

the ADA, from which H.R. 2694 incorporates the definition of reasonable accommodation. Therefore, if a religious organization has a paid leave policy, H.R. 2694 could require the organization to allow paid leave for purposes that conflict with its religious tenets.

The chamber also contends that H.R. 2694 is not a bill that addresses hiring, unlike the PDA and the ADA, which apply to hiring. This is false. H.R. 2694 applies to both employees and job applicants, so it is indeed a hiring statute.

Therefore, the religious organization protections in the Civil Rights Act and the ADA are just as relevant to H.R. 2694 as they are to those statutes.

Madam Speaker, to conclude, the motion to recommit includes H.R. 2694 in its entirety, with one important addition related to religious organization protections. My amendment simply incorporates the title VII religious organization protection to ensure these organizations are not forced to violate their faith in making employment and accommodation decisions.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this simple but important addition to the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, first, let me just restate what I said about the Congressional Research Service that found that States typically do not enact separate or specialized religious exemptions for pregnancy accommodation laws.

Madam Speaker, this MTR would jeopardize women's health and risk their pregnancies in order to provide a religious exemption for employers, to exempt them from the requirement to provide just basic and reasonable accommodations for the workforce. Exactly who would want them to deny these basic accommodations?

First, it is unnecessary. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act already exempts small private employers, including religious employers, with fewer than 15 employees. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 80 percent of religious organizations have fewer than 10 employees.

Second, the underlying bill does not in any way amend or change the underlying exemptions in title VII of the Civil Rights Act or Americans with Disabilities Act or any other bill. It doesn't affect the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. But it would, if it is specified in this bill, give the employer the idea that they could deny reasonable accommodations if they for some religious reason don't agree with the pregnancy: women who are pregnant and divorced, women pregnant out of wedlock, pregnant in a same-sex relationship.

What, you don't have to give them a water break?

This amendment is unnecessary. The other exemptions are there for legitimate religious reasons, and this overbroad amendment would just cause mischief.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD).

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this political poison pill of an MTR.

Corporations are a legal creation. They don't have religious beliefs. Their officers might, but they do not.

Let's be clear about who inspired the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

It is women who have asked for accommodations in lifting requirements because their doctors told them they were at high risk of miscarriage or preterm birth.

It is women like the worker in Pennsylvania who was denied a schedule change and fired due to cramping in her uterus that landed her in the ER.

This MTR invites discrimination. It emboldens those who would use religion as a basis to discriminate against people who are pregnant and not married, workers in same-sex couples, women who used IVF to get pregnant, even people with partners of a different race.

Something the proponents of this amendment aren't saying out loud is that other religious exemptions would already apply to the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

This MTR frustrates the purpose of a good bill, a bill that is supported by the Chamber of Commerce and by 89 percent of voters.

Every year, an estimated quarter of a million women are denied requests for an accommodation because current law forces pregnant workers to find other nonpregnant employees who received similar accommodations to make a case.

When pregnant women are denied accommodations, they face health risks, miscarriage, premature births.

Symptoms and conditions of pregnancy cannot be fully appreciated unless you have been pregnant yourself. So when you consider this vote on the MTR, remember that 80 percent of directors of ACWI Index companies are men. Men who have never experienced the struggles of pregnancy will be deciding whether to invoke an exemption to deny an accommodation to a pregnant worker. That is not right.

This bill is not some new burden on employers. They must already engage in a good faith interactive process over reasonable accommodations under the ADA.

This bill, as written, takes employer concerns into account. Employers with fewer than 15 employees or those who would suffer undue hardship need not provide accommodations.

Madam Speaker, I urge a resounding "no" vote on this MTR because it dilutes the very protections for pregnant workers that the bill seeks to estab-

lish. Those protections are long overdue.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

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 yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

CONDEMNING ALL FORMS OF ANTI-ASIAN SENTIMENT AS RELATED TO COVID-19

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 908) condemning all forms of anti-Asian sentiment as related to COVID-19, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 164, answered "present" 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]
YEAS—243

Adams	Correa	Gomez
Aguilar	Costa	Gonzalez (OH)
Allred	Courtney	Gonzalez (TX)
Axne	Cox (CA)	Gottheimer
Barragan	Craig	Green, Al (TX)
Bass	Crist	Grijalva
Beatty	Crow	Haaland
Bera	Cuellar	Harder (CA)
Beyer	Cunningham	Hastings
Bishop (GA)	Davids (KS)	Hayes
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Heck
Blunt Rochester	Davis, Danny K.	Herrera Beutler
Bonamici	Dean	Higgins (NY)
Boyle, Brendan	DeGette	Himes
F.	DeLauro	Horn, Kendra S.
Brindisi	DelBene	Horsford
Brooks (IN)	Delgado	Houlahan
Brown (MD)	Demings	Hoyer
Brownley (CA)	DeSaulnier	Huffman
Bustos	Deutch	Hurd (TX)
Butterfield	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Carbajal	Doggett	Jayapal
Cárdenas	Doyle, Michael	Jeffries
Carson (IN)	F.	Johnson (GA)
Cartwright	Engel	Johnson (TX)
Case	Escobar	Kaptur
Casten (IL)	Eshoo	Katko
Castor (FL)	Espallat	Keating
Castro (TX)	Finkenaue	Kelly (IL)
Chu, Judy	Fitzpatrick	Kennedy
Ciçilline	Fletcher	Khanna
Cisneros	Foster	Kildee
Clark (MA)	Frankel	Kilmer
Clarke (NY)	Fudge	Kim
Clay	Gabbard	Kind
Cleaver	Gallego	Kirkpatrick
Clyburn	Garamendi	Krishnamoorthi
Cohen	Garcia (IL)	Kuster (NH)
Connolly	Garcia (TX)	Lamb
Cooper	Golden	Langevin

Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebasack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez

Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
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
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires

NAYS—164

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garcia (CA)
Gianforte

Gibbs
Gohmert
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Jacobs
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McClintock
McKinley
Meuser
Miller

Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Stivers
Suozi
Swailwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yarmuth

Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shinkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Van Drew
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Abraham
Byrne
Cook
Davidson (OH)
DeFazio
Duncan
Dunn
Evans

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—23

Gaetz
Graves (GA)
LaMalfa
Marchant
McHenry
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo

□ 1249

Messrs. BRADY, KELLY of Pennsylvania, and LONG changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. GONZALEZ of Texas and DOGGETT changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Beyer)
Blumenauer
(Beyer)
Butterfield
(Kildee)
Lawson (FL)
(Demings)
Lie, Ted (Beyer)
Lipinski (Cooper)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lowenthal
(Beyer)
Lowe (Tonko)
Meng (Clark)
(MA)
Moore (Beyer)
(Correa)
Grijalva (Raskin)
Hastings
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Jayapal (Raskin)
Khanna (Gomez)
Kirkpatrick
(Gallego)

Rooney (FL)
(Beyer)
Roybal-Allard
(Aguilar)
Rush
(Underwood)
Serrano
(Jeffries)
Sewell (AL)
(DeBene)
Sires (Pallone)
Trahan
(McGovern)
Waters
(Brownley
(CA))
Watson Coleman
(Pallone)
Welch
(McGovern)
Wilson (FL)
(Hayes)

Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garcia (CA)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Guest

Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Jacobs
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McAdams
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes

NAYS—226

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
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
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney

Olson
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Shinkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Stauber
Stefanik
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS
ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit to the bill (H.R. 2694) to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition, offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 177, nays 226, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

YEAS—177

Aderholt
Allen
Amash

Amodei
Armstrong
Babin

Bacon
Baird
Balderson