than 40 hours a week on the job, they should be paid fairly for it. That is just the bottom line.

I have heard from some of my Republican colleagues that they do not want to update overtime rules. But if the Republicans want to take away this basic worker protection—basic worker protection—they are going to have to answer to millions of hard-working Americans who are putting in overtime without receiving a dime in extra pay. They can try, but I know I and many others are going to be right here fighting back for the workers and families we represent.

Boosting wages and expanding economic stability and security is good for families, and it is good for our economy. And, by the way, that is exactly what we should be focused on here in Congress—to help grow our economy from the middle out, not just the top down.

This isn't the only action we need to take to raise wages and expand economic stability for our families today. In the coming weeks and months, I am going to be working closely with Senate Democrats to continue our efforts to raise the minimum wage, to expand access to paid sick leave and fair and predictable work schedules, and to ensure women get equal pay for equal work.

But restoring overtime protections is a critical part of our work to make sure more families get much needed economic stability. Enacting these policies would be strong steps in the right direction to bring back the American dream of economic security and a stable middle-class life for millions of families.

For workers such as Paul, who just want fair pay for a fair day's work, for the parents who have sacrificed family time for overtime and not seen a dime in extra pay, and for families who are looking for some much needed economic security, I urge all of my colleagues to support restoring overtime protections.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

# RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

## MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 3038

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3038) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

#### SCHEDULE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, let me indicate to all Members that discussions continue on a way forward on a multiyear highway bill, and we will have more to say about that later in the day.

### HONORING THE SERVICEMEMBERS WHO WERE KILLED IN THE CHATTANOOGA TRAGEDY

Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, at dawn, with Congress returning to session, we lowered the flag at the U.S. Capitol to half-staff in honor of the servicemembers who were killed in Chattanooga. What we saw there was a tragedy for our country. It was a terrible blow to everyone who loved these brave Americans. We will never forget their sacrifice, and we will continue to keep their families and their memories in our thoughts today.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### DRIVE ACT

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, we are going to be moving to the highway bill. In fact, we are going to have the motion to proceed today at 2:15 p.m., and I think it is important that people realize the significance of this.

We do a lot of work around here that is not really critical. There are some issues that are. If you would like to read the Constitution sometime when you have nothing else to do, it will tell you that what we are supposed to be doing are two things: defending America and roads and bridges. That is what it says in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution. So anytime you are sitting around with nothing to do, you ought to read it, and you will realize that what we are going to do at 2:15 today is very significant.

Passing a long-term transportation reauthorization bill has been my top priority since I resumed the office of the chairmanship of the Environment and Public Works Committee. It is probably the second most important thing we do, second only to the Defense authorization bill.

In the first hearing we had in January, we had Secretary Foxx, the Secretary of Transportation, who is an outstanding Secretary. He is just as concerned about this as we are. Senator BOXER and I brought in Secretary Foxx as well as local government leaders to share the importance of ongoing Federal and State partnerships in maintaining the modern surface infrastructure system. Since that time, my committee has put forward a bipartisan bill called the DRIVE Act. It is significant, and it is not partisan. There is no such thing as a Democratic bridge or a Republican bridge or a Democratic road or a Republican road.

Historically, Republicans have been recognized as leading in this area, from way back in the days when President Lincoln spearheaded the Transcontinental Railroad; Teddy Roosevelt and the Panama Canal; and, of course, the Interstate Highway System, created by President Eisenhower.

President Eisenhower recognized that weakened defense and interstate commerce made our Nation vulnerable to the world. In 1952, when he proposed the Interstate Highway System, he commented that this was every bit as much about defending America as it was about the economy and being able to transport commerce around the States. In laving out the full interstate system, he envisioned it to be the physical backbone of the economy, fueling the growth of our GDP, our cities, and the competitiveness of our exports. This vision and certainty maximized the economic and mobility benefits of the system. Businesses and individuals knew that they could locate somewhere on the future interstate system and be connected to not just the rest of the country but the rest of the world.

This legacy system, which was built over 50 years ago, had a design life of 50 years, and it has actually been over 60 years—close to 70 years since it was built. We are beyond our warranty period, and we are in serious danger of eroding half a century of investments without proper maintenance, modernization, and reconstruction. We are on borrowed time with a system that is in full need of restoration. Our national interstate system currently has a maintenance backlog of \$185 billion on about 47,000 miles of interstate, and that is just to bring it back to the design it was in 1956.

Maintaining Eisenhower's vision of economic opportunity and strength in defense requires a continued partnership between the Federal Government and the States, which is the hallmark of the DRIVE Act. Yet, due to 33 short-term patches since 2005—I have to say this because this is significant. We