

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 F.	Levin (CA)	Ruppersberger	Meadows	Rose, John W.	Upton
Hice (GA)	Meadows	Smucker	Engel	Levin (MI)	Rush	Meuser	Rouzer	Wagner
Higgins (LA)	Meuser	Spano	Escobar	Lewis	Ryan	Miller	Roy	Walberg
Hill (AR)	Miller	Staubert	Eshoo	Lieu, Ted	Sánchez	Mitchell	Rutherford	Walden
Holding	Mitchell	Stefanik	Espallat	Lipinski	Sarbanes	Moolenaar	Scalise	Walker
Hollingsworth	Moolenaar	Steil	Evans	Loeb sack	Scanlon	Mooney (WV)	Schweikert	Walorski
Hudson	Mooney (WV)	Steube	Finkenaue	Lofgren	Schakowsky	Mullin	Scott, Austin	Waltz
Huizenga	Mullin	Stewart	Fletcher	Lowenthal	Schiff	Newhouse	Sensenbrenner	Watkins
Hunter	Newhouse	Stivers	Foster	Lowey	Schneider	Norman	Shimkus	Weber (TX)
Hurd (TX)	Norman	Taylor	Frankel	Lujan	Schrader	Nunes	Simpson	Webster (FL)
Johnson (LA)	Nunes	Thompson (PA)	Fudge	Luria	Schrier	Olson	Smith (MO)	Wenstrup
Johnson (OH)	Olson	Thornberry	Gabbard	Lynch	Scott (VA)	Palazzo	Smith (NE)	Westerman
Johnson (SD)	Palazzo	Timmons	Gallego	Malinowski	Scott, David	Palmer	Smith (NJ)	Williams
Jordan	Palmer	Tipton	Garamendi	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Serrano	Pence	Smucker	Williams
Joyce (OH)	Pence	Turner	Garcia (IL)	Maloney, Sean	Sewell (AL)	Perry	Spano	Womack
Joyce (PA)	Perry	Upton	Garcia (TX)	Matsui	Shalala	Posey	Staubert	Woodall
Katko	Posey	Wagner	Golden	McAdams	Sherman	Ratcliffe	Stefanik	Wright
Kelly (MS)	Ratcliffe	Walberg	Gomez	McBath	Sherrill	Reed	Steil	Yoho
Kelly (PA)	Reed	Walden	Gonzalez (TX)	McCollum	Sires	Reschenthaler	Steube	Young
King (IA)	Reschenthaler	Walker	Gottheimer	McEachin	Slotkin	Rice (SC)	Stewart	Zeldin
King (NY)	Rice (SC)	Walorski	Green (TX)	McGovern	Smith (WA)	Rigglesman	Stivers	
Kinzing	Rigglesman	Waltz	Grijalva	McNerney	Soto			
Kustoff (TN)	Roby	Watkins	Haa land	Meeks	Spanberger			
LaHood	Rodgers (WA)	Weber (TX)	Harder (CA)	Meng	Speier			
LaMalfa	Roe, David P.	Webster (FL)	Hastings	Moore	Stanton			
Lamborn	Rogers (AL)	Wenstrup	Hayes	Morelle	Stevens			
Latta	Rogers (KY)	Westerman	Heck	Moulton	Suo zzi			
Lesko	Rooney (FL)	Williams	Higgins (NY)	Mucarsel-Powell	Swalwell (CA)			
Long	Rose, John W.	Womack	Hill (CA)	Murphy	Takano			
Loudermilk	Rouzer	Woodall	Horn, Kendra S.	Nadler	Thompson (CA)			
Lucas	Roy	Wright	Horsford	Napolitano	Thompson (MS)			
Luetkemeyer	Rutherford	Yoho	Houllahan	Neal	Titus			
Marchant	Scalise	Young	Hoyer	Neguse	Tlaib			
Marshall	Schweikert	Zeldin	Huffman	Norcross	Tonko			
			Jackson Lee	O'Halleran	Torres (CA)			
			Jayapal	Ocasio-Cortez	Trahan			
			Jeffries	Omar	Trone			
			Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Underwood			
			Johnson (TX)	Panetta	Van Drew			
			Kaptur	Pappas	Vargas			
			Keating	Pascrell	Veasey			
			Kelly (IL)	Payne	Vela			
			Kennedy	Perlmutter	Velázquez			
			Khanna	Peters	Visclosky			
			Kildee	Peterson	Wasserman			
			Kilmer	Phillips	Schultz			
			Kim	Pingree	Waters			
			Kind	Pocan	Watson Coleman			
			Kirkpatrick	Porter	Welch			
			Krishnamoorthi	Pressley	Wexton			
			Kuster (NH)	Price (NC)	Wild			
			Lamb	Quigley	Wilson (FL)			
			Langevin	Raskin	Yarmuth			

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	Carbajal	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 F.	Clarke (NY)	Davis, Danny K.
Brindisi	Cleaver	Dean
Brown (MD)	Clyburn	DeFazio
Brownley (CA)	Cohen	DeGette
Bustos	Connolly	DeLauro
		DelBene

NAYS—190

Abraham	Collins (NY)	Guthrie
Aderholt	Comer	Hagedorn
Allen	Conaway	Harris
Amash	Cook	Hartzler
Amodei	Crawford	Hern, Kevin
Armstrong	Crenshaw	Herrera Beutler
Arrington	Curtis	Hice (GA)
Babin	Davidson (OH)	Higgins (LA)
Bacon	Davis, Rodney	Hill (AR)
Baird	Diaz-Balart	Holding
Balderson	Duffy	Hudson
Banks	Duncan	Huizenga
Barr	Dunn	Hunter
Bergman	Emmer	Hurd (TX)
Biggs	Estes	Johnson (OH)
Bilirakis	Ferguson	Johnson (SD)
Bishop (UT)	Fitzpatrick	Jordan
Bost	Fleischmann	Joyce (OH)
Brady	Flores	Joyce (PA)
Brooks (AL)	Fortenberry	Katko
Brooks (IN)	Fox (NC)	Kelly (MS)
Buchanan	Fulcher	Kelly (PA)
Buck	Gaetz	King (IA)
Bucshon	Gallagher	King (NY)
Budd	Gianforte	Kustoff (TN)
Burchett	Gibbs	LaHood
Burgess	Gohmert	LaMalfa
Byrne	Gonzalez (OH)	Lamborn
Calvert	Gooden	Latta
Carter (GA)	Gosar	Lesko
Carter (TX)	Graves (GA)	Long
Chabot	Graves (LA)	Loudermilk
Cheney	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Cline	Green (TN)	Luetkemeyer
Cloud	Griffith	Marchant
Cole	Grothman	Marshall
Collins (GA)	Guest	Massie

NOT VOTING—9

DesJarlais	Johnson (LA)	Wilson (SC)
Granger	Kinzing	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