers work for every penny they earn. They take cases that put their own livelihood at risk.

Many employment cases take years to resolve. Often they have to go to court over and over to litigate discovery and pretrial matters, and all the while, they are not collecting a paycheck from that case, because they have taken it on a contingent fee basis.

Without an award at the end of the case, they receive nothing, and they advance out-of-pocket expenses.

But even more important, without these lawyers, low-income female employees with legitimate grievances would have no recourse. Only with a competent lawyer’s help can they proceed.

This motion, if passed, would discourage lawyers from taking these cases. And if they don’t take these cases, employees, workers, families lose out.

The only test for attorney’s fees should be reasonableness. Courts and judges are well equipped to determine whether a fee is reasonable, far better equipped than Congress is.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Ms. SHERRILL).

□ 1715

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the motion to recommit offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

There are few things that define us as a country more distinctly than the idea that anyone can make it here through hard work and dedication. That dream rests on giving people a fair shot.

Right now, too many people in this country just aren’t getting a fair shot, and women in this country face additional barriers because they simply are not paid equally for their work.

Madam Speaker, this bill, H.R. 7, supports paycheck fairness because equal pay for equal work is about respect, and in New Jersey we know respect. I know what paycheck fairness looks like because we just passed it in New Jersey. It is high time that Congress ensures these commonsense values for the rest of the women across this country.

I have listened to objections raised today that women already have protections for equal pay. Well, let me assure you that the protections in our laws are not adequate.

I rise today, Madam Speaker, for women who are earning just 80 cents on every dollar. I rise for our African American women who are only earning 61 cents on the dollar. I rise today for Hispanic women who are only earning 53 cents on the dollar.

Madam Speaker, I rise today for American women and for their families so we can give them a fair shot, like a woman in my district who, despite being a single mom helping to pay off her children’s college debt, was passed over for a raise because her male coworker had a family to support, or another who found that she was being paid less than her male coworkers after years of performing the same job and with the same seniority. And, Madam Speaker, I am fighting today for my two daughters so they have the same opportunities and the same rights as my two sons.

In the House, we know what our coworkers are making. We can look it up. We need our constituents to have that same opportunity.

Madam Speaker, I have joined my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in the past on their motions. I believe deeply in the need for this body to come together today to focus on issues that matter to our families. It is time for my colleagues to now join me, because supporting women, supporting families, and supporting the American Dream is a shared value.

I know in New Jersey the equal pay bill passed with broad bipartisan support. In fact, in the entire State senate

and assembly, there were only two people who voted against it.

If there were ever a moment, if there were ever a bill, if there were ever a time to put obstruction aside, it is now. The motion put forth has nothing to do with equal pay, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 236, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 133]

AYES—191

Abraham	Gibbs	Mitchell
Aderholt	Gohmert	Moolenaar
Allen	Gonzalez (OH)	Mooney (WV)
Amodei	Gooden	Mullin
Armstrong	Gosar	Newhouse
Arrington	Graves (GA)	Norman
Babin	Graves (LA)	Nunes
Bacon	Graves (MO)	Olson
Baird	Green (TN)	Palazzo
Balderson	Grothman	Palmer
Banks	Guest	Pence
Barr	Guthrie	Perry
Bergman	Hagedorn	Posey
Biggs	Harris	Ratcliffe
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Hern, Kevin	Reschenthaler
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Rice (SC)
Brady	Hice (GA)	Riggleman
Brooks (AL)	Higgins (LA)	Roby
Brooks (IN)	Hill (AR)	Rodgers (WA)
Buchanan	Holding	Roe, David P.
Buck	Hollingsworth	Rogers (AL)
Bueshon	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Budd	Huizenga	Rooney (FL)
Burchett	Hunter	Rose, John W.
Burgess	Hurd (TX)	Rouzer
Byrne	Johnson (LA)	Roy
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Rutherford
Carter (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Carter (TX)	Jordan	Schweikert
Chabot	Joyce (OH)	Scott, Austin
Cheney	Joyce (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Cline	Katko	Shimkus
Cloud	Kelly (MS)	Simpson
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Smith (MO)
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Smith (NE)
Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Comer	Kinzinger	Smucker
Conaway	Kustoff (TN)	Spano
Cook	LaHood	Stauber
Crawford	LaMalfa	Stefanik
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Steil
Curtis	Latta	Steube
Davidson (OH)	Lesko	Stewart
Davis, Rodney	Long	Stivers
Diaz-Balart	Loudermilk	Taylor
Duffy	Lucas	Thompson (PA)
Duncan	Luetkemeyer	Thornberry
Dunn	Marchant	Timmons
Emmer	Marshall	Tipton
Estes	Massie	Turner
Ferguson	Mast	Upton
Fitzpatrick	McCarthy	Wagner
Fleischmann	McCaul	Walberg
Flores	McClintock	Walden
Fortenberry	McHenry	Walker
Foxx (NC)	McKinley	Walorski
Fulcher	Meadows	Waltz
Gallagher	Meuser	Watkins
Gianforte	Miller	Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
Axne
Barragan
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Spano
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)

Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright

NOES—236

Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlihan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nader
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran

Yoho
Young
Zeldin

Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

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

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 187, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

YEAS—242

Adams	Gabbard	Mucarsel-Powell
Aguilar	Gallego	Murphy
Allred	Garamendi	Nadler
Axne	Garcia (IL)	Napolitano
Barragan	Garcia (TX)	Neal
Bass	Golden	Neguse
Beatty	Gomez	Norcross
Bera	Gonzalez (TX)	O'Halleran
Beyer	Gottheimer	Ocasio-Cortez
Bishop (GA)	Green (TX)	Omar
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Pallone
Blunt Rochester	Haaland	Panetta
Bonamici	Harder (CA)	Pappas
Boyle, Brendan	Hastings	Pascrell
F.	Hayes	Payne
Brindisi	Heck	Pelosi
Brown (MD)	Higgins (NY)	Perlmutter
Brownley (CA)	Hill (CA)	Peters
Bustos	Himes	Peterson
Butterfield	Horn, Kendra S.	Phillips
Carbajal	Horsford	Pingree
Cárdenas	Houlihan	Pocan
Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Porter
Cartwright	Huffman	Pressley
Case	Hurd (TX)	Price (NC)
Casten (IL)	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Castor (FL)	Jayapal	Raskin
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Reed
Chu, Judy	Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)
Cicilline	Johnson (TX)	Richmond
Cisneros	Kaptur	Rose (NY)
Clark (MA)	Keating	Rouda
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Kennedy	Ruiz
Cleaver	Khanna	Ruppersberger
Clyburn	Kildee	Rush
Cohen	Kilmer	Ryan
Connolly	Kim	Sánchez
Cooper	Kind	Sarbanes
Correa	Kirkpatrick	Scanlon
Costa	Krishnamoorthi	Schakowsky
Courtney	Kuster (NH)	Schiff
Cox (CA)	Lamb	Schneider
Craig	Langevin	Schradler
Crist	Larsen (WA)	Schrier
Crow	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Cuellar	Lawrence	Scott, David
Cummings	Lawson (FL)	Serrano
Cunningham	Lee (CA)	Sewell (AL)
Davids (KS)	Lee (NV)	Shalala
Davis (CA)	Levin (CA)	Sherman
Davis, Danny K.	Levin (MI)	Sherrill
Davis, Rodney	Lewis	Simpson
Dean	Lieu, Ted	Sires
DeFazio	Lipinski	Slotkin
DeGette	Loeb sack	Smith (NJ)
DeLauro	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
DelBene	Lowenthal	Soto
Delgado	Lowe	Spanberger
Demings	Lujan	Speier
DeSaulnier	Luria	Stanton
Deutch	Lynch	Stevens
Dingell	Malinowski	Suozi
Doggett	Maloney,	Swalwell (CA)
Doyle, Michael	Carolyn B.	Takano
F.	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (CA)
Engel	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Escobar	McAdams	Titus
Eshoo	McBath	Tlaib
Españillat	McCollum	Tonko
Evans	McEachin	Torres (CA)
Finkenauer	McGovern	Torres Small
Fitzpatrick	McNerney	(NM)
Fletcher	Meeks	Trahan
Foster	Meng	Trone
Frankel	Moore	Underwood
Fudge	Morelle	Van Drew
Gabbard	Moulton	Vargas

NOT VOTING—4

DesJarlais
Granger

Griffith
Wilson (SC)

□ 1727

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Veasey	Wasserman	Wexton
Vela	Schultz	Wild
Velázquez	Waters	Wilson (FL)
Visclosky	Watson Coleman	Yarmuth
	Welch	

NAYS—187

Abraham	Gosar	Olson
Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Palazzo
Allen	Graves (LA)	Palmer
Amash	Graves (MO)	Pence
Amodi	Green (TN)	Perry
Armstrong	Griffith	Posey
Arrington	Grothman	Ratcliffe
Babin	Guest	Reschenthaler
Bacon	Guthrie	Rice (SC)
Baird	Hagedorn	Riggleman
Balderson	Harris	Roby
Banks	Hartzler	Rodgers (WA)
Barr	Hern, Kevin	Roe, David P.
Bergman	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)
Biggs	Hice (GA)	Rogers (KY)
Bilirakis	Higgins (LA)	Rooney (FL)
Bishop (UT)	Hill (AR)	Rose, John W.
Bost	Holding	Rouzer
Brady	Hollingsworth	Roy
Brooks (AL)	Hudson	Rutherford
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga	Scalise
Buchanan	Hunter	Schweikert
Buck	Johnson (LA)	Scott, Austin
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Sensenbrenner
Budd	Johnson (SD)	Shimkus
Burchett	Jordan	Smith (MO)
Burgess	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NE)
Byrne	Joyce (PA)	Smucker
Calvert	Katko	Spano
Carter (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Stauber
Carter (TX)	Kelly (PA)	Stefanik
Chabot	King (IA)	Steil
Cheney	King (NY)	Steube
Cline	Kinzinger	Stewart
Cloud	Kustoff (TN)	Stivers
Cole	LaHood	Taylor
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Thompson (PA)
Collins (NY)	Lamborn	Thornberry
Comer	Latta	Timmons
Conaway	Lesko	Tipton
Cook	Long	Turner
Crawford	Loudermilk	Upton
Crenshaw	Lucas	Wagner
Curtis	Luetkemeyer	Walberg
Davidson (OH)	Marchant	Walden
Duffy	Marshall	Walker
Duncan	Massie	Walorski
Dunn	Mast	Waltz
Emmer	McCarthy	Watkins
Estes	McCaul	Weber (TX)
Ferguson	McClintock	Webster (FL)
Fleischmann	McHenry	Wenstrup
Flores	McKinley	Westerman
Fortenberry	Meadows	Williams
Foxx (NC)	Meuser	Wittman
Fulcher	Miller	Womack
Gaetz	Mitchell	Woodall
Gallagher	Moolenaar	Wright
Gianforte	Mooney (WV)	Yoho
Gibbs	Mullin	Young
Gohmert	Newhouse	Zeldin
Gonzalez (OH)	Norman	
Gooden	Nunes	

NOT VOTING—3

DesJarlais	Granger	Wilson (SC)
------------	---------	-------------

□ 1735

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table H. Res. 245 and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 245

Resolved,

SECTION 1. COMMITTEE EXPENSES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives, in accordance with this primary expense resolution, not more than the amount specified in subsection (b) for the expenses (including the expenses of all staff salaries) of each committee named in such subsection.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$11,513,328; Committee on Armed Services, \$16,350,222; Committee on the Budget, \$10,380,424; Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, \$3,781,500; Committee on Education and Labor, \$14,578,714; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$21,147,384; Committee on Ethics, \$7,015,392; Committee on Financial Services, \$17,077,862; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$16,240,724; Committee on Homeland Security, \$15,308,002; Committee on House Administration, \$10,644,422; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$12,463,000; Committee on the Judiciary, \$15,860,594; Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress, \$487,500; Committee on Natural Resources, \$13,895,926; Committee on Oversight and Reform, \$18,990,068; Committee on Rules, \$6,654,378; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$11,079,654; Committee on Small Business, \$6,196,296; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$17,830,330; Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, \$8,276,384; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$18,266,864.

SEC. 2. FIRST SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2019, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2020.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$5,756,664; Committee on Armed Services, \$8,175,111; Committee on the Budget, \$5,190,212; Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, \$1,890,750; Committee on Education and Labor, \$7,289,357; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$10,573,692; Committee on Ethics, \$3,507,696; Committee on Financial Services, \$8,538,931; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$8,120,362; Committee on Homeland Security, \$7,654,001; Committee on House Administration, \$5,172,211; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$6,231,500; Committee on the Judiciary, \$7,930,297; Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress, \$450,000; Committee on Natural Resources, \$6,947,963; Committee on Oversight and Reform, \$9,495,034; Committee on Rules, \$3,327,189; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$5,539,827; Committee on Small Business, \$3,098,148; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$8,915,165; Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, \$4,138,192; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$9,133,432.

SEC. 3. SECOND SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount

specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2020, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2021.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$5,756,664; Committee on Armed Services, \$8,175,111; Committee on the Budget, \$5,190,212; Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, \$1,890,750; Committee on Education and Labor, \$7,289,357; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$10,573,692; Committee on Ethics, \$3,507,696; Committee on Financial Services, \$8,538,931; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$8,120,362; Committee on Homeland Security, \$7,654,001; Committee on House Administration, \$5,472,211; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$6,231,500; Committee on the Judiciary, \$7,930,297; Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress, \$37,500; Committee on Natural Resources, \$6,947,963; Committee on Oversight and Reform, \$9,495,034; Committee on Rules, \$3,327,189; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$5,539,827; Committee on Small Business, \$3,098,148; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$8,915,165; Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, \$4,138,192; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$9,133,432.

(c) REVIEW OF USE OF FUNDS IN FIRST SESSION.—

(1) REVIEW.—None of the amounts provided for in section 1 for a committee named in subsection (b) may be available for expenses of the committee after March 15, 2020, unless the chair or ranking minority member of the committee appears and presents testimony at a hearing of the Committee on House Administration held prior to such date to review the committee’s use of the amounts provided for in section 1 during the first session of the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress and to determine whether the amount specified in subsection (b) with respect to the committee should be updated on the basis of the review.

(2) WAIVER.—The Committee on House Administration may waive the application of paragraph (1) to any or all of the committees named in subsection (b).

SEC. 4. VOUCHERS.

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chair of such committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 6. RESERVE FUND FOR UNANTICIPATED EXPENSES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established a reserve fund for unanticipated expenses of committees for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress.

(b) AMOUNT.—The reserve fund under this section shall have a balance of \$8,000,000, of which—

(1) \$1,500,000 shall be available for unanticipated expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2019, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2020; and

(2) \$6,500,000 shall be available for unanticipated expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2020, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2021.

(c) ALLOCATION TO COMMITTEES.—Amounts in the reserve fund under this section shall be paid to a committee pursuant to an allocation approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 7. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.

The Committee on House Administration shall have authority to make adjustments in amounts under section 1, if necessary to comply with an order of the President issued under section 251A or 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or to conform to any change in appropriations for the purposes of such section 1.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, a commonsense bill to protect the smallest and most vulnerable among us, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, if this unanimous consent request can't be entertained, I urge the Speaker and the majority leader to immediately schedule the Born-Alive bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate at this time.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. I would ask that the—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate at this time.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1735

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1735.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 2019, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING HIS EXCELLENCY JENS STOLTENBERG, SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, April 3, 2019, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg, Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CRAIG). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING FLORENCE M. JOHNSON

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a community leader from Essex County, New Jersey, Ms. Florence M. Johnson. Ms. Johnson has been an exceptional leader across Essex County for the past four decades.

In the 1970s, she cofounded a housing development in East Orange, New Jersey, that was designed, built, and managed by African Americans—one of the first of its kind.

In the 1980s and 1990s, she was a trailblazing member of East Orange City Council.

In 2000, she joined the New Jersey Symphony Orchestra as an outreach and community engagement leader. At the New Jersey Symphony, Ms. Johnson led outreach to schools, churches, senior centers, and other organizations in order to make sure that the arts benefit everyone in the community.

This evening, she is being honored as a Hidden Figure in East Orange, New Jersey.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Ms. Florence M. Johnson for her leadership.

HONORING VIETNAM VETERANS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, tomorrow is National Vietnam War Veterans Day.

Madam Speaker, 46 years ago, March 29, 1973, the last combat troops were ordered out of Vietnam; and just 2 years ago, we designated March 29 as a national day to honor our Vietnam veterans.

Madam Speaker, in many instances, our Vietnam veterans often did not receive a warm welcome home when they returned from war. There were no parades, no welcome back ceremonies.

Our Vietnam veterans, many of whom were drafted, answered the Nation's call and served with honor and distinction.

Vietnam veterans constructed their own memorial here in Washington,

built entirely by private donations and dedicated to the 2.7 million servicemembers who served during the Vietnam war.

Madam Speaker, we all know someone who served in Vietnam. These veterans are our friends, our family, and neighbors. It is long overdue to salute them for their service, but it is not too late. This weekend, I will proudly be at the Cambria County War Memorial to mark this special day.

May God bless our Vietnam war veterans today, tomorrow, and every day. Welcome home.

□ 1745

SALTON SEA DROUGHT CONTINGENCY PLAN

(Mr. RUIZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address concerns about the Colorado River drought contingency plan and to sound the alarm and avoid a public health crisis at the Salton Sea in southern California.

To be clear, I support the goals of the DCP, which outlines voluntary water use cuts across seven Western States in the event of a worsening drought. However, I am concerned that the current proposal to implement the DCP provides an expansive waiver to the Bureau of Reclamation that could result in the reduction of water to the Salton Sea.

The Salton Sea is the largest inland body of water in all of California, and its very existence is already at risk. Ensuring the Salton Sea is protected as part of this agreement is critically important because, if the Salton Sea decline accelerates, thousands of lake beds will become exposed, subjecting residents of southern California to harmful dust that penetrates the lungs and can cause severe respiratory illness.

I look forward to working with the Natural Resources Committee to find a solution that prevents a broad waiver of Federal laws and that preserves water rights and critical environmental protections for its surrounding residents.

Madam Speaker, I support the goals of the DCP. However, I cannot in good conscience support implementation in a way that harms the Salton Sea or threatens the health of the people I serve.

CONSEQUENCES OF AIR FORCE RUNNING OUT OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDING

(Mr. GAETZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to raise the concerns of Floridians and Georgians who still await a supplemental appropriation from the Congress.

Every other major storm and disaster received a supplemental appropriation, but for some reason, victims of Hurricane Michael remain waiting.

The Air Force, expecting an appropriation, began the process of rebuilding Tyndall Air Force Base. This morning, the Air Force put out news that they have run out of O&M funds.

What does this mean? It means that, as of this morning, we have deferred 61 required facility projects at bases in 18 States across our country.

It means that, on May 1, we will stop work on Tyndall Air Force Base, failing to meet our obligations to rebuild.

It means that, on May 15, the Air Force will cut aircraft repairs, potentially endangering our pilots' safety when flying and limiting their training capacity.

Ultimately, it means that, on September 1, we will cut 18,000 training flying hours.

This is unacceptable in the current global environment. We must act now to ensure that the men and women serving in the Air Force are furnished with the tools to accomplish their missions.

This is our job as the Congress, and we need to do it immediately, since there are very few legislative days remaining before the Easter break.

WORLD WATER DAY

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise to commemorate World Water Day, just celebrated on March 22.

Water sustains life on Earth. It is critical to health, sanitation, food production, and the economy at large.

Tragically, over 2 billion people around our world lack access to safe drinking water, a humanitarian crisis. Some live in our country.

Limited access to freshwater is an ever-increasing risk to our national security as nations go to war over this precious resource. Meanwhile, terrorist organizations seek to control water resources to finance their destabilizing activities. That is why we must fully fund U.S. diplomatic leadership, to ensure that the looming conflicts over water can be nipped in the bud.

My own constituents in northern Ohio are acutely aware of how precious access to clean water can be. In the summer of 2014, fertilizer runoff led to massive clusters of harmful algae blooms in Lake Erie, compromising water supplies to over half a million residents of Toledo. Flint, Michigan, shortly thereafter, endured its own water crisis.

As the Appropriations Committee's Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee chair, I can assure you that our committee is working tirelessly to fight for improved infrastructure, environmental protections, and access to clean water.

Together, we will meet this crisis in our country and abroad and allow the

vital human right for freshwater to belong to everyone.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF BARBARA RICCA

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

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the passing of a dear friend and a model public servant from my district, Ms. Barbara Ricca of Newbury Township in Geauga County. Ms. Ricca passed away peacefully on Saturday morning, March 23, at the age of 95.

Barb proudly served as the legal secretary for Geauga County for over 30 years. She worked under five different prosecutors from both parties. In fact, when I became prosecutor, Barbara was my very first secretary.

She worked tirelessly until her retirement, but Barb did not retire from life. She worked just as hard as a volunteer at University Hospitals Geauga Medical Center and could be found baling hay on their family farm.

For relaxation, she played in the Great Geauga County Fair Band, of which she had been an original charter member since 1938. Most recently, I had the honor of pinning Barb at the Geauga County Fair to commemorate her 80th year of playing in the fair band.

Barb will not only be missed by her loving family and friends but by the entire Geauga County community.

May Barbara Ricca rest in peace.

CONGRATULATING FULLERTON COLLEGE BASKETBALL TEAM

(Mr. CORREA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, to my right is a picture of champs. I congratulate the Fullerton College men's basketball team for winning the State championship this last weekend.

This victory marks Fullerton College's fourth State championship title, but the first since 2006. This awesome performance is thanks to Coach Perry Webster and tournament MVP Lance Coleman, sophomore Rodrick McCobb, and the rest of the talented players.

I am honored to recognize these fine young men. These players are going to be role models, and they are going to be leaders in our community. These men have learned a lesson, which is that hard work and determination pay off.

These are our State champions. Congratulations to Coach Webster and the Hornets. They have earned this victory.

Go Hornets.

CONGRATULATING LAKELAND CHRISTIAN SCHOOL MOCK TRIAL TEAM

(Mr. SPANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Lakeland Christian School Mock Trial team for winning second place in the Florida High School Mock Trial Competition.

The team previously won first place in regionals and went on to win not only second place among all teams in Florida but also the Stephen Shenkman Professionalism Award and the Best Attorney award, which was granted to Abby Branham.

In addition to Abby, the team included Ama Fosu, Annie Bolter, Trent Curtis, Keaton Walding, Jace Gravitt, Faith Nagy, Emily Branham, Lucy Bolter, Seth Martinez, Tag Hunt, Riley Rhoden, Carter Sawicki, Haley Caylor, and Aline Peek.

These students dedicated many hours of hard work and preparation to learn the facts of their case and present them thoughtfully in the competition. I am confident the knowledge they gained will help them become active members of our community in college and beyond.

Their success comes not only from their own hard work but also from the mentors who guided them through the process. The talented students were coached by Chasity Branham, professor of criminal justice at Polk State College, and Judge Melissa Gravitt, who recently assumed the bench for Florida's 10th Judicial Circuit.

These women took many hours out of their busy schedules to impart their passion for justice to these students. I appreciate all that they do. Our next generation is made better by their service.

HONORING THE CAREER OF JUDGE RAMON GARCIA

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

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the career and service of a gentleman, the Honorable Ramon Garcia.

Judge Garcia recently completed his third term as the Hidalgo County judge, serving with honor and distinction during his tenure. Judge Garcia was first elected in 2002. At the end of his tenure in 2006, Judge Garcia left Hidalgo County in the best financial position it had ever been in, in its history.

Judge Garcia returned for a second round as Hidalgo County judge, being elected for a second term in 2010, and a third term in 2014, having served until this year in 2019.

His leadership and fiscally responsible policies have paved the way for Hidalgo County to construct a much-needed county courthouse. The Hidalgo County Commissioners Court officially named the courthouse's law library the "Hidalgo County Judge Ramon Garcia Law Library," paying homage to his positive contributions to Hidalgo County.

Ramon Garcia was born in 1948 at the old McAllen General Hospital, the current location of McAllen City Hall. He graduated with honors from the University of Houston, Bates College of Law, in 1972, and passed the State bar the same year.

He began practicing in 1973 with Joe B. Evins, who was an attorney at the time but would later go on to be the State district judge in our county.

Recently, Judge Garcia formed a coalition of community leaders to plan for the 2020 Census and ensure that Hidalgo County is accurately counted. The coalition's work is recognized statewide and by other city and county governments that are facing similar situations.

Today, Hidalgo County continues its fight for representation and entitlement funds, and they owe many thanks to Judge Garcia for his tireless work.

Madam Speaker, Judge Garcia is a pillar in our community. There are many reasons to admire the work of Judge Garcia. I personally thank the judge for his exemplary work in government, but I most admire his trial and advocacy skills that he has used to advocate for south Texas.

He has challenged the status quo as a litigator and as our county judge to the benefit of south Texans. It is a privilege to represent resilient, hard-working individuals like him.

RECOGNIZING CINCINNATI MOELLER CRUSADERS

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

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, the Cincinnati Moeller Crusaders have done it again, back-to-back Ohio Division I basketball champs 2 years in a row.

The Crusaders defeated the strong Akron Saint Vincent-Saint Mary team over the weekend, 52-44, to take the championship.

Moeller was undefeated this season going 29-0. In fact, going back to last season, it is their 49th win in a row in a league and a State known for great high school basketball teams.

As a graduate of a Greater Catholic League rival school, La Salle, I have to acknowledge that Moeller is strong in just about everything. In fact, my senior year at La Salle, Moeller was the only team to beat us in football, even with me anchoring the La Salle defensive line.

To Moeller's players, especially the seniors who will be graduating, the coaches, parents, teachers, and fans, congratulations. I wish them all the best in the future—unless, of course, they are playing my alma mater, La Salle.

REPEALING AFFORDABLE CARE ACT WOULD HAVE HARMFUL RE- PERCUSSIONS

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, today, I want to share the story of a family in my district. In 2015, the Cerrato family was in the NICU, fighting for the life of their son Ethan. At just 10 days old, he had undergone two major surgeries, had been the subject of dozens of procedures, and had spent the first days of his life traumatized and struggling through pain.

After only 10 days, the Cerrato family had accumulated a hospital bill of over \$250,000. While little Ethan was fighting for his life, Christine and Matthew Cerrato were grappling with the thought of filing for bankruptcy.

At this moment, the question became: What could they rely on? The answer was the Affordable Care Act, which was passed into law this week 9 years ago.

Earlier this week, the Department of Justice called on the Federal courts to overturn the ACA in its entirety, the latest attack from this administration on the affordable healthcare of millions of families, including many in my State of Colorado and in my district.

These relentless efforts to repeal this law would have harmful impacts on families across the country, like the Cerrato family.

We cannot move backward on the progress we have made to provide affordable healthcare to American families. Instead, we must move forward to lower drug prices, to lower the cost of healthcare, and to ensure that Colorado families and families all over America can get the care they need.

HONORING CHER KONDOR

(Mr. SMUCKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, March is Women's History Month, and I am proud to honor some remarkable women in my district.

Today, I am recognizing Ms. Cher Kondor, who I had the honor of meeting just recently. Cher is a Gold Star mother. Her son, Martin Kondor, was a U.S. Army specialist killed in Baqubah, Iraq, in 2004.

Of course, Ms. Kondor was devastated, but she decided to do something in his honor and in honor of all the other veterans who have served, particularly those who have sacrificed their lives for our freedom.

She created a memorial veterans garden called the Gold Star Garden in York County and has raised, since the time it was created, nearly \$1 million for the garden. This beautiful, living monument is a gathering place for those who want to commemorate and remember the fallen and celebrate the lives of our sons and daughters who volunteered to protect this country.

Ms. Kondor honors our Nation's veterans, and it is a privilege to recognize her contribution to our community on the House floor today.

We are thankful for her example and for her continued awareness of the sac-

rifices of those who have fought for us and for our freedom.

I am proud to honor Ms. Kondor.

□ 1800

BIPARTISANSHIP

(Mr. VAN DREW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to speak to the Members of the House. We are all here because the American people made it so.

The diversity of our Nation's political ideals is boundless. That is what made our country what it is today. We are here to represent these vast ideals.

The definition of bipartisanship is of or involving the agreement or cooperation of two political parties that usually oppose each other's policies. It is about cooperation, it is about compromise, and it is about working together with those who don't have the same exact ideals as you.

I am asking for the membership of this House to think on the idea of bipartisanship. It is my belief that we owe it to the American people to work together.

MUELLER INVESTIGATION

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

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, we, our country, over the past 2 years have lived through persistent and daily accusations against our President of Russian collusion in his election, accusations made by many Democrats and the media. Our President was accused of nothing short of high crimes and misdemeanors.

A 2-year, thorough investigation was carried out. Last Friday, perhaps the most thorough investigation in recent history concluded. The investigation enjoyed not only complete, unlimited access to witnesses, but the resources of the entire Federal Government, including the Department of Justice, the FBI, and the intelligence community.

The Mueller investigation reached a conclusion that no Russian collusion took place nor was there any evidence of any participation by any persons in the campaign.

The verdict is in. Nevertheless, our Democrat colleagues continue to talk about a further investigation. Any further investigations would not have the fraction of resources of the Mueller investigation.

I ask: Seriously? Another investigation? This one was not enough? Or are we prolonging for the sake of prolonging this issue?

We owe it to the American people to accept the facts from a 2-year investigation, move on, and do the work we were sent here to do. We owe this to the American people.

ISRAEL: AMERICA'S
INDISPENSABLE ALLY

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

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of America's indispensable ally, Israel. Israel is the brightest beacon of hope and freedom in the Middle East.

I proudly attended AIPAC's policy conference this week. Their mission is more important than ever.

Anti-Semitism and anti-Israel sentiment is rampant across the world and, sadly, is found even in this Chamber. I am appalled one of my colleagues is so brazen as to resurrect old lies of Jewish conspiracies, propaganda used to oppress the Jewish people for centuries.

Elsewhere, Iran's puppet, Assad, seeks to take Israel's land for strategic leverage in Iran's mission to wipe Israel off the map.

I am proud to stand with President Trump in defense of our ally, Israel. I am grateful he chose to recognize the Golan Heights as a part of Israel and proud we now officially recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital.

HONORING ROY BENAVIDEZ

(Mr. CLOUD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Master Sergeant Roy Benavidez. On the occasion of the Roy P. Benavidez Memorial Highway dedication, my district is proud to claim this Medal of Honor recipient as our own.

Sergeant Benavidez answered the call to serve his country in Vietnam. At one crucial time while overseas, he voluntarily boarded a rescue helicopter and put his own life on the line to save his fellow soldiers.

During the rescue effort, he was shot multiple times, bayoneted, and hit by grenade fragments as he fought for 6 hours to protect his wounded comrades. He saved the lives of at least eight men.

After returning home, he went before Congress to advocate for better veteran healthcare. He then devoted the rest of his life to service, speaking to students about the importance of education and inspiring American troops around the world.

May this highway serve as a memorial to this brave and selfless American, Master Sergeant Roy Benavidez.

NO ONE IS ABOVE THE LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. TLAI. Madam Speaker, I grew up in the district I serve where I have

seen firsthand the results of the failing to hold those in power accountable to the laws of the land. From corporate polluters who continue to violate the Clean Air Act with no real enforcement to stop the violations that hurt our public health, I have also seen firsthand a megabillionaire who directly violated Federal and State processes that resulted in thousands of trucks to rumble through our local neighborhoods where one in five children have asthma.

Do you know why those in power looked the other way? Because of political influence on my colleagues who then became conflicted.

This is why I rise today to put forward H. Res. 257, which creates a transparent process to ensure the protection of our democracy. That ensures that we don't have a lawless society that results in irreparable harm to the American people.

Doing nothing when we are seeing a blatant disregard of the United States Constitution and our ethical norms is dangerous. No one, Madam Speaker, including the President of the United States, is above the law.

I know many have focused on actions that were conducted prior to his taking the oath of office, and that is important. However, as critically important are the actions by the President after he swore to uphold the United States Constitution before all of us.

He is not a CEO, Madam Speaker, anymore, but a public servant who is held accountable not to shareholders and investors, but the actual American people, real people, people who expect all of us to follow the laws.

In the 2 years since he took office, President Trump racked up more than 1,400 conflicts of interest involving the government, those trying to influence it and The Trump Organization, according to a report released by the Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington.

President Trump used the Presidency to enrich himself by repeatedly promoting his businesses as extensions of his administration. Political allies, wealthy donors, special interests, and foreign governments have adopted a key tactic of patronizing Trump's businesses to garner favor with the Trump administration.

Here are some of the key findings from CREW's tracking of Trump's conflicts of interest:

President Trump made 118 visits to his properties in his second year in office, bringing his 2-year total to 281 visits to properties he still profits from while serving as President of the United States.

In his second year in office, President Trump and other White House staff promoted Trump businesses on at least 87 occasions. More than 150 political committees, including campaigns and party committees, have spent nearly \$5 million at Trump businesses since he became President. At least 13 special interest groups lobbied the White

House since Trump's inauguration, some for the first time, around the same time they also patronized a Trump property.

At least three foreign governments held events at Trump properties during Trump's second year in office. Two of those countries did so after holding similar events elsewhere in previous years.

Not only has President Trump still refused to divest from his businesses, he seems to have doubled down by reinforcing the idea that The Trump Organization is an extension of the Trump administration.

These offenses must be investigated.

In total, CREW found more than 900 conflicts in the second year of the Trump administration. This presents a clear picture of a Presidency used to turn a profit and the President's businesses serving at points of access to the corridors of power.

This report shows that special interests, foreign governments, and political allies continue to pour money into Trump's bank accounts while the American public is left in the dark about whether or not the President's policy decisions are made in the best interests of our country, or is it in the best interests of the President's bottom line, benefiting himself personally.

We have been sent here to legislate. I am thinking about the historic For the People Act we passed right here in this Chamber, the gun reform package we passed, legislation to protect our lands, to increase and strengthen healthcare for Americans, and much more.

I am proud of my first bills. One protects our public health in regards to petroleum coke exposure, and the other, which has a wide range of support, would prohibit the use of credit scores by the auto insurance industry.

However, Madam Speaker, none of these bills is free from the harm that comes from the current administration and the President of the United States not complying with the clauses of the United States Constitution. When these conflicts and direct violations to the Emoluments Clause are not investigated, we set a dangerous precedent that those issues we passed in this Chamber are not important.

I think about the recent announcement that T-Mobile and Sprint would like the Federal Government to approve a merger between the two companies. In the same breath, T-Mobile spent close to \$200,000 at the D.C. Trump hotel. This is what we call an upgraded version of pay to play, and it dangerously corrupts our democracy.

When President Truman sidestepped the Constitution and went to war, every sitting President had done the same. One of the first major challenges to the War Powers Act came in 1981 when President Reagan deployed military personnel to El Salvador without consulting or submitting a report to Congress.

In 1999, President Clinton continued a bombing campaign in Kosovo beyond

the 60-day limit cited in the law. A more recent War Powers Act dispute arose in 2011 when President Barack Obama initiated a military action in Libya without congressional authorization.

You see, Madam Speaker, when we do nothing, we set a precedent and allow it to become the norm. I can't stress enough how dangerous this is to the core of our democracy.

This will not be the last billionaire CEO who runs for President who will attempt to not divest from his business interests.

Now, what we have witnessed from this administration are acts that could very well be impeachable offenses outside of the scope of the Mueller investigation. We have a duty in this Chamber to inquire about these acts, to investigate them, to find out if there was any wrongdoing, and to seek accountability if it has been found.

That is why, today, I have introduced a resolution that calls on the Judiciary Committee to inquire into these activities that may be impeachable offenses. There are serious pieces of evidence out there, many that have come through the various committees of this body, in the media, and things within the public eye. An investigation will take a look at all of those things with the question: Are these impeachable offenses? Is our President acting above the rule of law?

As Congress, we have a job to ensure that is exactly what is not happening. If, at the end, it gets the President to comply, then we have done our job. If the President doesn't, then we move forward and, at the very least, put any future President on notice: Congress will hold you accountable and will require you to divest in your businesses.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

IMPEACHMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, it is always an honor to stand in the well of the House of Representatives.

Each time I am afforded this opportunity, I have tried to savor the moment knowing that it is not eternal and knowing that, at some point, we will no longer have this preeminent privilege. But I do appreciate having the opportunity to serve the people of the Ninth Congressional District and to serve my country. I love my country.

I thank the gentlewoman for what she has done with H. Res. 257. I support this resolution, and I would like to compliment the lady for what she has done since she has arrived in Congress.

□ 1815

She has truly hit the ground running. She came from the State house. She is a lawyer. She has been an advocate, and she understands the issues associated with criminal justice. So I thank her for what she has done and what she is doing with this resolution.

Madam Speaker, it was never intended for the executive branch of the government to investigate itself.

The Framers of the Constitution, in Federalist 65, addressed this. Federalist 65, the Federalist Papers.

I invite people to please read the Federalist Papers. If you can't read them all, just read Federalist 65 and 69.

Some things are made perspicuously clear. One of the things made clear is that impeachment is solely within the province of the House of Representatives.

Madison, the fourth President of the United States of America; Jay, the first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court; and Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury of the United States of America—these are the authors of the Federalist Papers, and they were prophetic with some of their writings.

While I would not agree with all that they did in their lifetimes, I will tell you that what they have done with reference to impeachment is prophetic, because they understood that at some point you could have a President who was unfit to hold office, but who had not committed a crime but should be removed from office before the next election because of the harm the President is imposing upon society.

Understanding this, they were in support of Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution, which deals with treason, bribery, and other high crimes and misdemeanors as the means by which a President can be removed from office after having been elected.

They understood that there might be a time such as this and a President such as Trump.

They understood that we, the Members of this august body, should be empowered such that we could take up the cause of the American people. Not because we are Democrats, because it is not about Democrats; it is about democracy. Not because we are Republicans, because it is not about Republicans; it is about the Republic and what Franklin said when he called to our attention: You have a Republic if you can keep it.

It is about maintaining this Republic. They were prophetic. They understood that you cannot allow the executive branch to investigate itself, because if you allow such to happen, you find yourself with what has happened with Mr. Mueller.

He has investigated, but he cannot hand it over to us because he is an agent of the executive branch of government. And, as an agent of the executive branch of government, he is required to submit his report to the executive branch, a report that is all about

the head of the executive branch of the government.

This is why the Framers understood that it was necessary to empower another branch of government to do this. How prophetic and how wise they were to do so.

It was not intended that we would outsource this investigation to the executive branch, which is, in essence, what has occurred. We have allowed the executive branch to assume what is truly the responsibility and the duty and the obligation of the House of Representatives.

This is ours. This is what we must do.

When there was a Republican administration in this House, I indicated that I wouldn't get in the way of that investigation, but I also indicated that the House should do its job.

And if the House is to do its job, it is contemplated that the Judiciary Committee would do exactly what the Representative from the 13th Congressional District in Michigan is doing now and, that is, take up the question of impeachment in the Judiciary Committee by way of a resolution such as what she has called to the attention of this Congress.

I salute her for doing so because this is what was contemplated by the Framers of the Constitution. This is what Madison contemplated, Jay contemplated, and Hamilton contemplated.

And, to give further evidence of what they contemplated, we but only have to review the impeachment in 1868 of Andrew Johnson.

Andrew Johnson was impeached in Article X of the Articles of Impeachment against him for speaking ill of Congress.

There is no requirement that the President commit a crime, that the President commit an offense for which he must be found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt before a President can be impeached.

Congress determines what the standard is for impeachment. Unfortunately, we have allowed what happens on the judicial side of the law to be conflated with what happens on the political side of the law.

The judiciary, or the judicial side, would have a crime. This is what Mr. Mueller was investigating, to see if a crime had been committed—a crime. And, if a crime is committed, of course the President can be impeached for committing a crime.

But the President can also be impeached if he has not committed a crime, but he is doing harm to society. This is the law.

When we say no person is above the law, we are talking about not only the law as it is codified with reference to criminality, but also the law as it has been codified such that impeachment can be the punishment in the sense that the President would be indicted.

It is not the same as an indictment, but it is quite similar, and the President would then have to face trial in

the Senate, presided over by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

There is no punishment, per se, with this entire process. It is just a means by which a President is removed from office. And, if he has committed a crime, he can, of course, still be prosecuted for the criminal activity.

So, tonight, we are here to thank the Member for what she has done in filing this resolution, H. Res. 257. We are here tonight to acknowledge that the Framers of the Constitution contemplated what she has done. She is in order.

We are here tonight to acknowledge that it is now within the hands of the Judiciary Committee, this resolution, and it is my prayer that the Judiciary Committee would take this resolution and bring it to a vote.

I believe that it is time for us to do what the Constitution contemplates by way of the words of the Framers and by way of what Federalist 65 has called to our attention.

However, I still stand tonight where I stood when I initially took to the floor of the House of Representatives and indicated that this President should be impeached. I stand where I stood then, and I also stand on the premise that, if the Judiciary Committee does not act, any Member of this august body can bring impeachment to a vote.

I stand on this. This is what the rules allow. And as a Member of Congress, I have given an assurance that there will be another vote on impeachment in the House of Representatives.

I will do it. I don't like using personal pronouns because my mother always said: "Alexander, whatever you will do, you will do with others."

But, because of the way the process is codified, I will do it because I love my country.

I will do it because I understand that we have a person who is unfit to be President holding this office.

I will do it because I want to protect the democracy.

I will do it because I believe in the Republic.

I will do it because I salute the flag and I believe in liberty and justice for all.

I will do it because I believe that Lincoln was right when he spoke of government of the people, by the people, for the people being forever a part of our country, our land.

I will do it because it is the appropriate thing to do at a time such as this, with a President such as Trump.

And finally this, Madam Speaker, I have not suggested that I have whipped or would whip, meaning encourage others to vote a certain way. I have consistently said you should vote your conscience.

I still stand by it. Vote your conscience. Vote your conscience, knowing that, at some point on the infinite continuum that we call time—at some point on the infinite continuum that we call time, there will be people who will review our actions through the vista of time.

And, when they review our actions, the query will be: What did they do when they had an opportunity to take up the cause of justice?

They will want to know what did we do. And the only way they can know what we did is for there to be a vote.

At some point, we have to move beyond talking points to action items. The only way to make this an action item is for there to be a vote.

And those who look through the vista of time, perhaps generations unborn, when they look through the vista of time, they will want to see the record. And the record will show where we stood when we had the opportunity to remove an unfit person from office, an unfit President.

The record will show where we stood, but, more importantly, it will give them some clues as to what was happening in this House at the time. It will give them some evidence of where we were.

And I assure you, Madam Speaker, at some point on this infinite continuum, people are going to ask the question: What was wrong with them? What was wrong with them?

They had a President who was separating babies from their mothers at the border, with no means of reuniting them.

Babies are still separated from their parents.

They will want to know: What was wrong with them? They allowed this?

They will want to know: How could you decide that you are going to take up the cause against persons who make commentary in the House, but you won't take up the cause against a President who went so far as to say there were some fine people among the bigots, the racists, the xenophobes, the Islamophobes, the Islamophobes, the nativists; among those persons who marched and proclaimed "Jews will not replace us," persons who said, "blood and soil."

How could you allow this to go unchallenged?

They will want to know: What was wrong with them? Why would they allow such a person to continue in office, a person who demeans the country when he demeans its heroes, a person who demeans persons by simply deciding that name-calling is more appropriate than debating issues.

And, by the way, calling a person who is a bigot a bigot is not name-calling. That is properly labeling the actions of a person, the behavior of a person.

And, by the way, for those who may not have paid attention, if you have been following these various TV programs, news programs, information sources, host after host, persons who are being interviewed, have said that the President is a racist. They have said that the President is a bigot.

I understand that it is difficult for some to say. Not for me. Not for me. I know what bigotry looks like. I know what racism smells like. I know what

it sounds like. I know what it tastes like. I suffered through it.

□ 1830

I would not want to see what I had to endure become a part of the fiber and fabric of this country ever again. Whenever we see evidence of this ugliness rearing its head, we should do what we can to stare it down and stop it.

I stand here tonight believing that we have a duty, a responsibility, and an obligation to allow what this Congresswoman has called to our attention to move forward. I stand on the Constitution in saying this, and I will stand with her. I am proud to be associated with her and what she is doing.

When we do bring this to a vote, my hope is that every Member will vote his or her conscience. That is all that I ask, just vote your conscience, and let the record reflect where we stood.

As Dr. King put it, the truest measure of a person is not where the person stands in times of comfort and convenience. The truest measure of a person is where you stand in times of challenge and controversy.

These are times of challenge and controversy. The question is, where do we stand? The record will show where we stand.

There are some who will say that this is going to be a hard vote. I have a sense of what hard votes are like. I have had to take some hard votes since I have been in Congress. I have had to take some hard votes and never had a person say thank you for taking that hard vote. I have taken my share of hard votes.

I have some members of the clergy that still have not found favor with some of the votes that I have taken, but I took them because it was the principled thing to do, because it was the constitutional thing to do, because it was not only the right thing to do, but the righteous thing to do. So I know what hard votes are like.

People expect me to take hard votes, and they expect me, after I take my hard votes, to go back and convince my constituents that I did the right thing. Nobody seeks to protect me from hard votes. I know what hard votes are like.

I understand when people say this would be a hard vote. I understand it. But that is why we came. We were elected to take hard votes. If it were easy, then we wouldn't be here. Other folk would do the easy things. People who get elected to Congress are expected to take hard votes, to do that which is difficult.

Let us understand that the record will reflect the vote. It will give people who look through the vista of time some indication as to why we are doing what we are doing and have not done what we should have done.

Madam Speaker, again, I am proud to stand in the well of the Congress of the United States of America. I never take for granted this preeminent privilege. I will always be grateful to the Speaker

of the House and all the various officers of this House for permitting the time. I am grateful, and I thank them for being as magnanimous, if you will, as they are, but also for following the rules and allowing me to speak. This is a great opportunity.

I pray that we who hold public trust will honor the Constitution of the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to say that I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 252.—An act to authorize the honorary appointment of Robert J. Dole to the grade of colonel in the regular Army.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 28, 2019, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

494. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting notification to Congress of the anticipated use of Selected Reserve units that will be ordered to active duty under the authority of 10 U.S.C. 12304b, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 12304(f); Public Law 94-286, Sec. 1; (90 Stat. 517); to the Committee on Armed Services.

495. A letter from the Under Secretary, Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Department is not submitting a formal report to Congress in response to Sec. 2803, Sub. Sec. (c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act due to funding not made available; to the Committee on Armed Services.

496. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Sustainment, Department of State, transmitting a notification that the assembly of the required report on the Department's Operational Energy Strategy will be completed at the end of May 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

497. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for the Division of Regulatory Services, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Guidance for the Standard for Borrower Defense to Repayment Applications; Institutions' Notifications of Financial Responsibility Events, Actions, and Conditions; Implementation of the Class Action Bans and Predispute Arbitration Agreements Provisions; the Repayment Rate and Financial Protection Disclosures Provisions of the 2016 Borrower Defense to Repayment Regulations (RIN: 1840-

AD19) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

498. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for the Division of Regulatory Service, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Student Assistance General Provisions, Federal Perkins Loan Program, Federal Family Education Loan Program, William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program, and Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education Grant Program [Docket ID: ED-2015-OPE-0103] (RIN: 1840-AD19) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

499. A letter from the Chair, National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Thirteenth Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Administrative Simplification Provisions of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) OF 1996, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 242k(k)(7); Public Law 104-191, Sec. 263; (110 Stat. 2033); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

500. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a semi-annual report detailing telecommunications-related payments made to Cuba pursuant to Treasury Department licenses during the period from July 1 through December 31, 2018, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6); Public Law 102-484, Sec. 1705(e)(6) (as amended by Public Law 104-114, Sec. 102)(g)); (110 Stat. 794); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

501. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to South Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

502. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities that was declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

503. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism that was declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

504. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Ukraine that was declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

505. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Bureau's 2018 Transportation Statistics Annual Report, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 6312; Public Law 112-141, Sec. 52011(a); (126 Stat. 894); to the

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

506. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Alaska Towns; Toksook Bay, AK; Unalakleet, AK; Wainwright, AK; and Yakutat, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0350; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AAL-6] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

507. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace, Amendment of Class D Airspace, and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Tacoma, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1032; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANM-4] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

508. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31235; Amdt. No.: 3837] received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

509. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31231; Amdt. No.: 3833] received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

510. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31232; Amdt. No.: 3834] received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

511. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31239; Amdt. No.: 3840] received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

512. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31238; Amdt. No.: 3839] received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

513. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31236;

Amdt. No.: 3838] received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

514. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0962; Product Identifier 2018-NM-125-AD; Amendment 39-19560; AD 2019-03-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

515. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0580; Product Identifier 2018-NM-025-AD; Amendment 39-19558; AD 2019-03-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

516. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0409; Product Identifier 2017-NM-120-AD; Amendment 39-19559; AD 2019-03-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

517. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0907; Product Identifier 2018-NM-118-AD; Amendment 39-19562; AD 2019-03-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

518. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0906; Product Identifier 2018-NM-122-AD; Amendment 39-19561; AD 2019-03-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

519. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0508; Product Identifier 2018-NM-012-AD; Amendment 39-19563; AD 2019-03-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

520. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0385; Product Identifier 2018-CE-019-AD; Amendment 39-19554; AD 2019-03-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

521. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D

and Class E Airspace; Atwater, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1091; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AWP-26] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

522. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Corry, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0998; Airspace Docket No.: 18-AEA-19] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

523. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace and Class E Airspace; Schenectady, NY, Ithaca, NY, and Albany, NY [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0256; Airspace Docket No.: 18-AEA-11] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 21, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. NADLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1585. A bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-21, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, Ways and Means, Education and Labor, Natural Resources, and Veterans' Affairs, discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1585 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. PORTER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GALLEGO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. CRIST, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PANNETTA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WELCH, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr.

JEFFRIES, Mr. KILMER, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. ROSE of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. DEAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SCHRIER, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 9. A bill to direct the President to develop a plan for the United States to meet its nationally determined contribution under the Paris Agreement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 1895. A bill to restore the integrity of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CORREA (for himself, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. WALTZ, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1896. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to expand the military student identifier program to cover students with a parent who serves in the reserve component of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois (for herself, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. BASS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 1897. A bill to improve Federal efforts with respect to the prevention of maternal mortality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 1898. A bill to modify the prohibition on United States assistance and financing for certain exports to Cuba under the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

- By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. COSTA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COHEN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. KATKO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. SOTO):
- H.R. 1899. A bill to provide for the refinancing and recalculation of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.
- By Ms. HAALAND (for herself, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. COLE):
- H.R. 1900. A bill to establish a business incubators program within the Department of the Interior to promote economic development in Indian reservation communities; to the Committee on Natural Resources.
- By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FOSTER):
- H.R. 1901. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve access to rehabilitation innovation centers under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.
- By Mr. HOLDING (for himself and Mr. LEWIS):
- H.R. 1902. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow officers and employees of the Department of the Treasury to provide to taxpayers information regarding low-income taxpayer clinics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.
- By Miss RICE of New York (for herself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. TRONE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. WATERS):
- H.R. 1903. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to support individuals with younger onset Alzheimer's disease; to the Committee on Education and Labor.
- By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. O'HALLERAN):
- H.R. 1904. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to make the Reclamation Water Settlements Fund permanent; to the Committee on Natural Resources.
- By Mr. GOMEZ:
- H.R. 1905. A bill to require notice from the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of any closure of a Taxpayer Assistance Center; to the Committee on Ways and Means.
- By Mr. CROW:
- H.R. 1906. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the nonbusiness energy property credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.
- By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself and Mr. KIND):
- H.R. 1907. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the qualification requirements with respect to certain multiple employer plans with pooled plan providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.
- By Mr. BURCHETT (for himself, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, and Mr. COHEN):
- H.R. 1908. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Master Sergeant Rodrick "Roddie" Edmonds in recognition of his heroic actions during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services.
- By Mr. CHABOT (for himself and Mr. SCHNEIDER):
- H.R. 1909. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise rules relating to general solicitation or general advertising to allow for presentations or other communication made by or on behalf of an issuer at certain events, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.
- By Mr. AMASH (for himself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. BUCK):
- H.R. 1910. A bill to abolish the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.
- By Mr. WALTZ (for himself, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. BACON):
- H.R. 1911. A bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to expand certain benefits for survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in line of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.
- By Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico:
- H.R. 1912. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for requirements relating to documentation for major acquisition programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.
- By Mr. CISNEROS:
- H.R. 1913. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay educational assistance or subsistence allowances to certain individuals during school term, quarter, or semester breaks; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.
- By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):
- H.R. 1914. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to national priority safety programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.
- By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself and Mr. GUTHRIE):
- H.R. 1915. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make technical improvements to the Net Price Calculator system so that prospective students may have a more accurate understanding of the true cost of college; to the Committee on Education and Labor.
- By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. NEWHOUSE):
- H.R. 1916. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide alternative minimum funding rules for certain single-employer plans maintained by a community newspaper; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.
- By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself and Ms. SPEIER):
- H.R. 1917. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to submit to Congress an annual report on projects that are over budget and behind schedule, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.
- By Mr. GIANFORTE:
- H.R. 1918. A bill to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Bozeman, Montana, as the "Travis W. Atkins Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.
- By Mr. KELLY of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. GUEST, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, and Mr. WOMACK):
- H.R. 1919. A bill to amend the Animal Health Protection Act to provide chronic wasting disease support for States and coordinated response efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.
- By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. MATSUI):
- H.R. 1920. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide a higher Federal matching rate for increased expenditures under Medicaid for mental and behavioral health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.
- By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. YOUNG):
- H.R. 1921. A bill to authorize Federal agencies to establish prize competitions for innovation or adaptation management development relating to ocean acidification; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.
- By Mr. KIND (for himself, Ms. MENG, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. LAHOOD):
- H.R. 1922. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include certain over-the-counter medical products as qualified medical expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.
- By Ms. LEE of California (for herself and Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio):
- H.R. 1923. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue quarter dollars in commemoration of the Nineteenth Amendment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.
- By Mrs. LEE of Nevada (for herself and Mrs. LESKO):
- H.R. 1924. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide child care to veterans at Vet Centers in the same manner as the Secretary provides child care to veterans at other Department of Veterans Affairs facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.
- By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):
- H.R. 1925. A bill to designate the Manhattan Campus of the New York Harbor Health Care System of the Department of Veterans Affairs as the "Margaret Cochran Corbin Campus of the New York Harbor Health Care System"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.
- By Mr. PHILLIPS (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):
- H.R. 1926. A bill to provide temporary protected status for certain nationals of Liberia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. PALMER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. YOHO, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. WALKER, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 1927. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the nature of judicial review of agency interpretations of statutory and regulatory provisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RESCHENTHALER (for himself, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. STEUBE, and Mr. CLINE):

H.R. 1928. A bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to impose penalties for State noncompliance with enforcement of immigration law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDA:

H.R. 1929. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the qualified fuel cell motor vehicles credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 1930. A bill to provide for the elimination of the Department of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas):

H.R. 1931. A bill to authorize dedicated domestic terrorism offices within the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to analyze and monitor domestic terrorist activity and require the Federal Government to take steps to prevent domestic terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHRIER (for herself, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. GOMEZ):

H.R. 1932. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat as compensation for purposes of retirement contribution limitations any difficulty of care payments excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 1933. A bill to prohibit States from retroactively imposing a sales tax collection duty on a remote seller, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SERRANO (for himself, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 1934. A bill to direct the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information to prepare and submit periodic reports to Congress on the role of telecommunications in hate crimes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr.

KATKO, Mr. COLE, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. STEEL, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. REED, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. COOK, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. STAUBER, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. BOST, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. KINZINGER, and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 1935. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to enhance provisions related to pay discrimination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 1936. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to modify the terms of the Jackson Gulch rehabilitation project in Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. TORRES of California (for herself and Ms. HAALAND):

H.R. 1937. A bill to amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000, the Buy Indian Act, and the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide industry and economic development opportunities to Indian communities; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. TRAHAN (for herself and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1938. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to small employers providing an eligible automatic contribution arrangement under a retirement savings plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 1939. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the health coverage tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mrs. MILLER):

H.R. 1940. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to make available parental leave benefits to parents following the birth or adoption of a child, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. REED, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HOLDING, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DUFFY, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. HECK, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. EMMER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that tax-exempt fraternal benefit societies have historically and continue to provide critical benefits to Americans and United States communities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself and Mr. REED):

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution expressing support for designation of the first Friday of October as "Manufacturing Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. TLAI (for herself and Mr. GREEN of Texas):

H. Res. 257. A resolution inquiring whether the House of Representatives should impeach Donald John Trump, President of the United States of America; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H. Res. 258. A resolution affirming United States support for the continued implementation of the Treaty of Peace between the Arab Republic of Egypt and the State of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself and Ms. ESHOO):

H. Res. 259. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives to support the repatriation of religious and ethnic minorities in Iraq to their ancestral homelands; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MORELLE, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H. Res. 260. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Middle Level Education Month; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERRY:

H. Res. 261. A resolution strongly condemning the February 2019 terrorist attack in India, offering condolences to the family and friends of the victims, and reaffirming solidarity with the people of India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H. Res. 262. A resolution recognizing linemen, the profession of linemen, the contributions of these brave men and women who protect public safety, and expressing support for the designation of April 18, 2019, as National Lineman Appreciation Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H. Res. 263. A resolution expressing support for the designation of April 9, 2019, as National Yellow Ribbon Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 9.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 1895.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 9 of the Constitution of the United States; the power to constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court.

The purpose of the bill is to amend the civil asset forfeiture procedures and Section 8, Clause 9 extends to Congress the power to create inferior courts and to make rules of procedure and evidence for such courts.

By Mr. CORREA:

H.R. 1896.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 1897.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 1898.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerate powers listed in Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution, to regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 1899.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. HAALAND:

H.R. 1900.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 1901.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. HOLDING:

H.R. 1902.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 1903.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1904.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl. 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

U.S. Cont. art. IV, sec. 3, cl. 2, sen. a

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rule and Regulations respecting the Territory of other Property belonging to the United States;

By Mr. GOMEZ:

H.R. 1905.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. CROW:

H.R. 1906.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 1907.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8.

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 1908.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV,

Section 3, Clause 2. The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 1909.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 1910.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the implied power to repeal laws that exceed its constitutional authority as well as laws within its constitutional authority.

By Mr. WALTZ:

H.R. 1911.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The Congress shall have the power to provide for the common defense.

By Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico:

H.R. 1912.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CISNEROS:

H.R. 1913.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 1914.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 1915.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 1916.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 1917.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 9

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. GIANFORTE:

H.R. 1918.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. KELLY of Mississippi:

H.R. 1919.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 1920.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8—to provide for the general welfare and to regulate commerce among the states.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 1921.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3; and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1922.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 1923.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. LEE of Nevada:

H.R. 1924.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 To raise and support Armies.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1925.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H.R. 1926.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. RATCLIFFE:

H.R. 1927.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article III, Section 1, Sentence 1, and Section 2, Clauses 1 and 4 of the Constitution, in that the legislation defines or affects judicial powers and cases that are subject to legislation by Congress; Article 1, Section 1, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of legislative powers generally granted to Congress by that section, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive; and, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. RESCHENTHALER:

H.R. 1928.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article I—The Congress shall have the Power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Mr. ROUDA:

H.R. 1929.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 1930.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution states that "The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department of Officer thereof."

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 1931.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
 By Ms. SCHRIER:
 H.R. 1932.
 Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
 Article I of the Constitution.
 By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:
 H.R. 1933.
 Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
 Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
 By Mr. SERRANO:
 H.R. 1934.
 Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
 Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the United States Constitution related to general welfare of the United States.
 By Ms. STEFANIK:
 H.R. 1935.
 Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
 Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution
 By Mr. TIPTON:
 H.R. 1936.
 Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
 Article 1, Section 8
 By Mrs. TORRES of California:
 H.R. 1937.
 Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
 According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.
 Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.
 By Mrs. TRAHAN:
 H.R. 1938.
 Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
 Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;
 By Mr. TURNER:
 H.R. 1939.
 Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
 Article 1, Section 8
 By Mrs. WAGNER:
 H.R. 1940.
 Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
 Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:
 H.R. 6: Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. SHERRILL, and Ms. SPANBERGER.
 H.R. 35: Mr. PANETTA.
 H.R. 36: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BERA, and Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 64: Mr. MARSHALL.
 H.R. 94: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
 H.R. 95: Mr. VELA, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LATTA, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 96: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. GARCIA of Illinois.
 H.R. 101: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. WALTZ, and Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 148: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H.R. 154: Mr. YARMUTH.
 H.R. 216: Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. EMMER.
 H.R. 218: Mr. MAST, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. PALMER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. CLOUD.
 H.R. 250: Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
 H.R. 296: Mr. GOODEN.
 H.R. 299: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COX of California, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BRADY, Mr. GOLDEN, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 309: Mr. DEFAZIO.
 H.R. 310: Mr. PETERS and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 332: Ms. OMAR.
 H.R. 336: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 397: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 400: Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 444: Mr. VAN DREW and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
 H.R. 445: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 446: Mr. STEUBE.
 H.R. 500: Mr. BALDERSON.
 H.R. 510: Mr. MOULTON.
 H.R. 530: Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 553: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 555: Mr. CLAY and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 578: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 594: Ms. SCANLON.
 H.R. 602: Mr. GAETZ.
 H.R. 613: Mr. ARMSTRONG and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 638: Mr. BANKS.
 H.R. 641: Mr. CORREA.
 H.R. 651: Ms. OMAR.
 H.R. 663: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 693: Mr. CLEAVER and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 759: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 763: Mr. LEVIN of California.
 H.R. 784: Mr. BUCSHON.
 H.R. 808: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
 H.R. 824: Mr. KEATING, Ms. PINGREE, and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
 H.R. 835: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 838: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. NORMAN.
 H.R. 846: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
 H.R. 849: Mr. RICHMOND and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 855: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.
 H.R. 861: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 873: Mr. POCAN and Mr. RYAN.
 H.R. 888: Mr. STEUBE, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. LATTA.
 H.R. 897: Mr. CLOUD.
 H.R. 912: Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 938: Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 943: Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mr. KIM.
 H.R. 945: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
 H.R. 962: Mr. STEUBE.
 H.R. 965: Ms. ESHOO, Ms. MATSUI, and Mrs. CRAIG.
 H.R. 986: Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 987: Mr. RUSH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PAL-LONE, and Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 1002: Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 1004: Mr. EVANS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 1006: Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 1007: Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 1010: Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1035: Mr. MARSHALL.
 H.R. 1043: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1044: Mr. BEYER and Mr. CLEAVER.
 H.R. 1046: Mr. BEYER.
 H.R. 1095: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
 H.R. 1096: Mr. LONG and Ms. STEFANIK.
 H.R. 1098: Mr. PERRY.
 H.R. 1111: Mr. HASTINGS and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
 H.R. 1134: Ms. OMAR.
 H.R. 1139: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. WEXTON, and Mrs. CRAIG.
 H.R. 1146: Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. WILD, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. COX of California, Mr. DELGADO, and Mr. GOLDEN.
 H.R. 1166: Ms. WILD, Ms. SPANBERGER, and Mr. BEYER.
 H.R. 1175: Mr. KILMER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. NORMAN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. HOLDING, and Ms. WILD.
 H.R. 1179: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1186: Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 1289: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 1305: Mr. VAN DREW and Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 1306: Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 1307: Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 1311: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
 H.R. 1327: Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. CRIST, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, and Ms. HOULAHAN.
 H.R. 1345: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1358: Mr. SPANO.
 H.R. 1360: Mr. LAMB.
 H.R. 1384: Mrs. TRAHAN.
 H.R. 1385: Mr. KENNEDY and Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 1386: Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 1396: Mrs. LURIA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. VELA, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CRIST, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. MOORE, Ms. TITUS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. TONKO, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SIREs, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. BASS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BALDERSON, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. LAMB, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 1398: Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, and Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 1400: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. KATKO.
 H.R. 1418: Mr. FERGUSON.
 H.R. 1423: Mr. CLEAVER.
 H.R. 1425: Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SPANBERGER, and Mr. PHILLIPS.
 H.R. 1499: Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 1527: Mr. MASSIE.
 H.R. 1572: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
 H.R. 1588: Mr. ROSE of New York.
 H.R. 1595: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. SHERRILL, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 1597: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
 H.R. 1602: Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 1629: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.
 H.R. 1641: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
 H.R. 1652: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 1668: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 1673: Mr. WOODALL.
 H.R. 1679: Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. JOHNSON of

Ohio, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. VELA, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 1680: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TURNER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. BRINDISI, and Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 1706: Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BARR, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 1715: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1721: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 1722: Ms. HILL of California and Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 1735: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1739: Ms. WILD.

H.R. 1740: Ms. WILD.

H.R. 1748: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1753: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 1755: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 1759: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 1762: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1770: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 1781: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1830: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 1837: Mrs. LURIA, Mr. SPANO, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CRIST, Mr. MAST, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SIRES, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms.

TITUS, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 1846: Mr. WELCH, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1854: Mr. KATKO and Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 1855: Mr. CONAWAY and Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1857: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 1860: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1884: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. KIND, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CROW, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HECK, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BERA, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.J. Res. 38: Ms. MENG.

H. Con. Res. 20: Ms. GRANGER and Ms. ADAMS.

H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. RUSH and Ms. TLAIB.

H. Res. 27: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H. Res. 49: Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. GOODEN.

H. Res. 60: Ms. DEAN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. KIM.

H. Res. 107: Mr. KIM.

H. Res. 124: Mr. KIND, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. AGUILAR.

H. Res. 138: Mr. GREEN of Texas and Mr. VAN DREW.

H. Res. 154: Mr. MALINOWSKI and Mr. DELGADO.

H. Res. 190: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H. Res. 220: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. LEWIS.

H. Res. 221: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. COSTA.

H. Res. 222: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. COSTA.

H. Res. 231: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H. Res. 241: Mr. MARSHALL.

H. Res. 246: Mr. WATKINS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COOPER, Mr. KIND, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. SPANO, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. BUDD, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BANKS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LATTA, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. KATKO, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CASE, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. COLE, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ROSE of New York, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 1735: Ms. MOORE.