of mixed-motive age discrimination in Federal employment claims. We have to fight back against these motivating factors that have nothing to do with a person's experience or ability.

It is important that when we pass legislation, we ensure that it has public data on the outcome in order to be transparent and accountable to the residents who we serve back home.

For the sake of our residents and to protect our older workforce, Congress must ensure that age is not again a motivating factor in employment decisions.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this amendment requires the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights to produce a report on mixed-motive claims in age discrimination cases filed by Federal employees against their Federal agency employers. I have several concerns with this amendment.

First, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is a small agency that is not well equipped to undertake such a study. This amendment requires ''funds appropriated in advance,'' otherwise known as taxpayer dollars, to be spent to do the report, which means the agency doesn't have the resources to take on this mandate.

Second, while H.R. 1230 was only referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, this amendment involves the interests of two other committees that are not represented in this debate. The Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction over the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, which is tasked with doing the report directed by the amendment, and the Oversight and Reform Committee has jurisdiction over the employment relationships between Federal agencies and their employees.

Third, this report will be submitted to Congress no later than 5 years after the bill goes into effect. I am not sure what good a report published 5 years from now will do for us who are being asked to vote on H.R. 1230 now.

Fourth, perhaps most importantly, there is a lack of evidence that a report is needed on age discrimination claims in Federal agencies. The Committee on Education and Labor received no evidence on this matter.

With H.R. 1230, Democrats have chosen to further their pro-trial lawyer agenda with legislation that masquerades as a protection for workers.

H.R. 1230 is yet another one-size-fits-all approach that fails to address the purported problem, neglects the experience of workers and employers, and disregards decades of Supreme Court precedent.

This amendment does nothing to address the fundamental flaws in H.R. 1230, and it directs a small agency to conduct a study without a clear basis of the need for that study.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Chairman, I think it is really important to note that this came about because the last report that we could find on age discrimination in this particular area is from the 1970s. It is about time that we bring this forward.

We could not find anything anywhere that specifically looked at this particular Federal mixed-motive age discrimination kind of study, again, since the 1970s.

The burden of proof is just too high on Federal employees. We need to go back and be very centered around making sure that there is equal access to proving a discrimination case of this type.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, this is a solution in search of a problem.

We all know that it is almost impossible to fire a Federal employee. In fact, I think the number is less than 1 percent who are fired each year.

Maybe the reason we haven't had an updated report is because there hasn't been the need for an updated report. I think, again, this is a totally unnecessary amendment, and I am totally opposed to it.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. TLAIB) having assumed the chair, Mr. CUELLAR, 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. 1230) to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1602

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of Maryland) at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

PROTECTING OLDER WORKERS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 790 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1230.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1602

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1230) to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes, with Mr. CUELLAR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 116–377 offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. ALLEN

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 116–790 offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 257, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

AYES—163

Abraham	Bost	Conaway
Aderholt	Brady	Cook
Allen	Brooks (AL)	Crenshaw
Amodei	Buck	Curtis
Armstrong	Bucshon	DesJarlais
Arrington	Budd	Diaz-Balart
Babin	Burchett	Duncan
Bacon	Burgess	Dunn
Baird	Carter (GA)	Emmer
Balderson	Carter (TX)	Estes
Banks	Chabot	Ferguson
Barr	Cheney	Fleischmann
Bergman	Cline	Flores
Biggs	Cloud	Fortenberry
Bilirakis	Cole	Foxx (NC)
Bishop (NC)	Collins (GA)	Fulcher
Bishop (UT)	Comer	Gaetz