



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 2013

No. 64

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 8, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MARK R. MEADOWS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

We pray for the gift of wisdom to all with great responsibility in this House for the leadership of our Nation.

May all the Members have the vision of a world where respect and understanding are the marks of civility, and honor and integrity are the marks of one's character.

Send Your blessing today upon our honored guest, Madam President, the Honorable Park Geun-hye of the Republic of Korea. Raise up, O God, women and men from every nation who will lead toward the paths of peace and whose good judgment will heal the hurt between all peoples.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done within these hallowed halls 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 his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore 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. After consultation among the Speaker and the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent, the Chair announces that, when the two Houses meet in joint meeting to hear an address by Her Excellency Park Geun-hye, President of the Republic of Korea, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those immediately to his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House. Due to the large attendance that is anticipated, the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly enforced. Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor. The cooperation of all Members is requested.

The practice of reserving seats prior to the joint meeting by placard will not be allowed. Members may reserve their seats by physical presence only following the security sweep of the Chamber.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of

Wednesday, April 24, 2013, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly, (at 9 o'clock and 4 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1022

JOINT MEETING TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HER EXCELLENCY PARK GEUN-HYE, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

During the recess, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 10 o'clock and 22 minutes a.m.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms, Mrs. Kerri Hanley, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The joint meeting will come to order.

The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort Her Excellency Park Geun-hye, President of the Republic of Korea, into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR);

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY);

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN);

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS);

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE);

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP);

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON);

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY);

□ 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.

H2487

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT);

The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER);

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT);

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI);

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER);

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN);

The gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL);

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN);

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL);

The gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA);

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU);

The gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL); and

The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort Her Excellency Park Geun-hye, President of the Republic of Korea, into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID);
The Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH);

The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ);

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN);

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL);

The Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN);

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO);

The Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI); and

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER).

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms announced the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, His Excellency Hersey Kyota, the Ambassador of the Republic of Palau.

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The Members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered

the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 10 o'clock and 36 minutes a.m., the Sergeant at Arms, the Honorable Paul D. Irving, announced Her Excellency Park Geun-hye, President of the Republic of Korea.

The President of the Republic of Korea, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The SPEAKER. Members of Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you Her Excellency Park Geun-hye, President of the Republic of Korea.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

President PARK. Speaker BOEHNER, Vice President BIDEN, distinguished Members of the House and the Senate, ladies and gentlemen,

I am privileged to stand in this Chamber—this hallowed ground of freedom and democracy—to speak about our friendship and our future together.

After I arrived in Washington the day before yesterday, I went to the Korean War Memorial near the banks of the Potomac. I read the words etched in granite: "Our nation honors her sons and daughters, who answered the call to defend a country they never knew and a people they never met." Time and again, I am moved when I read those familiar words.

Let me express—on behalf of the people of the Republic of Korea—our profound gratitude to America's veterans. Their blood, sweat and tears helped safeguard freedom and democracy.

I also offer my heartfelt appreciation to four men in particular. They served in that war and now serve in this Chamber. Their names are Congressmen JOHN CONYERS, CHARLES RANGEL, SAM JOHNSON and HOWARD COBLE.

Gentlemen, my country thanks you.

When the guns fell silent in the summer of 1953, Koreans were surviving on \$67 a year. Six decades later, Korea is one of the top five car producers and the eighth-largest trading nation.

Some call this the "Miracle on the Han River."

But for those of us in Korea, it was anything but a miracle. And it wasn't just built from within. Koreans worked tirelessly in the mines of Germany, in the jungles of Vietnam, and in the deserts of the Middle East.

These are the people—the proud Korean people—I am so honored to serve as President.

They are the ones that made Korea what it is today.

Together, we will write a sequel to that story: "A Second Miracle on the Han River."

This time, it will be written with a revived economy, with a people that are happy, with a flourishing culture, and on a pathway to a reunified Peninsula.

These are the four tenets that guide my government. We also know that we didn't come this far on our own.

Along our journey we have been aided by great friends, and among them the United States is second to none. America, I thank you for your friendship.

If the past is anything to go by, our new journey will also be filled with excitement.

This year, we honor the 60th anniversary of our alliance. And today, I would like to acknowledge one iconic family that captures those 60 years.

It is the family of Lieutenant Colonel David Morgan.

Colonel Morgan's grandfather, the late Warren Morgan, fought in the Korean War. The senior Morgan was a commander in the U.S. Naval Reserve.

His father, John Morgan, also served in the Korean War. He was a battery commander of the 213th Field Artillery.

Colonel Morgan himself has served two tours in Korea in 1992 and 2005.

The Morgan family is a living testimony to our 60 years together—three generations of Americans helping to safeguard Korea. That family is here with us today.

As President of a grateful nation, I salute the Morgan family and the commitment and friendship of the American people.

Looking forward, our precious alliance is setting its sights on a better world—a brighter future. Bound by trust, guided by shared values, we are cooperating across and beyond our own boundaries.

Korea has stood by the United States in Iraq and Afghanistan. Together, we supported peace-building and reconstruction in those nations.

Following the Washington Conference in 2010, Seoul hosted the second Nuclear Security Summit last year. There we reaffirmed our commitment to the vision of "a world without nuclear weapons."

A world without nuclear weapons—President Obama's vision—must start on the Korean Peninsula. For the Peninsula is home to the only divided nation-state and directly faces the threat of nuclear weapons. It is an ideal test bed for a future free of nuclear arms. If we can pull it off on the Korean Peninsula, then we can pull it off anywhere else.

Korea has been pursuing the peaceful use of nuclear energy. It is also firmly committed to the principle of non-proliferation. Korea and the United States are partnering to build reactors in third countries. In this regard, we need a modernized, mutually beneficial successor to our existing civil nuclear agreement. Such an accord will bring huge benefits to related industries in both our countries.

Our partnership also extends to development assistance.

The United States and Korea send the largest numbers of aid volunteers abroad. We will work side by side to help lower-income countries. In 2011, our aid agencies signed a document that facilitates these efforts. And Korea's aid agency will soon be signing another with the U.S. Peace Corps.

In March of last year, the Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement went into effect. The agreement adds an economic pillar to our alliance. It has moved us closer to a comprehensive strategic alliance.

We can do even more. If the bill on visa quotas for Korean professionals is passed in this Congress, both our economies will benefit, for it would help create many more jobs. It would show our people what the FTA can do for them.

I ask Congress for its understanding—for its support.

Our FTA also connects East Asia and North America and provides a key platform for building a common Asia-Pacific market. The agreement also helps underpin Washington's rebalancing toward the region.

Collectively, these developments paint a forward-leaning alliance. They point to a 21st century partnership that is both comprehensive and strategic.

Ladies and gentlemen,

That is our present, the foundation on which we stand. I now wish to share my vision of "our future together"—a future that we will build together as partners.

Following our meeting yesterday, President Obama and I adopted a joint declaration. Building on the extraordinary accomplishments of the last 60 years, we determined to embark on another shared journey toward peace on the Korean Peninsula, toward cooperation in Northeast Asia, and, finally, toward prosperity around the world.

It is my hope that as we make this journey, our partnership will be guided by a three-part vision.

The first is to lay the groundwork for enduring peace on the Korean Peninsula and over time for reunification.

That future, I know, feels distant today.

North Korea continues to issue threats and provocations firing long-range missiles, staging nuclear tests that undermine peace on the Peninsula and far beyond it.

The Korean Government is reacting resolutely but calmly. We are maintaining the highest level of readiness. We are strengthening our cooperation with the U.S. and other international partners.

Korea's economy and financial markets remain stable. Companies—both domestic and foreign—see this, and are expanding their investments.

Korea's economic fundamentals are strong. Its government is equal to the task. And it is backed by the might of our alliance. So long as this continues, you may rest assured: no North Korean provocation can succeed.

I will remain steadfast in pushing forward a process of trust-building on the Korean Peninsula. I am confident that trust is the path to peace, the path to a Korea that is whole again.

The Republic of Korea will never accept a nuclear-armed North Korea. Pyongyang's provocations will be met decisively.

At the same time, I will not link humanitarian aid provided to the North Korean people, such as infants and young children, to the political situation.

And with the trust that gradually builds up, through exchange, through cooperation, we will cement the grounds for durable peace and, eventually, peaceful reunification.

But as we say in Korea, it takes two hands to clap. Trust is not something that can be imposed on another.

The pattern is all too familiar—and badly misguided. North Korea provokes a crisis. The international community imposes a certain period of sanctions. Later, it tries to patch things up by offering concessions and rewards. Meanwhile, Pyongyang uses that time to advance its nuclear capabilities. And uncertainty prevails.

It is time to put an end to this vicious cycle.

Pyongyang is pursuing two goals at once—a nuclear arsenal and economic development. We know these are incompatible. You cannot have your cake and eat it, too.

The leadership in Pyongyang must make no mistake. Security does not come from nuclear weapons. Security comes when the lives of its people are improved. It comes when people are free to pursue their happiness.

North Korea must make the right choice. It must walk the path to becoming a responsible member in the community of nations.

In order to induce North Korea to make that choice, the international community must speak with one voice. Its message must be clear and consistent.

Only then will we see real progress in inter-Korean relations. Only then will lasting peace be brought to the Korean Peninsula and Northeast Asia.

Sixty years ago, a stretch of earth bisecting the Korean Peninsula was cleared of arms. Today, that demilitarized zone drawn to prevent armed collision is the most militarized place on the planet. And the standoff around the DMZ has the potential to endanger global peace.

We must defuse that danger. Not just South and North Korea. The world must also get involved. The demilitarized zone must live up to its name, a zone that strengthens the peace, not undermines it.

It is with this vision in mind that I hope to work toward an international park inside the DMZ. It will be a park that sends a message of peace to all of humanity. This could be pursued in parallel with my trust-building process. There, I believe we can start to grow peace—to grow trust. It would be a zone of peace, bringing together not just Koreans separated by a military line, but also the citizens of the world. I call on America and the global community to join us in seeking the promise of a new day.

Honorable Members of Congress,

The second leg of our journey extends beyond the Korean Peninsula to all of

Northeast Asia, where we must build a mechanism of peace and cooperation.

Sadly, today, the nations of this region fail to fulfill all that we can achieve collectively. That potential is tremendous.

The region's economies are gaining ever greater clout and becoming more and more interlinked. Yet differences stemming from history are widening.

It has been said that those who are blind to the past cannot see the future. This is obviously a problem for the here and now. But the larger issue is about tomorrow. For where there is failure to acknowledge honestly what happened yesterday, there can be no tomorrow.

Asia suffers from what I call "Asia's paradox": the disconnect between growing economic interdependence, on the one hand, and backward political, security cooperation on the other. How we manage this paradox—this will determine the shape of a new order in Asia.

Together, we must meet these challenges. And so I propose an initiative for peace and cooperation in Northeast Asia.

We cannot afford to put off a multilateral dialogue process in Northeast Asia. Together, the United States and other Northeast Asian partners could start with softer issues. These include environmental issues and disaster relief. They include nuclear safety and counterterrorism. Trust will be built through this process. And that trust will propel us to expand the horizons of our cooperation.

The initiative will serve the cause of peace and development in the region, but it will be firmly rooted in the Korea-U.S. alliance. In this sense, it could reinforce President Obama's strategy of rebalancing towards the Asia-Pacific.

Of course, North Korea could also be invited to join. If we start where our interests overlap, then later on it will be easier to find common ground on the larger challenges, easier to find solutions to our mutual benefit.

I firmly believe that Korea and the United States will work hand in hand as we shape an emerging process for cooperation in the region.

The third and final leg of our journey extends even farther beyond the Peninsula—beyond Northeast Asia to the rest of the world.

It is to contribute to happiness—the happiness of Koreans on both halves of the Peninsula, the happiness of all humanity. This is a vision I also advanced at my inauguration.

The "pursuit of happiness" is enshrined in the American Declaration of Independence. It also occupies a special place in the Korean Constitution. I have long believed that our alliance should aim far, that it should ultimately seek a happier world.

Guided by this spirit, we stood side by side in the frontiers of peace and freedom. Infused by this spirit, we are expanding cooperation on global issues,

issues like counterterrorism, nuclear nonproliferation and the global financial crisis.

Our efforts will not stop there. Together, we will help spread the universal values of freedom, human rights, and the rule of law. We will march together to take on global challenges—from fighting poverty to tackling climate change and other environmental issues.

Members of the House and the Senate,

Our journey since the Korean war has been led by a specific mission to respond to threats and provocations from the north and to defend freedom and peace on the Korean Peninsula.

Today, our alliance is called upon to go beyond that—beyond just the defense of freedom and peace. We are called upon to step forward on a new journey—a journey toward a Korea that is at peace, that is happy, and that is made whole.

Our economic partnership must also aim higher and reach further into the future.

President Obama has outlined the Startup America Initiative. Together, with my strategy for a creative economy, we can advance toward a common goal—to help channel the innovative ideas, the passion, and the drive of our youths towards a brighter future.

Koreans and Americans are partnering in new ways, whether at world tours of Korean pop stars for Hollywood films or at reconstruction sites in the Middle East.

Together, we can envision a future that is richer, that is safer, and that is happier.

Our chorus of freedom and peace, of future and hope, has not ceased to resonate over the last 60 years and will not cease to go on.

Thank you very much.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

At 11 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m., Her Excellency Park Geun-hye, President of the Republic of Korea, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Members of the President's Cabinet;

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, (at 11 o'clock and 16 minutes a.m.) the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1201

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 12 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 8, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 8, 2013 at 9:27 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1071.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

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.

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, as a mother who has worked for many years outside of the house raising our three children, I know firsthand about the challenges of trying to balance work with family life. That is why I'm a proud cosponsor of the Working Families Flexibility Act, which would give more time to workers, the freedom to decide how to use their time. For some people, this may mean taking a sick child to the doctor or attending their daughter's ballet recital or caring for an aging parent.

Currently, an outdated law prohibits private sector employers from even offering their employees the option to choose paid time off as compensation for overtime hours worked. The Work-

ing Families Flexibility Act would put an end to this arbitrary restriction.

By leveling the playing field and giving more employees the freedom to control their overtime compensation, this commonsense proposal will help strengthen families and our workforce.

TRAVEL AND TOURISM

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, this week is the 30th annual National Travel and Tourism Week. On Monday, I met with travel and tourism leaders in my State to discuss what we can do at the Federal level of government to strengthen this key sector of our economy.

According to the U.S. Travel Association, travel and tourism generated \$2 trillion in economic output in 2012. The industry is also one of America's largest employers, supporting 14.6 million jobs. And this is especially important for my home State of Rhode Island, where the travel and tourism sector supports more than 40,000 jobs and generates \$3.5 billion in spending. But we need to do more to support the travel industry, as well as the small business community that depends on a thriving tourism economy.

I am a cosponsor of the bipartisan JOLT Act, a bill that would revise existing visa laws to support the American travel and tourism economy while maintaining essential national security protocols.

I look forward to working further with my colleagues to highlight the importance of our travel and tourism economy in a way that will put men and women back to work in Rhode Island and across our country.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mr. DENHAM. As chair of the Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines and Hazardous Materials, tomorrow the full Transportation Committee will be taking up legislation which represents a significant opportunity to create American jobs and spur economic growth in our country.

Quite simply, the Northern Route Approval Act will end years of bureaucratic delays and finally allow construction to the Keystone XL pipeline project. The delay alone over the last 4 years has blocked 120,000 American jobs. The delays have to stop. This has bipartisan support. It is time to stop the delays. In my home State of California, we have not only seen huge skyrocketing gas prices, but we continue to see high unemployment and rolling blackouts.

I'm part of the House Energy Action Team, and it is time to make sure that we have energy independence, lower

gas prices and energy prices, and create American jobs. It's time to stop the delays of the Keystone XL pipeline.

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, today we're considering the Republican's latest attack on workers' rights. Republicans are calling this bill the Working Families Flexibility Act, but a more appropriate name would be the More Work, Less Pay Act. This bill is bad for middle class families and would make life worse for workers.

It would essentially end the 40-hour workweek by permitting employers to not pay overtime to workers who exceed 40 hours per week. Instead, it would allow employers to hold earned comp time in their control. It would allow employers to refuse the right of workers to take time off to help a family member in need or attend a parent-teacher conference. That's wrong, Mr. Speaker.

Productivity of our Nation's workers is at an all-time high, yet again we see efforts to whittle down the rights of hardworking families.

Instead of focusing on attacking workers, maybe we should focus on creating good-paying jobs. That's what our constituents want. That's what Americans want.

REINING IN REGULATION TO HELP JOBS RECOVER

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, America's workers and families are in a jobs depression. Since 2009, 9.5 million people have dropped out of the workforce. America's workforce participation rate is the lowest since Jimmy Carter was President. Millions looking for full-time work can find only part-time jobs.

Overreaching Federal regulation is a big reason for this jobs disaster. The Obama administration's onslaught of new major regulation is unprecedented. Every day, Federal agencies erect more roadblocks to economic growth and a jobs recovery.

The House Judiciary Committee is working hard to provide relief. It passed the REINS Act last month and is at work on other groundbreaking legislation to reduce unneeded regulation. This legislation is critical to the growth and recovery America needs, and the Judiciary Committee will do all it can to achieve it.

□ 1210

CANCEL THE SEQUESTER ACT

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. It has now been 857 days since I arrived in Congress, and the Republican leadership has still not allowed a single vote on serious legislation to address our unemployment crisis.

The nightmare of joblessness is destroying the American Dream.

When I was graduating from college, my American Dream was owning a home and starting a family, while, for the class of 2013, the American Dream means just having a job—any job—to make ends meet. By eliminating public sector jobs during a time of high unemployment, the sequester is killing the American Dream. It's up to us to cancel the sequester and ensure that America is again a land of opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, let's bring H.R. 900, the Cancel the Sequester Act, to the floor for a vote to end this shame. Our mantra should be jobs, jobs, jobs.

AMERICAN AND SOUTH KOREAN ALLIANCE

(Mr. GARRETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARRETT. I rise to speak about the strong relationship between the United States and South Korea, one of our most important relationships, for South Korea is one of America's closest allies in Asia and, indeed, in the entire world. Since the Korean war in the 1950s, the U.S. and South Korea have stood side by side in the name of democracy and liberty and to face down the forces of tyranny and oppression and dictatorship from North Korea and the broader world.

All you need to do is to compare North and South Korea to understand how successful South Korea has been and how much of a failure the Kim regime in the North has been.

South Korea is the world's 15th-largest economy and Asia's fourth-largest. Companies like Samsung, Kia, and LG are major, globally known brands, while Seoul ranks as one of the great cities of the world. South Korea is a vibrant, open society with an equally vibrant and open political system.

Now take North Korea. North Korea is a kleptocratic, vicious dictatorship that tramples on the most basic rights of its citizens, all in the name of glorifying the Kim family and its cadre of jack-booted thugs. There is no freedom of choice, no freedom of religion, and no freedom to dissent from the line of the Kim regime. For the average North Korean, there is only poverty, despotism, and no hope as the regime squanders its resources on its bloated military and dangerous nuclear program.

THE MIRA LOMA SCIENCE BOWL WIN

(Mr. BERA of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, last week, a team from Mira Loma

High School in Sacramento won the National Science Bowl for the third time since 2009. Hosted by the U.S. Department of Energy, the Science Bowl was created to encourage students to enter science and mathematics careers.

I want to congratulate these talented and hardworking students from my home district. They represent America's future. They are our country's next generation of innovators. We must continue to inspire our students to excel in fields like science and math. We need to make science cool.

To Jack Gurev, Daniel Shen, Siddharth Trehan, and Saaket Agrawal, you guys make us proud.

And, Coach James Hill, keep inspiring the next generation to go into science and math. It's cool.

OBAMA'S VISIT TO TEXAS SHOULD FOCUS ON ENERGY

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Tomorrow, the President of the United States will be traveling to the great State of Texas to talk jobs. I am proud that the President recognizes Texas as a leading job-producing State and that he understands what it is to create jobs and retain a robust economy.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, The Wall Street Journal had an interesting article—it's on my chart up here—about the energy boom in Texas. It stated that Texas produces as much oil as the next four oil-producing States combined. The Lone Star State now pumps nearly 2 million barrels a day.

Now, the President's tour only has one stop in Texas, south of Austin, which is unfortunate. I would like to invite the President to come to my energy-rich district along the Texas gulf coast and see what job creation really looks like. If the President wants to create jobs, there is a project—the Keystone pipeline to be exact—that has been waiting 1,692 days to do just that.

I encourage and welcome President Obama to come to my district so he can talk with local business leaders who want the Keystone pipeline.

That's the way it is from where I sit. I'm RANDY WEBER.

THE CAMARILLO SPRINGS WILDFIRE AND THE HEROISM OF THE FIRST RESPONDERS

(Ms. BROWNLEY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Last week, Ventura County endured one of the largest wildfires in our county's history. The Camarillo Springs wildfire burned over 28,000 acres, damaging some homes and buildings and threatening many neighborhoods in Ventura County.

I rise today to thank more than 1,800 firefighters and first responders who

worked around the clock to control the blaze and who, in so doing, saved every single life and prevented the potentially massive destruction of personal property. Despite high heat, dry temperatures, and very windy conditions, firefighters in Ventura County joined others from throughout the State to successfully contain the fire quickly and without any loss of life.

I am so proud of our first responders and of our brave firefighters. All of Ventura County is so very grateful for their heroic dedication to our continued safety.

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, we will be voting on the House floor for the Working Families Flexibility Act. This legislation will allow private sector employers to empower their workforce by allowing them to choose compensation in the form of paid time off or in cash wages.

Now let me tell you a story about Karen and her family.

Karen works hour after hour to meet the family needs, to make ends meet, and to provide for her two children. Sometimes there just does not seem to be enough hours in the day. When school starts up, she can never have enough hours with Matt and Sarah to support them in their extracurricular activities. Instead of being able to use her overtime for time instead of wages, she has to take time off without pay. Federal law mandates that Karen take money when what she really values is time with the family.

Folks, the key word when discussing this bill is "choice." This is not a mandate on our job creators. Let me repeat that: this is not a mandate. This is a step toward letting hardworking Americans decide what is best for them and getting government out of their lives.

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the so-called Working Families Flexibility Act. Mr. Speaker, this is a wolf in sheep's clothing—a guise to pressure employees to work more and get paid less.

H.R. 1406, which I like to call "Paying Working Families Less Act," cuts overtime pay and eliminates all flexibility. Rather than pay overtime when the work is performed, this bill provides that the employers have up to a year to pay an employee his overtime, essentially providing employers unauthorized, interest-free loans. This bill will hurt working class families and wage workers who depend on their

overtime to pay their rent, their grocery bills, their heating and water bills. They can't afford to wait a year for pay that they have rightfully earned.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a worker or a family friendly bill, as some of my colleagues are leading this body to believe. Rather, it is a blatant attempt to dismantle the Fair Labor Standards Act and roll back workers' rights 100 years. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill. We should be strengthening the fair labor laws and standards for working men and women, not destroying them.

□ 1220

FULL FAITH AND CREDIT ACT

(Mr. McCLINTOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the President vowed to veto the Full Faith and Credit Act, charging that it would "result in Congress refusing to pay obligations it has already agreed to."

I challenge the President to name one Member of Congress who has ever suggested that this is an acceptable substitute for not paying our other bills. His reliance on this falsehood is a measure of the bankruptcy of his argument.

Delaying payments on our other obligations would do enormous damage. But one thing could do even more damage, and that is the threat of defaulting on our sovereign debt. H.R. 807 takes that threat off the table and assures credit markets that their investments in the United States are absolutely guaranteed, no matter what political storms are raging in Washington.

One would think that a President who has run up more debt than almost all of his predecessors combined would understand the importance of guaranteeing the credit that supports that debt.

INVEST IN SUSTAINABLE ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES

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

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Safe Climate Caucus to highlight the fact that investing in sustainable energy technologies won't only move the Nation towards a clean energy future, but it will also grow our economy.

In order to prevent the worst impacts of climate change, we must transition to lower carbon energy systems. Making the necessary investments in the Nation's smart grid is one way to facilitate this transition. Smart grid investments are already producing real economic benefits.

The Department of Energy recently released a report on the economic im-

pact of Recovery Act investments in the smart grid. The report found that for every million dollars of direct spending on smart grid, the Nation's GDP increased by \$2.5 million. In addition, a wide variety of industrial sectors have benefited from these smart grid investments.

Mr. Speaker, climate change is a real threat to our way of life, and there's no time to waste. Fortunately, if we take action now, we can cut pollution while growing our economy.

THE IMPACT OF OBAMACARE

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, this past week, I was back in my district, like the other Members were, talking with folks about how Washington is affecting their families. One of the biggest concerns I heard was how ObamaCare could impact their lives.

It turns out the health care law seems to be anything but affordable and more of a problem than a solution. For example, since it was signed into law in 2010, the administration hasn't been completely transparent about the new health care exchanges. The exchanges are just over 6 months from implementation, and we still know very little about how they will operate.

There's also the impact the law could have on jobs. The CBO estimates ObamaCare will become a \$1 trillion tax hike. These tax hikes could hurt small businesses across Alabama and across the country as employers cut hours to avoid covering employees' health care. In fact, according to a study by the Hudson Institute, over 54,000 jobs in Alabama related to the hospitality, restaurant, and leisure industries are at risk because of the health care law.

I voted against this bill because of these concerns and more, and I also voted to repeal it time and time again. It's looking like a train wreck of a law, and we need to stop it.

NATIONAL TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

(Mr. SIREs asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of our teachers during National Teacher Appreciation Week.

Across the country, we trust teachers with our most valuable resource: our children.

Our teachers serve as role models and mentors to our kids, helping them to reach their potential; and in New Jersey, we have among the most talented teachers in the country.

It was because of the mentorship of my teachers in high school that I applied for college and eventually became a teacher myself, and it is because of my experience in the classroom that I

understand the challenges of our educators today.

While we ask our teachers to prepare our children to meet the challenges of the 21st century, we must also give them the tools to rise to these challenges. Competitive salaries and financial resources must be provided so that they can recruit the very best teachers in science, technology, engineering, math, and the arts.

While we honor our teachers this week, let's not forget the services they do for our children every day. Let us join together in recognizing teachers across this country.

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, as a father and a grandfather, I am fully aware of the responsibilities and challenge of balancing a vocation and job responsibilities with taking care of the needs of my family. Mr. Speaker, that challenge is even greater today for American hardworking families who have to address the needs of their young children or perhaps aging parents who live nearby.

For almost 30 years, we have allowed this flexibility and option for those who work for the government to have the choice between taking comp pay or taking additional pay for additional work that they have to perform. Wouldn't it be great if we would do the same thing for those who are in the private sector? For some reason, we haven't allowed that.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I'm supporting the Working Families Flexibility Act. We need to pass this today in the United States Congress to give the same privileges, rights, and options to those in the private sector as we allow in the public sector.

THE SO-CALLED WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Today is just a few days before Mother's Day, and the House Republican leadership has this House considering the so-called Working Families Flexibility Act on the floor.

This bill is no Mother's Day bouquet, but instead it amounts to a bunch of dead flowers. It denies working mothers—like my mother, who still works today as a secretary and is a part of our middle class—and other hardworking Americans the flexibility they need. This bill only gives flexibility to employers.

Under this misguided legislation, employers would have the flexibility to substitute compensation time for over-

time pay. This legislation makes it less expensive for employees to work overtime, encouraging employers to demand more overtime, leading to more work and less pay.

Instead, we should be voting on priorities for working families like equal pay for all, raising the minimum wage, and giving hardworking Americans true flexibility. Unfortunately, the majority just does not understand the needs of working Americans.

Today, I will be voting "no" on H.R. 1406 because I will defend hardworking moms like my mom and others who rely often on overtime pay to make ends meet.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for working families. Vote "no" on H.R. 1406 and give working moms what they deserve this Mother's Day, which is equal pay for equal work.

THE IMMIGRATION BILL THREATENS PUBLIC SAFETY

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Center for Immigration Studies has analyzed the Senate immigration bill and found it threatens public safety. For example:

The bill allows the legalization of illegal immigrants who have been convicted of three misdemeanors, including multiple offenses for drunk driving, vehicular homicide, domestic violence, certain sex offenses, and identity theft;

It requires immigration agencies to ignore convictions under State laws for immigrant smuggling and human trafficking;

It waives criminal offenses for anyone under 18, even if the offender was tried as an adult; and

Anyone simply claiming eligibility for any legalization program may not be detained and need not show proof of eligibility.

So the Senate bill threatens American safety, which is another reason it should be opposed.

□ 1230

GIVING NIAGARA FALLS THE WATERFRONT IT DESERVES

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, this week's announcement that New York State is committing to take action on removing the Robert Moses Parkway in Niagara Falls is welcome news for western New York. Niagara Falls is a national treasure, drawing millions of visitors each year, yet the parkway has created a physical and economic barrier between Niagara Falls and its extraordinary waterfront.

With Federal infrastructure dollars already stretched thin, we must take every opportunity to look at alter-

native funding sources. In this case, the New York Power Authority, the body responsible for the creation of the parkway and the current owner of its infrastructure, has the responsibility and the capacity to fund its removal.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot let the New York Power Authority off the hook on this historic wrong. By holding them to this obligation, we free up State and Federal resources for additional projects in Niagara Falls, maximizing the impact of our investment. It's time for Niagara Falls to have the waterfront it deserves.

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, in our recovering economy today, we have many families that have two working parents, each juggling their careers, coordinating children at school and extracurricular activities, parent-teacher meetings, and other work obligations. For so many Americans, balancing these important demands of family and work proves to be extremely difficult and oftentimes exhausting.

That is why I rise today in support of giving private sector employees the same flexibility and choice to balance their careers and home lives that public sector employees have enjoyed for the past 30 years.

The Working Families Flexibility Act simply gives employees a choice that already exists for public employees; and if passed, this commonsense legislation would correct an outdated Federal law and help give all employees more options to take care of family obligations.

Mr. Speaker, during our continued economic recovery, at a time when it is difficult for Americans to see Washington come together and pass bipartisan, positive solutions, let's show them that we understand times are difficult for many and pass the Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013.

HONORING BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS AND TRAINMEN

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

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 150th anniversary of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen, North America's oldest rail labor union. Since its founding on May 8, 1863, the BLET has always played a critical role in the transportation of people and goods throughout our Nation.

As America expanded westward, locomotive engineers and trainmen led the way. Our men and women on the railroads connected two oceans and opened up the new frontier.

Today, U.S. railroads transport 2.5 trillion metric tons a year. As we expand into new technology and high-speed rail, locomotive engineers will continue to propel the American economy forward.

The Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen now counts 55,000 active and retired members among its ranks. These are the men and women who work around the clock to literally make the trains run on time.

In recognition of the 150th anniversary of the Brotherhood, I ask my colleagues to join me in passing a resolution to honor them for their contributions in growing this great Nation.

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

(Mrs. WAGNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make life work a little easier for moms and dads in the St. Louis region. I rise today on behalf of every parent who wished they had more time to spend with their children or more time to care for a parent or a loved one. I rise today to level the playing field for all private sector employees so they receive the same flexibility public sector employees have enjoyed for nearly 30 years.

That is why I cosponsored the Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013, which allows employees the choice, voluntary choice, of paid time off or comp time in lieu of cash wages for overtime. The Working Families Flexibility Act is commonsense legislation that will help balance the needs of family life and the workplace, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure and make life work a little easier for all Americans.

REPEAL SEQUESTRATION

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, we've heard the words "sequestration" and "sequester" so often they've now become household terms. But when the Budget Control Act of 2011 became law, no one intended that sequestration would take place. In fact, everyone thought it would be so devastating that neither political party would let it stand. Well, Mr. Speaker, it stands.

At every opportunity to repeal sequestration, it has not happened. Yet we know Congress can act to address the impacts if it hits the front page of the paper. Our Republican colleagues did so for the FAA. But it is now time for us to ask: What about the children's Head Start program? What about FEMA for the victims of Hurricane Sandy? What about nutrition for women and children, also called WIC?

We need to compromise on these and other major programs, just like for the

FAA. We need Republicans to come to the table for the benefit of the people.

Wouldn't it be great if we could finally repeal sequestration?

GROWING JOBS IN AMERICA

(Mr. SESSIONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, just a few hours ago we had an opportunity to welcome the President of South Korea to this great body to listen to her words about how America, through not only our foreign policy but also with our United States military, helped South Korea to overcome the forces of Communism from the north and from China.

We heard the President speak about the economic growth and vitality of her people, of the Korean people who want more and better friendship with America. But the underlying theme was economic freedom—freedom for her people, freedom for people to make their own decisions. This is consistent with the message that we heard from the last head of a foreign government speaker we had, from Mexico, who spoke about how Mexico is going to aim for GDP growth of 6 percent.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we here in America catch on to what our allies are doing all across the globe, and that is seeking economic freedom, economic growth, and jobs for all of their people. We should be doing the same thing in this country. Mr. Speaker, that's why the Republican Party is trying to grow jobs and make sure life is better for Americans now.

STUDENT AID EXPANSION ACT

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over the last 4 months, I have been proud to work towards building out what I have called the Infrastructure of Opportunity for our Nation. Recently, I had the opportunity to file legislation to reinforce one of the major cornerstones of that infrastructure: access to colleges and universities.

A few weeks ago, I filed the Student Aid Expansion Act of 2013 that will provide higher education students increased access to affordable financial aid. As we've all witnessed across our districts, the cost of tuition continues to rise. In Texas, for example, tuition and fees at public institutions have increased over 90 percent since 2003.

Meanwhile, students and families are left looking for ways to keep their higher education affordable. Over the last 10 years, we have seen students rely more heavily on loans to finance their education. Fifty-two percent of direct student aid now comes in the form of loans.

The Student Aid Expansion Act of 2013 would remove barriers that are

currently preventing our institutions of higher education from promoting affordable, State-based alternatives. These types of loans are zero interest and can be fully forgiven if a student does well in school. Importantly, this legislation will not cost Federal, State, or local governments a single dime.

SUPPORT UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, it has now been more than 2 months since mindless sequestration across-the-board cuts were enacted, crippling so many important services and benefits that Americans rely on, such as Social Security processing at Social Security offices around this country.

Well, there's another very important earned benefit that's being cut—unemployment benefits. Republicans keep rewarding the superrich while cutting unemployment benefits. When you cut benefits, you not only hurt men and women who are looking for work, you actually hurt economic recovery.

Fact: unemployment checks pump money back into local communities, helping the economy to recover. Where does the money go? Groceries, gasoline, school clothing, rent payments, basics.

The U.S. Department of Labor, during the Bush administration, found that every dollar spent on unemployment benefits pumped \$2 back in to the local economy. It's a good deal. Therefore, sequestration cuts in unemployment compensation inflict pain not only on jobless families, but also harms economic growth in a major way.

I call on my Republican colleagues to come to the table, compromise, reverse the mindless sequester that is cutting unemployment benefits. Let's celebrate Mother's Day by paying workers their full earned benefits, not imposing more worry on the unemployed among America's working families.

□ 1240

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

(Mr. GALLEG0 asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak against H.R. 1406, misnamed the Working Families Flexibility Act.

Feeding a family, paying our bills, and making sure that our kids have what they need, for most of us, those are the core things that we worry about each month, and they all involve money.

However, H.R. 1406, which would be more appropriately named the Working Families Get Less Act, does nothing for those working families who are

struggling to make ends meet. The bill fails to recognize that people usually work overtime because they need the money.

The legislation essentially ends overtime pay by allowing an employer to give time off instead. Supporters say it gives working mothers more flexibility because they would have the option of spending their time at home—that's the flexibility.

But no matter how you slice it, you cannot feed a family with time off. Every hour of work matters to a family's bottom line. It's a factor in food and clothing and keeping a roof over your head.

So I urge a "no" vote on this bill that takes the money out of the pockets of working women and families in Texas and across the country.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 807, FULL FAITH AND CREDIT ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 202 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 202

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 807) to require that the Government prioritize all obligations on the debt held by the public in the event that the debt limit is reached. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Camp of Michigan or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, the gentlewoman from New York, my friend (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. House Resolution 202 provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 807. This rule provides for discussion opportunities for Members of the minority and the majority to participate in this debate.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to guarantee the full faith and credit of the United States for generations to come by ensuring that our Nation will never default on our debt obligations.

Functionally, H.R. 807, the Full Faith and Credit Act of 2013, ensures that the Treasury Department will continue to make payments on the principal and interest of our debt, including debt held by the Social Security trust fund, in the event that the statutory debt limit is reached. Requiring the Treasury to make good on its obligations to the Social Security trust fund will ensure that those funds are available to honor our commitment to seniors and disabled Americans.

Moreover, H.R. 807 provides certainty to investors, small businesses, retirees, pension beneficiaries, and international markets that we will never negatively impact our economy by allowing this Nation to default on its debts.

In the larger sense, it is our opportunity to engage, in a public forum, the Treasury Department and the administration on what we believe is the right way to engage in discussions about how we will move forward in uncharted territories as it's dealing with the financial difficulties of our country.

However, today's debate is symptomatic of the larger problem. For far too long, our Federal Government has spent too much money and borrowed too much. We have spent money and not listened to the American people, nor looked ahead at the consequences of spending too much, saving too little, and not creating jobs that will help to sustain the American Dream, the next generation, and the systems which we hold so dear to the American system.

House Republicans however, today, come to the floor, under the leadership of our great Ways and Means Chairman, DAVE CAMP, and some ideas that have come from Congressman TOM MCCLINTOCK of California, and we are working on ideas with commonsense solutions to cut wasteful spending, reform entitlement programs, and balance the budget in a way that furthers our country, strengthens what we do, and makes sure we are ready for tomorrow.

Yet at almost every turn, including yesterday, up in the Rules Committee upstairs, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have opposed pro-growth agendas and pushed for higher taxes and more spending. It happens almost every single day, every single bill

that we bring before the Rules Committee, a demand to increase spending and increase taxes.

Our Nation does not have a taxing problem. It has a spending problem; and until we enact meaningful reforms, we will not improve our dire financial dilemma and the circumstances that come with trying to manage a problem instead of a growth opportunity to make our country stronger.

Today, the American economy is struggling and has been struggling now in our fifth year to regain momentum and is burdened by massive amounts of Federal spending and Federal debt. Allowing our Nation to default would severely hinder what little growth there is, potentially causing the U.S. to slip back into another recession and risk another downgrading of our credit rating.

For these reasons, default is unacceptable; and that is why House Republicans, we think weeks, perhaps months ahead of trying to finally address this issue, we think it's time that our ideas are on the floor of the House of Representatives, talking openly, not just among ourselves and with the administration, but also the American people. And that is the purpose of us being here today.

House Republicans are willing to work with our colleagues in the Senate, as well, and also at the White House; and we'd like to find a compromise that would raise the debt limit, while simultaneously enacting meaningful legislation that will fix our Nation's broken tax system.

We need to create jobs through job enrichment, through a Tax Code that is vibrant and does not harm job creation, that does not do things that would cause people to want to not invest in this country because of taxes that are out of control and spending that harms their business.

So we want to rein in our out-of-control spending and reform our ballooning entitlement programs to preserve them for generations to come. It should be our responsibility.

We, as Members of Congress, were elected by the people, and we should be able to come and face tough issues with good answers. We should not try and scare people back home. We should be able to tell the truth about the legislation, and we need to be honest about the circumstances of the pathway that we remain on because of our President's and the Democrats' agenda.

So, unfortunately, President Obama has already stated that he is unwilling to negotiate with the House or the Senate over the debt limit.

□ 1250

It is this President when he was a Senator who voted repeatedly against a debt limit increase, called it irresponsible and a lack of leadership; and yet today he says just give him all the power, he'll take care of this himself. As such, the bill before us today is a necessary and prudent safety net designed to avoid economic calamity

should we reach the debt limit and not have resolved that between the House, the Senate, and the President.

I applaud Congressman TOM MCCLINTOCK, my dear friend from California, and our great young chairman from Michigan, DAVE CAMP, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. Each of them brings their work product to the floor today, as well as many of our other colleagues such as my Rules Committee member, the young man from Orlando, Florida, DAN WEBSTER, who brought forth ideas that would help shape not only the legislation that we have today, but the desire of the Republican conference to make sure that we continue to talk about the issues and problems that we see before they become a crisis, before they become something that is unworkable and rather to share our great ideas now. So for the timeless work on this issue, I thank all three of them for working on this bill today.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes." I encourage them to vote "yes" on the rule, I encourage them to be thoughtful and truthful about the legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my friend from Texas, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before I really begin, I want to make clear that what the President said in his statement of disapproval and veto, that he would not negotiate over this foolish bill, that he was not going to negotiate what to do if we go into default because his intent, as well as the intent of the Democratic Party, is not to default.

It's right honest, but instead of really talking about today lifting the debt limit, we're going to discuss the usual do-nothing legislative agenda: let's fiddle while Rome burns and pass a one-House bill that the Senate will never touch and the President will never see, which is what we do here once, sometimes twice, a week.

But today, I think they've really outdone themselves. Instead of wasting time on a bill that can be characterized as redundant like we do the 35, 36 times that we vote against health care, the majority is now considering legislation that treads into the realm of the precarious.

Regardless of whether the legislation before us is approved by this Chamber, the very fact that the majority is proposing policies to manage the economic default is by itself a threat to our economy. Both the Treasury and outside experts have made clear that picking and choosing which debts we pay is legally questionable and logistically impossible.

The President has, as my colleague said, warned that in the highly unlikely event that this bill reaches his desk, he will unequivocally veto it. But instead of listening to this fact, the majority is moving ahead with a pro-

posal and a debate that puts us on the road to default. They do so even as The Washington Post reports this morning that the economy is improving, revenues are up and spending is down, which undermines the stream of doom that we hear. But today the irresponsible actions of the majority are, once again, needlessly encouraging the economic recovery.

Let me be clear: the legislation does not raise the debt ceiling, which is the only way to take away the threat of default; but, instead, the bill guarantees that when we hit the debt ceiling, our foreign creditors and the Social Security trust fund will be paid in full while the well-being of millions of Americans—vendors and people we owe legitimate debts to—are left to chance.

Under this legislation, the majority is actively putting the interests of China before millions of Americans, including Active military servicemembers, veterans, and even the men and women who clean the floors of the Capitol and fold napkins in the Members' dining room. Every single one of these citizens relies upon their paycheck and upon the United States Government to pay the debts in order to put the food on their tables and to make ends meet.

With today's bill, the majority is proposing that the welfare of these Americans be left to chance while they protect China and foreign bondholders from the threat of default. In addition, the majority is endangering the regular payments owed to infrastructure projects, food safety inspectors, education programs, and public health research. It is a reckless plan that would directly hurt the most vulnerable members of society who already struggle in the sequestration to get by.

Furthermore, the act of choosing whom we will repay when we default on our debt is in and of itself an act that will threaten to throw our economy back into recession. During the recent hearing of the Committee on Ways and Means, the MIT economist Simon Johnson warned that if we default on even a portion of our debt, the unemployment rate would more than double, countless companies would go out of business, and investors would flee the United States.

Meanwhile, The Economist magazine has written:

Failure to raise the debt ceiling would force immediate spending cuts equal to 6 percent of GDP. Not only would that threaten to send the economy back into recession; it would also deprive doctors, pensioners, contractors, and millions of others the money needed to meet their own obligations and set off a chain reaction of defaults. Even a few days' default would roil the global financial system which relies on Treasuries in countless transactions. The mere possibility could incite skittish investors to dump their holdings, driving up interest rates.

Tony Fratto, a former spokesperson for President George W. Bush, said:

Prioritization is impossible. Is the government really going to be in the position of withholding benefits, salaries, rent, contrac-

tual payments, and so forth in order to pay off Treasury bondholders? That would be a political catastrophe.

It should be clear by now that the act of even bringing a bill such as this to the floor for debate can scare investors and endanger our economy. This type of economic brinksmanship is extremely dangerous. The majority's games are compounded by their uninterest in repealing the sequester. As we speak, the sequester is preventing thousands of cancer patients from receiving lifesaving treatment and keeping thousands more children from receiving the education—I think 70,000 is the figure—through the Head Start program. These are some of the devastating cuts that don't go away simply because the majority refuses to take action and repeal the sequester in full.

Tragically, the majority's willingness to endanger our economy is not new. In August of 2011, the majority headed down the road to default for the first time in our history by threatening to default on our debts. Despite the opportunity to reach compromise with the administration, the majority claimed a zero-sum political game that had serious consequences. And because of their actions, August 2011 was the worst month for job creation in 3 years. The Dow Jones Industrial Average plunged 2,000 points, and our Nation's credit rating was downgraded for the very first time. The effects were very real and very dangerous. A responsible legislative body would never head down that road again a second time. But that's exactly what we're doing here today.

For more than 225 years, this Chamber has been dedicated to preserving the order and stability of our government even in the most partisan of times. Despite their differences, generation after generation of legislators has known that when it comes to the integrity of our Nation, we must succeed together or else fall alone.

Dangerously in the last 2 years, the majority has taken step after step to undermine the central pillar of our government, including the proposal that they put forward today. We've frequently done so through a closed legislative process. And while the majority states that today's legislation is moving forward under a structured rule, it is only structured for the Members of the majority.

For the second time this week, the majority is bringing forth a rule that denies consideration of a single Democrat amendment. As a result, we debate a dangerous proposal and one that puts the interests of China before the welfare of the American people and the economic stability of the United States.

Yesterday, the Speaker of the House was asked if the proposal laid before us would indeed pay China before paying U.S. troops. He admitted that it would and said:

Listen, those who have loaned us money, like in any other proceeding, if you will,

court proceeding, the bondholders usually get paid first. The same thing here.

That simple statement tells us what we need to know.

□ 1300

I refuse to put China's interests before the interests of the American people, and I refuse to sit silently as the majority moves us one step closer to default.

I urge my colleagues to please vote "no" on today's rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, one of the Members of Congress that I spoke about that not only brought pieces of this legislation to the Ways and Means Committee but really as part of the debate for our conference and to the American people is our next speaker.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Elk Grove, California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

Mr. McCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule to bring the Full Faith and Credit Act to the House floor.

I had hoped that amidst all the controversies gripping this Congress that certainly we should at least be able to agree that the full faith and credit of the United States Government should not hang in the balance every time there's a fiscal debate in Washington. Unfortunately, even so commonsense a proposition as this cannot produce a consensus in today's Congress.

This bill simply guarantees the debt of the United States. No matter what political storms are raging in Washington, the public credit must be maintained. Yet this President and his followers—who have taken our Nation on the biggest borrowing binge in its history, who have run up more debt than almost all of his predecessors put together—oppose this commonsense attempt to assure credit markets that whatever else happens in Washington, their loans to this government are absolutely safe.

You know, most States have had similar provisions in their laws or constitutions guaranteeing their debt for generations. Last year, in testimony to the Senate, Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke praised these State provisions for maintaining confidence in State and municipal markets. He told our own House Budget Committee that a similar measure at the Federal level would help protect our Nation against the threat of default.

The President and his followers argue that this is somehow an excuse for not paying our other obligations. What absolute nonsense. I challenge them to name one Member of Congress who has ever suggested that this measure is an acceptable alternative to not paying our other bills.

Their reliance on this falsehood is a measure of the bankruptcy of their argument. Do they actually suggest that all of these other States—that have

guaranteed their sovereign debts for many generations—have ever used these guarantees as an excuse not to pay their other bills? On the contrary, by providing clear and unambiguous mandates to protect their credit first, they actually support and maintain their ability to pay for all of their other obligations.

The gentlelady from New York puts forth the argument that this measure would put foreign creditors ahead of programs serving Americans. Well, I would remind her that public credit is what makes possible all of the other programs of this government, from paying our troops to seniors' health care. Without it, we cannot pay our other bills.

I would also remind her that most of the public debt is held by Americans—much of it through American pension funds. China holds less than 10 percent. So the overwhelming effect of this measure is to protect the investments that Americans have made in their own government while protecting the credit that supports every other expenditure of this government, including our troops.

In its original form, this measure restated the already existing authority of the Treasury Department to prioritize the other obligations in order to assure prompt and full payment of the debt, and added a mandate requiring it to do so. The committee's much simpler and more practical approach directs the Treasury Secretary to pay the debt, even if it means temporarily borrowing outside the debt limit in order to do so. I want to thank it for this improvement, which I gratefully acknowledge and wholeheartedly endorse.

Let me say this again: no one advocates that this government delay paying any of its bills, and this legislation does no such thing. Indeed, this measure protects our ability to pay all of our other bills because paying those bills depends on maintaining the Nation's credit.

But given the precarious nature of our Nation's finances, principle disputes over how the debt limit is addressed are going to happen from time to time. I remember just a few years ago when then-Senator Barack Obama vigorously opposed increasing the debt limit sought by the Bush administration. Well, I've never equated Mr. Obama's opposition to the debt limit increase as anything other than a principled and well-placed concern over the proper management of our finances. It's sad that he cannot grant the motives of his opposition the same courtesy.

But when these controversies erupt—as they inevitably will do in a free society—it is imperative that credit markets are supremely confident that their loans are secure.

So I say this a third time: an impasse on the debt limit is something much to be avoided because it could do enormous damage to our Nation's prestige

and its prosperity. But there is one thing that could do even more damage than delaying payments on our other bills, and that is the threat of a default on our sovereign debt. This measure takes that threat off the table. It assures credit markets that their investments in the United States are as certain as anything that can be had in this life.

Mr. Speaker, let us pass this rule and proceed with consideration of the bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the ranking member on Ways and Means.

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. You know, when you boil this all down, essentially what this bill says is pay some bills first and not others. I came here because, if the rule passes, we'll have a full discussion tomorrow, but I wanted to share with everybody the story that I saw this morning. It's accurate.

The headline is: "John Boehner on Debt Ceiling: Let's Pay China First, Then U.S. Troops." That headline in Huff Post is based on an interview with the Speaker on Bloomberg TV by Peter Cook. I quote Mr. Cook:

Doesn't it mean, as Democrats have suggested, that you're basically choosing to pay China before you pay U.S. troops?

The Speaker: Listen, those who have loaned us money, like in any other proceeding, if you will, court proceeding, the bondholders usually get paid first. Same thing here.

Then the Speaker says, to conclude his comments as to the Administration:

If it comes to the point where they don't have enough money to pay the bills, here is some order that we think is sound.

It's not sound. As the SAP says, it's not workable. It endangers our economy. I quote Keith Hennessey, a former Bush administration economist:

It would be the first step to becoming a banana republic. A bloody mess.

As mentioned earlier by our distinguished ranking member on the Rules Committee, another Bush administration official, Tony Fratto, said:

Prioritization is impossible. Is the government really going to be in the position of withholding benefits, salaries, rent, contract payments in order to pay off Treasury bondholders?

Almost half, by the way, are held by foreigners. So it isn't sound also to choose some over others. So I just wanted to go through the list, if I might, so everybody understands essentially what this is saying.

China and other bondholders first, not American troops in harm's way.

China first, not retired and disabled veterans.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. LEVIN. China first, not doctors and hospitals treating Medicare patients.

China first, not American small businesses who provide goods and services. China and others first, not school lunch programs.

China and others first, not universities doing medical research.

China and other bondholders first, not college students who earn Pell Grants, or taxpayers due refunds, or other Federal trust funds holding Treasury bonds—for example, Medicare trust funds, deposit insurance, highway and airport trust funds, and the Federal Housing Authority.

□ 1310

In a word, this is irresponsible. Default is default is default. The Republicans are playing with fire, I think, to gain political leverage. Instead, they should think of the national interest.

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

We've had an opportunity once again today, as we did yesterday, to hear from the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Michigan. He brought his ideas, the best ideas he had, up to the Rules Committee yesterday on this same issue.

But the issues that the gentleman speaks about are attacking our answers. Their answer that they propose is tax increases and spending increases, and that way we'll simply have more money into the system. Because as we've already heard today just a few minutes ago, the more money we give in unemployment compensation, the more vitality is in our cities, more spending takes place, more unemployment compensation, more vitality, more spending in our cities.

Mr. Speaker, that's the wrong way to go. The Republican Party does not believe that we should create a permanent underclass of people who receive unemployment compensation or who are afraid of facing the truth about where this country is headed.

The facts of the case are other countries are ahead of us on this curve. Most of them are in Europe, and they ignored the signs that Republicans are here talking about today, the signs of spending too much, relying on its people to raise taxes for them to bring money in, and a big government continuing to put rules and regulations and impediments in front of people.

The facts of the case are simple. We are here today because it is President Obama and the Democrats who spent too much money, who are destroying jobs, and who even today are holding back the Keystone pipeline, what could be thousands of jobs for people in this country, lessen our reliance on other parts of the world for our energy, and bring back American-made jobs. This is exactly why we are having problems.

So, it's the Republican Party that is trying to offer a public discussion, a public debate, including our great Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER, who says we need to make sure that part of the debate comes down to, if we get to that

point, that we pay back the people who loaned us money in the first place. They need to have confidence that they can continue loaning us money because we are still having to borrow a lot of money.

I can think of few things that would be worse than to publicly announce we are going to pay somebody else before we pay back our creditors. That is how creditors no longer lend any money to you.

So, what Republicans are doing is having a public debate. We are bringing this to the floor. And I do recognize our friends on the other side, our Democrat friends, that they want to spend more and tax more. They have never seen enough spending in this place. They want more and more. They are like our President—they have an insatiable appetite to spend people's money. And then, like, literally, somebody who started a fire, is an arsonist, show up as the firefighter, the hero, to say, but I want to save our country.

They created the economic malaise that we have. It is overspending, it's holding back job creation, and Republicans are going to stand on the floor and have this debate with the media and the American people and the administration and say, let's know what we are going to do when we get there months ahead of time so that we don't falter like we did some time ago, and take on the President's idea again of sequestration only to have him argue against his own idea later and then try to mislead the American public what this whole issue is about. It's about the economic demise of the United States of America and how we are having to work here to make sure that we publicly discuss this before it becomes too late.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California, one of our impressive freshmen, Mr. HUFFMAN.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the impossibly misnamed Full Faith and Credit Act, a bill which would actually make a mockery of our country's full faith and credit. It prepares our country for default by prioritizing payments to Wall Street and foreign governments over nearly every other national obligation.

We've seen the disastrous effects on our credit rating, our stock market, and our economic recovery when Congress plays political games with the debt ceiling, but here we go again.

Why would my colleagues across the aisle prioritize paying the Chinese Government over paying our troops in Afghanistan? What about air traffic controllers, FBI investigators, disabled veterans, small businesses who contract with the government, doctors who treat Medicare patients? This bill says it's okay to stiff all of them, as long as Chinese bondholders are paid in full.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to move forward with House-Senate negotiations

on a final budget resolution that strengthens the economy and avoids default. That's what we've been asking Speaker BOEHNER to do. Instead of taking that responsible step, we are here today considering a bill that will take us closer to the brink of economic chaos.

For the sake of American workers and businesses, I urge my colleagues to reject this dangerous bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Once again, the dominant theme from our friends on the other side seems to be China first, this pays China first. That's the constant refrain we're hearing.

Let me again remind them, China holds about 10 percent of our debt; Americans hold more than half of it. All of our spending from this government depends on maintaining our credit.

That means whoever is loaning us money, whether China or Timbuktu, whether it's the Teamsters pension fund or a child's savings bond that they've gotten for their birthday, we are borrowing over a quarter of everything that we spend. If we cannot borrow, if the confidence of the credit markets is ever compromised, this whole house of cards collapses around us, a house of cards constructed by this administration's profligate borrowing.

Our credit is now bearing a greater burden and strain that it has ever borne before. All this measure suggests is that we should at least reinforce that credit with exactly the same guarantees that most of our States have successfully employed for generations and, I would remind my friend from California, California has had in its Constitution for over 100 years.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I'm opposed to the rule, and I'm opposed to the Pay China First bill. It is my understanding that they've added something, I think it's called the Camp amendment, that would make sure that Members of Congress are not paid if the Nation, in fact, defaults. This borrows an idea that I introduced back in the summer of 2011, H.R. 2653. We had a number of bipartisan cosponsors.

I'm worried, though, that despite imitation being the sincerest form of flattery they've diluted this concept to make it unconstitutional. Due to the 27th Amendment, it is unconstitutional to adjust Member pay during a session. We had it drafted so that Members would be paid last, which would pretty much ensure that we would not be paid. Perhaps they've corrected the drafting on their side.

□ 1320

They've also done this to me once before this year. They took our no budget-no pay idea that the No Labels

group had sponsored, which has now become law, but they took out the heart of it. Right now, we should be having a House-Senate conference since both Houses have finally passed legislation. The Senate being the laggard, now after 4 years, they've finally passed a budget, but now we're refusing to conference the budget.

I am a believer in pay-for-performance. The American taxpayers are not getting their money's worth from today's Congress. They should be getting their money's worth, and I think these concepts about penalizing Congress when we fail to do our job are very powerful concepts; but they should be given full strength, not diluted and unconstitutional treatment in a quicky amendment such as is being offered here. The core idea of pay-for-performance I hope that more of my colleagues will look at because Congress does many things right, and we should be rewarded for that. We fail in many ways, and we should be penalized for that.

Today, sadly, the only people in America who are not able to pay Congress by performance are the taxpayers. Those special interests are paying us by performance all the time whether in PAC contributions or in post-retirement job opportunities. That is one reason this Congress is not performing to full capability. It is one reason we are not living up to our potential. So, as we look at this concept, at this Camp amendment, please let's do it right. Please, let's make sure that Congress is not paid for failure.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge Mr. COOPER's presence here today. His idea was valid and, in fact, was utilized in what we have done.

The slight difference of how I'd like to describe this to the gentleman is: we did not say that Members cannot be paid. What we said is that no new debt can be used to pay Members. So, if we're spending 40 percent too much money today and if 60 percent were coming in, we could be paid out of that amount, but we could not be paid out of the debt-side amount, which is what this legislation is about and why this legislation is germane.

I do thank the gentleman. I thank the gentleman for his idea that Members of Congress should equally suffer or equally gain as the American people have. In this circumstance, it's a loss for all of us, and that is why Chairman CAMP included this as an amendment. It was to make sure that we clarified: As part of this bill, Members of Congress could not be paid with new debt that was being brought to the United States.

So I hope that clarifies not only the success that we believe that Mr. COOPER brought with his ideas but also the intent of what this legislation actually does, what we spoke about in the Rules Committee and the fine line between paying a Member and whether it comes

from new debt or whether it comes from operating entities that would be within the 60 percent that would not be the new debt. I hope this clarifies not only what we are trying to do but that we speak forthrightly to Members about what this legislation actually is.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Article I, section 8.1:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

Now Amendment 14, section 4:

The validity of the public debt of the United States . . . including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services . . . shall not be questioned.

But that's precisely what the Republican Party, the Republican majority, is doing today. I have many friends on the Republican side of the aisle whom I respect, but I've never been as disappointed in them as I am today.

"Pari passu." That means "equal." The United States of America, for 235 years, has treated all of its creditors equally. If you're the landlord, if you get a salary, if you mow the lawn on the National Mall, you get paid at the same time that somebody who loans money to the United States gets paid. Everybody gets paid. That's how we treat it. We don't treat it that China or Wall Street or Saudi Arabia, because they've loaned us money, gets paid before the nurse working in one of our VA hospitals. That's not America. That is wrong. That is not how we run our country. It is unconstitutional.

I'd say to my friends that this short, little bill of yours to prioritize our debts is exactly the wrong thing to do. If I were a credit-rating agency, I'd say, if you're prioritizing your debts, you're getting ready to not pay somebody. Everybody is treated equally. If I were that credit rating agency, I would downgrade us today.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I'd say to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, to the majority party: Don't do this. This is wrong. This is not our Nation.

We have built this Nation on equality, and that includes the equality of payment. Whether you're a landlord or if you work for the country or if you're a veteran, whatever it may be, you get paid. That's how we operate it.

We in this Congress have the ability not only to raise the revenue that's needed to do that but to manage our expenses, but we don't stiff anybody. So I'd say to my friends: Withdraw this bill now. It is bad legislation. It is wrong for this Nation. Get rid of it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman

of the Financial Services Committee, the Member from the Fifth District of Texas, the gentleman from Dallas, Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee for yielding, Mr. Speaker.

I also want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), who has been, perhaps, the most cogent defender of the Constitution on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and who has provided his leadership today to ensure that we do not have default on sovereign debt but that we put this Nation on a path to fiscal sanity, and I thank him for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the folks in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas, whom I'm proud to represent, have a lot of insecurity about their personal economy, and they have great fear that their children will not enjoy a brighter future.

I heard my friend, the gentleman from Colorado, say that everyone gets paid. Well, maybe that's part of the problem. Maybe that is one of the reasons under President Obama's leadership there has been more debt created in the last 4 years than in our Nation's first 200. We are awash in debt. We know that we have a debt, not because we have insufficient taxes, but because we spend too much. Math is a pesky thing.

In the last 10 years, the Department of Ag: up 114 percent; HUD: up 61 percent; HHS: up 79 percent. Our total government spending has increased 70 percent; and measured by median family income, the family budget, which has to pay for the Federal budget, it is down 6 percent.

Now, some have said, You know, revenues are a problem. Well, revenues are up 52 percent, but you can't raise taxes enough to chase the spending that the Democrats and the President want to foist upon the American people. They have put us on a path to national bankruptcy. At some point, we've got to quit spending money we don't have. Again, we are on the precipice of a debt crisis, and we have it because of too much spending.

To some of my friends on the other side of the aisle, their answer to the debt ceiling is to get rid of it. Some have introduced legislation just to get rid of the debt ceiling.

□ 1330

That's kind of like, Mr. Speaker, a fire breaks out in your home and your response is to unplug the smoke detector because of that nuisance noise in the background that maybe your house is on fire. I would remind my friends on the other side of the aisle, Greece didn't have a debt ceiling vote, and yet we have Democrats who say, No, let's just get rid of it.

But for those who believe that we're not going to get rid of it, we have other friends from across the aisle who essentially want to use it as a hostage for

something that is not a debt. A debt is when you go out and you borrow money and you must pay it back. Every family understands this. It's one thing for an American family to borrow money to pay their mortgage versus borrowing money so that they can pay for a Las Vegas vacation that they would like to take. They are not equivalent.

Mr. Speaker, paying sovereign debt is not the same thing as borrowing money so that this institution and this town can continue to spend money for pottery classes in Morocco, to pay for the travel expenses of the Alabama Watermelon Queen, to pay for robotic squirrels and all the rest of the lunacy that this Federal Government spends and in the end takes bread off the table of hardworking American families.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that the President has this power, but he says, No, I don't have this power. So I find it ironic that we're willing to codify what we already believe to be the law of the land, and the President says, No, I want to veto that. Again, he wants to use this as a hostage.

This is a very simple bill introduced by the gentleman from California to require our Treasury to make good on all of our debt payments. That's it. We must stop borrowing money to squander our children's future. This bill will help us do this.

But the Democrats, they don't want to take this specter of default off the table. It's the only way they can continue spending. They say they do. If they do, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to seeing their name up on the big board soon.

This is the right thing and the smart thing to do, and I urge that the House, adopt this rule and adopt the bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to talk about what it is we're trying to pay for on our side:

Pay and benefits for 1.4 million active duty troops and 780,000 troops in reserves will not be paid while China is paid;

Benefits to 3.4 million disabled veterans;

1.3 million veterans receiving education or home purchasing assistance;

Earned payments to American small businesses;

Payments to 1.1 million doctors and health care practitioners who provide care to seniors with Medicare;

Payments to schools for nutritious lunches served to 32 million children;

Payments to 44,000 National Institutes of Health grantees.

With that, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would raise the debt ceiling, but only insofar as necessary and only for the purpose of paying our debts to China and to Social Security.

Not raising the debt ceiling beyond what this bill does would mandate not

paying Medicare beneficiaries or our troops overseas or our veterans here at home or anyone owed money for working for the Federal Government and would generally collapse the economy by forcing default on most of our debts.

Raising the debt ceiling merely allows us to pay debts we have previously incurred—all debts previously incurred. We should recognize this simple reality by eliminating the debt ceiling and passing responsible budgets. But Republicans now use the debt ceiling to hold the entire country hostage unless the demands that they haven't figured out yet are met. This reminds me of a 1930s gangster film: it's a nice restaurant you've got over there; it's a nice economy you've got over there; pity if it should happen to blow up if you don't meet our demands.

This Republican tactic has already brought about the first downgrade in the U.S. credit rating in history and has brought about brutal spending cuts that have punished the middle class, failed to help the millions of Americans looking for work, and weakened the safety net for working families and seniors.

Mr. Speaker, it was two wars and two Bush tax cuts and 8 years of irresponsibility that brought us the deficit in the last budget adopted under George Bush of 10.1 percent of GDP. We have reduced that budget deficit in 3 years from 10.1 percent of GDP to 4.8 percent today. This is the fastest deficit reduction since the demobilization after World War II.

Economists agree that the draconian austerity decreed by the sequester is slowing our economic growth, eliminating millions of jobs, and could create a double-dip recession. We have seen this in Europe where, starting 2½ years ago, they adopted the policies the Republicans want. They adopted severe austerity and they cut budgets too much. The result is a double-dip recession. With their negative economic growth, we're still at positive economic growth.

We're hearing from our Republican friends today about how endangered our credit rating is. Our credit rating is so endangered, despite their frightening rhetoric, that we are paying the lowest interest rates on our bonds ever, and our bonds are selling higher. People are getting in line to buy our bonds because our credit rating is, in fact, quite good.

Yet, in spite of presenting the American people with a plan to invest in our economy and create jobs for the 12 million Americans looking for work, Republicans are once again intent on manufacturing a crisis that will only increase unemployment. We should not develop a plan for how to generate and then manage a devastating default that will put our economy into chaos; we should repeal the sequester, slow down our deficit reduction, spend the money on highways and bridges and infrastructure investing and putting our people back to work so that more peo-

ple work, unemployment goes down, government spending and unemployment insurance and food stamps go down, and the economy improves and our unemployment also goes down. That's the proper path.

What the Republicans are trying to do would say, Don't do that. Follow the path of Europe. Get 12 percent or 15 percent unemployment. This bill would head us in that direction. That's not the direction we should be going.

We ought to safeguard our credit and not even contemplate the possibility of default.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 202 and H.R. 807 because the last time Congress did something this dumb it cost the American public \$19 billion over the next 10 years. Why? Because our credit rating was downgraded for the first time in the history of the United States. Let's not do something like that again.

That does not help the economy, and it doesn't put anyone to work. All it does is make sure that everybody around the world who loves to buy American-backed paper just gets more money for it, which means more money out of the pockets of Americans for one reason and one reason only: to have the optics of politics of a bill like this that actually basically states that we are not going to back the paper that people buy.

That is something that is not within our American values. That's something that doesn't even need to see the light of day. And it's a shame that we would play politics with the American dollar and we would play politics with the reputation of this great country by having these two bills before us.

Mr. SESSIONS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if my colleague has any more requests for time?

Mr. SESSIONS. Except for my final close, I do not. And I thank the gentlewoman.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman.

Let me introduce the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, if we can defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to hold a vote on the Student Loan Relief Act.

If Congress doesn't act, next month undergraduate students across the country will see a hike in their student loan interest rates. If my Republican colleagues want to talk about debt priority, this should be a part of the dialogue.

To discuss the proposal, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question.

As the gentlelady said, defeat of the previous question will allow her to propose, instead, an amendment to the rule to a bill that intentionally degrades the full faith and credit of our country, sets that aside and instead allows for consideration of the Student Loan Relief Act, a measure which will prevent the subsidized Stafford student loan program from doubling in 53 days.

□ 1340

Let me again reiterate that point. On July 1, if Congress does not act, the subsidized Stafford student loan program, which provides student loan assistance to over 7 million young Americans, will double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. We have heard a lot of talk on the floor here today about debt and about trying to protect the young people of this country. Well, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York recently issued its latest update regarding student loan debt in this country, which is now \$1.1 trillion. It's higher than credit card debt, and it is higher than car loan debt.

When we talk about the challenges facing, particularly, young people in this country who are trying to get the opportunity to upgrade their skills, something that this recession has taught us painfully is necessary because the unemployment rate of people with high school degrees or less is three times as high as people with 4-year degrees, the fact of the matter is that the subsidized Stafford student loan program is a lifeline in terms of young people being able to pay the rising cost of tuition.

Despite the fact that we have a ticking clock of 53 days and only 24 session days scheduled between now and July 1, the majority has not brought a single proposal forward to avoid this catastrophe from happening to young people all across the country.

The Student Loan Relief Act, which I am the lead cosponsor of, has over 125 cosponsors here in the House, will extend the lower rate for 2 years, and will allow this Chamber to once and for all get its arms around this serious, critical problem for the future of this country. The fact of the matter is that the student loan debt issue requires a comprehensive rewrite of the Higher Education Authorization Act which will give tools to young people, starting in high school, to make better choices about where they go to school, how they're going pay for it, with better awareness and information. It would also allow people who have graduated to be able to refinance their debt so they can lower those monthly payments.

Again, talk to the Realtors in this country about what's holding back the housing market. Young people in their twenties and thirties who are carrying

student loan debt of 60, 70, \$80,000 are not in a position to go out and buy a house because they can't qualify for a mortgage because of these high payments.

It is time for Congress to focus on what people are really waking up in the morning thinking about and worrying about, which is how to pay for college.

Mr. Speaker, on May 1, we just celebrated decision day, which is the day when young people make the choice about where they're going to college. Unfortunately, they have no clue about whether or not their subsidized Stafford loan rate, which has been in place for the last 6 years, is going to continue beyond July 1.

It is time for this Chamber to focus on what's important for American families. Let's take up the Student Loan Relief Act. Let's pass a higher education authorization bill which deals with this issue from soup to nuts, and let's set aside this crazy bill which intentionally degrades the full faith and credit of our country.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The fact that this Chamber has dedicated valuable time and resources to the consideration of an unconstitutional bill that will put our Nation on the road to default is regretful. The fact that this legislation puts the economic interests of China before paying our soldiers' salaries and providing benefits to our veterans is a disgrace.

The plan presented by the majority fails to raise the debt ceiling, which is the only way that we can prevent economic default. Instead, it simply wastes another week of valuable time and the \$24 million that it costs to run this House of Congress for a week and moves us that much closer to yet another downgrade in our Nation's credit rating, something that had never happened until this majority assumed control of the House. And now it is actually possible the majority would lead us to the second downgrade of the Nation's credit over the course of 2 short years.

On May 19, our Nation will reach its debt ceiling, and emergency measures would be put into place to delay default. We've seen this film before, and we know how the movie ends—a twisted plot with terrible consequences that come by refusing to pay our bills. I urge my colleagues not to walk down that road again.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues most enthusiastically to vote "no" to defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on

the rule. I would like to see this bill withdrawn.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I have been around this place a long time, and I've heard of people who did not read bills. I have heard of people who did not understand bills, but I have never seen a circumstance such as today where the truth was being held hostage.

The facts of the case are very simple. Republicans today are offering a mechanism to the President of the United States and the American people that says, if we do get in a circumstance where we do not extend our debt to further allow the Federal Government to buy more debt to pay its obligations, then we offer this opportunity, and that is that the government can, even when we're in a circumstance where we cannot borrow more money, and let's say we spend 60 percent that we get money in but 40 percent is the debt that we can no longer have available to pay our obligations, about a 60/40 split, then we're allowing the Federal Government to go borrow more debt to pay its obligations so that it doesn't compete against the money that does come in to pay the bills of the United States as the President of the United States would choose.

I've never heard of a more reasonable option. We're not telling the President how to spend the money. We're giving authorization for new debt to pay our debt obligations. That's not cutting people off. It's not truthful to say we're going to do that. Anybody that tells you that didn't read the bill.

What this is about is to say, if we go into a debt circumstance where we cannot come to an agreement, then we are authorizing the Federal Government, the Treasury, to go get more debt, only enough to pay debt obligations to where we do not default, and then we work on the circumstances of how much money comes in.

This has been miscast. The truth has been held hostage, and I am disappointed in Members of Congress who came down here and misled the American people about what this bill is. It is nothing more than allowing the Treasury to go borrow money to pay its already obligations to people who loaned us money. It says nothing about how they will pay normal bills to people. And to come to this floor and to suggest this is simply a disservice to the obligations I think that we have to be open and honest about what our job is.

I urge my colleagues to understand the simplification of what this bill is about, to not try to twist it to have it become something that it is not. I hope my colleagues will vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying legislation.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 202 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

Amendment in the nature of a substitute:

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, 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. 1595) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for Federal Direct Stafford Loans. 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 the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill 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. 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. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 2. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in the first section of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Al-

though it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. SESSIONS. 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.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1350

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1406.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 198, I call up the bill (H.R. 1406) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 198, the amendment recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce printed in the bill is adopted. The bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1406

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 "Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. COMPENSATORY TIME.

Section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(S) COMPENSATORY TIME OFF FOR PRIVATE EMPLOYEES.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—An employee may receive, in accordance with this subsection and in lieu of monetary overtime compensation, compensatory time off at a rate not less than one and one-half hours for each hour of employment for which overtime compensation is required by this section.

"(2) CONDITIONS.—An employer may provide compensatory time to employees under paragraph (1)(A) only if such time is provided in accordance with—

"(A) applicable provisions of a collective bargaining agreement between the employer and the labor organization that has been certified or recognized as the representative of the employees under applicable law; or

"(B) in the case of employees who are not represented by a labor organization that has been certified or recognized as the representative of such employees under applicable law, an agreement arrived at between the employer and employee before the performance of the work and affirmed by a written or otherwise verifiable record maintained in accordance with section 11(c)—

"(i) in which the employer has offered and the employee has chosen to receive compensatory time in lieu of monetary overtime compensation; and

"(ii) entered into knowingly and voluntarily by such employees and not as a condition of employment.

No employee may receive or agree to receive compensatory time off under this subsection unless the employee has worked at least 1,000 hours for the employee's employer during a period of continuous employment with the employer in the 12-month period before the date of agreement or receipt of compensatory time off.

"(3) HOUR LIMIT.—

"(A) MAXIMUM HOURS.—An employee may accrue not more than 160 hours of compensatory time.

"(B) COMPENSATION DATE.—Not later than January 31 of each calendar year, the employee's employer shall provide monetary compensation for any unused compensatory time off accrued during the preceding calendar year that was not used prior to December 31 of the preceding year at the rate prescribed by paragraph (6). An employer may designate and communicate to the employer's employees a 12-month period other than the calendar year, in which case such compensation shall be provided not later than 31 days after the end of such 12-month period.

"(C) EXCESS OF 80 HOURS.—The employer may provide monetary compensation for an employee's unused compensatory time in excess of 80 hours at any time after giving the employee at least 30 days notice. Such compensation shall be provided at the rate prescribed by paragraph (6).

"(D) POLICY.—Except where a collective bargaining agreement provides otherwise, an employer that has adopted a policy offering compensatory time to employees may discontinue such policy upon giving employees 30 days notice.

"(E) WRITTEN REQUEST.—An employee may withdraw an agreement described in paragraph (2)(B) at any time. An employee may also request in writing that monetary compensation be provided, at any time, for all compensatory time

accrued that has not yet been used. Within 30 days of receiving the written request, the employer shall provide the employee the monetary compensation due in accordance with paragraph (6).

“(4) PRIVATE EMPLOYER ACTIONS.—An employer that provides compensatory time under paragraph (1) to employees shall not directly or indirectly intimidate, threaten, or coerce or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce any employee for the purpose of—

“(A) interfering with such employee’s rights under this subsection to request or not request compensatory time off in lieu of payment of monetary overtime compensation for overtime hours; or

“(B) requiring any employee to use such compensatory time.

“(5) TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT.—An employee who has accrued compensatory time off authorized to be provided under paragraph (1) shall, upon the voluntary or involuntary termination of employment, be paid for the unused compensatory time in accordance with paragraph (6).

“(6) RATE OF COMPENSATION.—

“(A) GENERAL RULE.—If compensation is to be paid to an employee for accrued compensatory time off, such compensation shall be paid at a rate of compensation not less than—

“(i) the regular rate received by such employee when the compensatory time was earned; or

“(ii) the final regular rate received by such employee,

whichever is higher.

“(B) CONSIDERATION OF PAYMENT.—Any payment owed to an employee under this subsection for unused compensatory time shall be considered unpaid overtime compensation.

“(7) USE OF TIME.—An employee—

“(A) who has accrued compensatory time off authorized to be provided under paragraph (1); and

“(B) who has requested the use of such compensatory time, shall be permitted by the employee’s employer to use such time within a reasonable period after making the request if the use of the compensatory time does not unduly disrupt the operations of the employer.

“(8) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘employee’ does not include an employee of a public agency; and

“(B) the terms ‘overtime compensation’ and ‘compensatory time’ shall have the meanings given such terms by subsection (o)(7).”

SEC. 3. REMEDIES.

Section 16 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 216) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “(b) Any employer” and inserting “(b) Except as provided in subsection (f), any employer”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) An employer that violates section 7(s)(4) shall be liable to the employee affected in the amount of the rate of compensation (determined in accordance with section 7(s)(6)(A)) for each hour of compensatory time accrued by the employee and in an additional equal amount as liquidated damages reduced by the amount of such rate of compensation for each hour of compensatory time used by such employee.”

SEC. 4. NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES.

Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall revise the materials the Secretary provides, under regulations published in section 516.4 of title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, to employers for purposes of a notice explaining the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to employees so that such notice reflects the amendments made to such Act by this Act.

SEC. 5. SUNSET.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall expire 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in House Report 113-51, if offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON) or his designee, which shall be considered read and shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1406, the Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today we have an opportunity to make life a little easier for working families across the country. This legislation doesn’t create a new government program or bureaucracy. It doesn’t spend taxpayer dollars or add to the national debt. The Working Families Flexibility Act simply removes an outdated Federal policy that denies private sector workers the flexibility they need to better balance family and work.

For 75 years, the Fair Labor Standards Act has provided covered workers with basic wage and hour protections. Those covered by the law receive time-and-a-half in paid compensation for each overtime hour worked. The law plays a significant role in millions of workplaces; yet it does not reflect the realities of the modern workforce.

For example, in 2011, 59 percent of families with children had two working parents, compared to 37 percent 40 years ago. Meanwhile, 8.5 million workers today are single parents, and one in three undergraduate students also works full-time.

Behind each statistic, Mr. Speaker, are men and women trying to juggle family and work; a single, working mom that needs extra time to attend a parent-teacher conference, a dad hoping to leave work early to catch his son’s Little League game, a married couple working two jobs while raising a family and caring for an aging relative.

Supporting a family is about more than providing an income; it’s about being there for one another. We know there are a lot of workers who would seize the opportunity to earn a few extra dollars, but others may welcome additional paid time off to spend with loved ones.

Shouldn’t workers choose what’s best for their families? Shouldn’t workers choose?

Unfortunately, Federal law denies many private sector workers this fundamental choice. The law assumes everyone would choose more money in the bank over more time with family. To add insult to injury, public sector employees have enjoyed this benefit for decades; yet we continue to treat those in the private sector differently.

That’s not fair, Mr. Speaker. It’s not fair to millions of hardworking Americans. The Working Families Flexibility Act will remove this unnecessary barrier and allow private sector employers to offer employees the choice to accrue paid time off, or comp time, for working overtime. The bill does not change the 40-hour work week, and comp time would accrue at the same time-and-a-half rate as cash wages.

The legislation includes numerous protections to ensure the use of comp time is strictly, strictly, Mr. Speaker, voluntary, such as requiring a written agreement between the employer and employee, allowing workers to cash out their accrued comp time whenever they choose, retaining all enforcement remedies available under current law, and adding new protections to prevent coercion and intimidation.

At the heart of the legislation is worker choice. Workers choose whether to accept comp time. Workers choose when to cash out their accrued comp time, and workers choose when to use their paid time off, so long as they follow the same standard public sector employees do. Same standard, Mr. Speaker.

Americans sacrifice a lot to provide for their families. Let’s get the Federal Government out of the way and give workers the flexibility they need to thrive at home and at work.

I urge my colleagues to support the Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in opposition to this legislation, which, again, is no stranger, sadly, to this Congress. This is the fifth time that the majority party has introduced it, going back to 1997; and each time, the huge flaws in this legislation have resulted in its complete collapse in terms of getting anything close to real support through both Chambers and through the executive branch. And once again, it doesn’t deserve that support in this case.

Despite the representations made in its title, that it promotes workers’ flexibility, that it gives workers choice, the fact of the matter is, a closer examination of the bill shows the opposite is true.

The better way to describe this bill is the More Work, Pay Less bill because what it does is take the 1938 Fair Labor Standards Act, which created a bright line to protect people’s right to a 40-hour work week, and make sure that that next hour after 40 hours is paid for with the time-and-a-half of wages. And, again, that created the weekend in America. That created the time off that families have taken for granted as middle class Americans for decades.

What this bill does is it blurs that line; it creates total chaos in terms of trying to come up with a system to set up ground rules with a case-by-case contract, written contract, that’s mandated by the language of the bill, and

then leaves it to the enforcement of State Labor Departments Wage and Hours Divisions, which are totally incapable of going into the tens of thousands of workplaces all across America and trying to figure out whether or not, in fact, the rules have been followed.

A closer examination of the bill shows, on page 8 of the bill, in lines 7–10, that, in fact, all these representations that the worker gets to choose are, in fact, not correct. At the end of the day, the employer has the right to veto any comp time that this bill has allowed to accrue over any period of time. So the notion that somehow a person has that choice to accumulate comp time and then be able to use it for a family vacation, or a family emergency, in fact, does not meet the actual plain language of the bill that is before us today.

And that is why organizations that represent working families, organizations that represent women, organizations that have been part of employment law for years and years and years in this country have resoundingly come out in opposition to this legislation. Over 160 various organizations of every stripe representing religious groups, women's groups, labor groups, groups that, again, deal with employment law have basically looked at this legislation for the fifth time and given it thumbs down.

□ 1400

The fact is we should do that. There's no question, however, that workers do, in fact, need more help in terms of making sure that the wages that have stagnated over the last three decades get more support. And families, again, are strained by the fact that those stagnating wages have required second jobs and multiple spouses in the workforce.

But the fact is that there are much better solutions than this legislation, the More Work Pay Less Act. In fact, what we should do is set up a standard for paid sick leave in this country so that a single parent waking up with a child whose temperature is over 100 degrees doesn't feel that they have no choice in terms of how to deal with that situation, that they have some guaranteed opportunity without losing the pay that they need to put food on the table or put gas in the tank, that they, in fact, have that choice which so many of us here as Members of Congress and our staffs certainly take for granted. We should apply the same standards in terms of sick pay that we enjoy to the working people of this country.

This bill doesn't do it. This bill does not meet that test. Again, it sets up a system that is completely unworkable and unenforceable. It butchers the Fair Labor Standards Act's bright line that has protected the American weekend for decades and decades in this country, and in the name of workplace flexibility, in fact, tips the scales of

power within the American workforce, once again against the worker, against the employee, who basically for far too long has suffered in this economy.

We need better solutions. This is not the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I'm very, very pleased right now to yield 3 minutes to the author of this terrific piece of legislation, a member of the committee, the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota, my chairman, for all of the hard work on this bill and the committee, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to sponsor this bill. And I can tell you, as a working mom, my husband, Riley, and I certainly relate to and understand the pulls on families that are juggling so much between their work life and their home life. If you talk to any working mom or dad, you'll hear them say things like, wouldn't it be nice to have flexibility to attend my son's soccer game, coach a tee ball team, take care of my aging parent, or be there to support my children at a time when one of the spouses is being deployed by our military.

These are all things that working moms and dads want to be a part of. Those that have elderly parents want to be there for their parents in their time of need. We can't legislate another hour in the workday, but we sure can give moms and dads a little bit of relief when it comes to flexibility in their workplace.

Under this bill, no worker could ever be forced—despite the claims of my colleagues on the other side—no worker could ever be forced to take time off, paid time off, just like no business would ever be forced to offer it. For some people, having paid time off is far more valuable than money.

The problem is, Mr. Speaker, that under the current law, the private sector doesn't enjoy the same privilege to offer this benefit to their workers as the public sector does. And as my colleague was just talking about sick time, sick leave, and the benefits that we may enjoy in the Federal Government, I think that the private sector should enjoy the benefit that Federal employees have now, and that's compensatory time and the right to choose what to do with their time.

Our message to Americans, Mr. Speaker, is very clear. We must get Washington out of the way of how they use their time. It is your time to choose.

All existing enforcement remedies under the current law are retained; but this legislation goes above and beyond to incorporate additional protections that will prevent coercion and ensure utilizing comp time is truly voluntary, including a requirement of a written agreement, a voluntary written agreement between the employer and the

employee, a cash-out provision entitling the employee to ask for their paid overtime at any time, and a provision requiring employers to be found in violation of coercion to pay double damages.

I want to read—I have lots of quotes from constituents, but there is one in particular that sums all of this up. I got a note from a young lady who lives a long way from Alabama's Second Congressional District, in California; and she writes:

As a kid growing up with both parents who worked, I missed a lot of time with them. I am also an only child so I didn't really spend time with my actual family. I was either in daycare or a friend's house during the 5-day workweek. And if my mom took time off, she wouldn't get paid over that time period—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. KLINE. I yield the gentlewoman 1 additional minute.

Mrs. ROBY.

I didn't really spend time with my actual family. I was either in daycare or a friend's house during the 5-day workweek. And if my mom took time off, she wouldn't get paid over that time period, even though she would work overtime. So when I read about this bill, I was touched and compelled to tell you that if this bill passes it really would change people's lives and help families around America. Thank you for recognizing how valuable time is to people, and for giving us an option of how to use our time.

I thought that was compelling. Mr. Speaker, I think that sums up this bill in its entirety. This doesn't solve our Nation's debt problems or our deficit, but this provides some relief to working families in America, to those working moms and dads.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege now to yield 2 minutes to the minority whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mrs. ROBY and I are friends, but we have a very substantial disagreement about this bill.

I call it the Pay Working Families Less bill because what it will result in is a cut in pay for almost everybody. Yes, there will be those who will volunteer who can afford to do comp time. Others will not be. And so they will not be able to earn overtime because the employer will invariably—not because they're bad people—but will invariably go to the person that will, in fact, do it for free.

I understand it's comp time, but they won't get paid. Most workers at this level need the pay. They need to pay their mortgage, they need to pay their car payment, and they need to send their kids to school. It would, of course, be cheaper to run a business if we didn't pay people at all. But it wouldn't be America.

Mr. Speaker, today in the House it's *deja vu* all over again. This bill has been here before. In 2003 it was pulled

from the floor. Why? Because at that point in time, there were a significant number of Republicans who thought this was a lousy idea and thought it would undermine the Fair Labor Standards Act and the pay of working people. Unfortunately, there aren't that number of Republicans left in this House.

It's *deja vu* all over again not only because this bill would send American workers back to the days before the 40-hour workweek, but we've also seen this same bill introduced and then, as I said, withdrawn. That's because it would eliminate the 40-hour workweek as we know it.

Now, I know my friends on the Republican side disagree with that premise. I've been an employer. I've seen employers. They're not bad people, but they're trying to maximize profits, and they wouldn't be paying minimum wage if they didn't have to; and very frankly, the minimum wage is way below what it ought to be.

This bill says that we would provide the workers with comp time, but permission as to when a worker could take accrued comp time would be entirely in his or her boss' hands.

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

Mr. COURTNEY. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HOYER. So that that letter, while a very nice letter, doesn't take that into consideration. The result would be longer hours for workers with no overtime pay and only the hope that their bosses will let them take their earned time off when asked. How we have skewed the rules and play against the middle working class of America. You ought to read the book "Who Stole the American Dream?" by Hedrick Smith.

Workers wishing to collect their overtime pay would be forced to wait until the end of the year, essentially granting employers an interest-free loan.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't fair, it isn't right, and it isn't going to become law; and everybody on this floor knows that—everybody. All 434 of us that are here today know that this bill is not going to become law. But we're wasting our time on it. Instead of wasting time on a partisan measure that would never make it through the Senate, we ought to be working on creating jobs and restoring fiscal discipline, not a partisan rollback of workers' rights, but a bipartisan compromise to help put more Americans to work.

Again, I say, if those Republicans who were Members of this House in 2003 were still here, this bill would not be on the floor.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I'm always interested to listen to the characterizations of a bill that simply aren't true.

It's my pleasure right now to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington, the chair of the Republican Conference, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.

□ 1410

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. I want to recognize and express appreciation to the chairman of the committee and the author of the legislation, Mrs. ROBY, for their tremendous leadership on this important issue.

I'm proud to rise in support of the Working Families Flexibility Act because it is time for our labor laws to enter the 21st century, just like our workforce has.

I support this legislation because it is time for those in the private sector to have the same freedom and flexibility that those in the public sector have had for years. As a mom, a working mom, I have two young kids—Cole is six and Grace is two. I understand firsthand how important it is to have the flexibility to meet the demands of your job and still the obligation of your family. And I am so grateful, like millions of working moms in this country, that I do have flexibility. It's not easy, that's for sure, but the current law makes it way too hard for many hardworking moms and dads in this country.

The workplace today is not the workplace of the 1930s, when many of these laws and regulations were first written. In fact, the most significant economic and sociological change in our society in the last half century has been the entry of women into the workforce.

Today, 75 percent of women between the ages of 25 and 55 are in the workforce, and we've seen a significant growth in the number of working moms. In fact, today, 60 percent of moms with children under 6 are in the labor force. The workforce has changed, and it's time for the laws to change with it.

Most of our labor laws and regulations were drafted in the 1930s, at a time when most households had a single income. For too long, Federal laws and regulations have lagged behind, and it's time we bring them into the 21st century. This legislation does just that. It amends the Fair Labor Standards Act to allow the private sector to provide time off instead of overtime compensation if that's what the employee prefers.

Labor laws—written years ago—require that full-time hourly workers be paid time and a half if they work longer than 40 hours a week. For the most part, hourly employees who want to take occasional time away from their jobs either must take annual leave or leave without pay. These rules are particularly outdated given that we live in a world where people no longer need to be chained to their desk for precisely 8 hours a day, especially in light of cell phones and Internet connections, mobile offices and part-time work.

Current law doesn't provide any workplace flexibility for those in the private sector. This legislation changes that. It gives private sector employees the same choice as those in the public sector, while getting the Federal Gov-

ernment out of the way and putting decisions in the hands of people rather than Washington bureaucrats. That's why we must pass this law. It promotes freedom and choice, and it makes life easier for Americans all across this country.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, as somebody who was a private sector small employer for over 25 years, I just have to say that today, under existing law, employers already have the flexibility to give workers paid time off. The only new flexibility this bill gives is flexibility for employers to not pay people overtime. The fact is employers have that choice to give their workers paid time off.

With that, I would now like to yield 3 minutes to the esteemed chairman of our committee, who has led the fight for working families for over 30 years in this Congress, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a shell game. It's a trick. It's a Trojan horse. If an employer wants to give you time off, as the gentleman from Connecticut said, the employer can give you time off. He can give you comp time to go to your parent-teacher conferences, to take care of an ill member of your family, take care of yourself. But they don't do that. So they're going to dangle overtime here.

If you're willing to work overtime, sometime in the future they might give you that comp time. But it's not your comp time; it's the comp time that the employer will choose when and where you can take it. So if you work overtime this week and your child is very sick next week and you ask for the time and he says, no, we're busy, I can't give you the time off, you lose.

Your employer can bank up to 160 hours of your comp time before there's any obligation. That's almost 4 weeks of overtime. For many people, that overtime is really important. But this bill says your employer can go to you and say you can have the overtime—which may be very important to your family budget. It was when I was young and married and had children. I worked every hour of overtime I could get when I was in the Merchant Marines working on oil tankers. I worked every hour I could get in the canneries. I worked every hour I could get in the refineries because I needed that for my family budget. I didn't need comp time, I needed income.

But now the employer says you can have overtime, but I'm going to pay you back in comp time. If you say no, you have no protections. Your employer might say, okay, I'll find somebody else. Or your employer may offer it to you again and you say I can't do it, I need the overtime, and then you could be fired.

They want to keep saying you're protected and you have the same rights as people in the Federal employment system. You don't. There's nothing in the law that prevents your employer from

firing you because you can't work the schedules your employer wants. They can say it all day long, but it's not in this legislation.

If your employer goes broke before the time that they have to give you your comp time, you're out. And if you don't like the way your employer treated you and fires you because you couldn't possibly do the comp time or you couldn't do the overtime, you can go sue in court. How many middle class families can go sue their employer in court, have that kind of money?

This is what it has always been since 1997, when this bill was introduced—1997. Yes, the workplace has changed. States and cities and employers are giving people paid time off so they can take care of their families when they need to take care of their families. But that's not what this bill is. It's an assault on the 40-hour workweek. It's an assault on overtime. An employer can get the work and never really have to pay the overtime.

If you're in seasonal employment, if you're in an up-and-down business, you work like crazy and he says okay, things are slower in this part of the season, take that time off. You don't get to say, well, I don't really need that time off; I wanted to save that time for a parent-teacher conference. I'm sorry, we're going to be busy when that parent-teacher conference is.

You get what's going on here? This isn't women friendly. This isn't mom friendly. This isn't family friendly. This is friendly to people who want to get rid of overtime and break down the 40-hour week that protects families so they're not working overtime.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I now am pleased to yield 2 minutes to a member of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise today in this Chamber as the son of a working, single-parent mother who still works at the Delta Faucet factory in Greensburg.

I rise today in this Chamber as the son of a family who would have benefited from the flexibility and the time that is presented in the opportunity of the Working Families Flexibility Act.

I want to commend my committee chairman, Representative KLINE from Minnesota, and I want to commend my committee colleague from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) for bringing forward this commonsense, family friendly legislation.

This bill is about freedom, the freedom to choose whether working overtime means more money in your pocket or more time to spend with your family.

This bill is about equality, the equality of giving private sector employees the same opportunities that their public sector counterparts have had for years. Despite the rhetoric on the other side of the aisle, this act provides private sector employees the same kinds of opportunities that public sec-

tor employees have had for years and used successfully.

This bill is also about time, the extra time workers will have to spend doing what they want to do or need to do if they decide that's more important to them than having a few extra dollars.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will make life a little easier for the working men and women of this great country by giving them the freedom to choose how they spend their time. That's something we all should support.

□ 1420

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1½ minutes to the Representative from Oregon, a colleague on the House Education and the Workforce Committee, Ms. BONAMICI.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1406, the so-called Working Families Flexibility Act, which would deal yet another devastating blow to working families who are already scraping by in these tough economic times. Let's look at the facts:

Approximately two-thirds of Americans are living paycheck to paycheck.

Since 2000, hourly wages have flat-lined, but productivity has risen 23 percent.

Employee compensation as a share of national income is at its lowest in 50 years, but corporate profits are stronger than ever.

American families are putting in longer hours for less pay; and, colleagues, this bill makes things worse.

If this bill becomes law, which we know it won't, a single mom living paycheck to paycheck could work more than 40 hours a week and receive no overtime pay in her paycheck. She would still have to pay the babysitter that week for the extra hours she spent on the job with no guarantee she'll be able to take the comp time off when she needs it. She would have to accept the days off her employer offers—that might not match her schedule—or else wait up to a year to receive the pay that's rightfully hers. And if the business closes, she's out of luck and out of pay.

Instead of getting a paycheck that includes overtime, she'll be forced to decide between an interest-free loan to her employer, or time off when it's convenient for her boss, not for her. Under this bill, millions of working families who are already living on the edge would work longer hours and take home less pay. They would have less flexibility, not more.

Colleagues, if we really want to talk about flexibility, let's talk about paid sick leave. I urge my colleagues to take a stand for working people and oppose this bill.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Indiana, a member of the committee, Mrs. BROOKS.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support on behalf of moms and dads and those who

aren't parents that would be possibly impacted by the Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013. Currently, private sector employees do not have the same choice their public sector counterparts have enjoyed. Specifically, there are so many obstacles that prevent workers from being able to take comp time in lieu of cash wages. This commonsense piece of legislation removes those barriers and gives the private sector working moms and dads more flexibility.

We are getting ready to celebrate Mother's Day this weekend, and I wanted to make special note of the difficulties working moms have finding a job that respects their family choices and pressures. I recently finished a book—talking about books earlier—called “Leaning In” by Facebook's COO, Sheryl Sandberg. She says, “Too many standards remain inflexible and unfair, often penalizing women with children.” She notes that 50 percent of employed mothers are unable to take time off to care for a sick child.

She also discusses a Human Rights Watch study that found parents delayed having their babies immunized or dealing with their own health issues because they can't get time off. The study found parents believe “there is virtually no protection for workers seeking flexible schedules.”

The bill on the floor now would give those working moms and dads the flexibility they want, need, and deserve. This empowers working parents to make the right decisions for their family. If dad can take work off for a doctor's visit, mom can choose to take cash if that's what she decides. If he can't, then she can choose to take the comp time. It gives them that flexibility.

As a woman and a mom who has worked in the public sector and the private sector, I know firsthand how this does help working parents, and it helps those government workers attain that flexibility they deserve. It's time we bring that flexibility to the private sector. It's the 21st century. We have to reform our workplace. This bill helps us accomplish that. I urge adoption.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP's wretched Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 1406, the deceptively-named, Working Families Flexibility Act—or, as I call it, The Working Families to Death Act. This bill—which is really an old, recycled idea from 1997—would allow employers to provide hourly workers with comp time rather than paying time-and-a-half on wages for more

than 40 hours of work. Simply, for hourly workers, this bill equals more work for less pay.

Republicans have stated that “hourly workers do not have the same rights that salaried employees and all federal employees have.” And that they are “trying to make equity and fairness.” Further, they highlight that “flexible work arrangements have been available to federal government workers since 1978” and “it is high time that the workers in the private sector of this country enjoy the same benefits.”

Can you guess when those statements were made? Not this week or last week but in 1997 and 2003. Today’s latest attempt to pass this “comp time” bill is part of the GOP’s rebrand to become more family-friendly. The bill’s sponsor stated, “time is more precious to [a working father] than the cash payments.”

In reality, this bill creates more flexibility for employers and places workers at risk of being fired if they choose overtime pay to help meet their obligations rather than comp time. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and work on policies that provide true, earned flexibility and fair wages for all workers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A Member asking to insert remarks may include a simple declaration of sentiment toward the question under debate but should not embellish the request with extended oratory.

The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. COURTNEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I now yield to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. LOWEY. I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP’s dubious Mother’s Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother’s Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise Members to confine their unanimous-consent request to a simple declarative statement of the Member’s attitude toward the measure. Further embellishments will result in a deduction of time from the yielding Member.

The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP’s reprehensible Mother’s Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother’s Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut’s time will be charged.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the “GOP’s Mothers’ Day Gift: More Work, Less Pay.”

This misnamed “Working Families Flexibility Act” only offers greater flexibility to employers and lower wages to workers. Under this measure, workers will not get paid for hours that exceed 40 hours per week. That compensation will instead go into a fund controlled by their employer.

Employers would be allowed to refuse a worker time off to deal with a family member or attend a parent-teacher conference. This is not real flexibility for workers. This proposal is simply another assault on working families and it should be defeated.

It is particularly ironic that House Republicans would offer this legislation in the week leading up to Mother’s Day. As working women and mothers in New York and throughout the nation struggle with a tough economy, this ill-conceived measure would pull the rug out from under them, making them work more for less compensation.

It is time to focus on real solutions that help working families prosper. Vote down this bill so we can focus on creating jobs, speeding our economic recovery and addressing challenges faced by working men and women.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP’s shameful Mother’s Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother’s Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut’s time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP’s deplorable Mother’s Day gift—more work and less pay for working mothers. Happy Mother’s Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut’s time will be charged.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, the Working Families Flexibility Act, more aptly called the “Paying Working Families Less Act,” would have a negative impact on families in Nevada and across the country. H.R. 1406 offers the empty choice of comp time in lieu of overtime wages without providing sufficient employee protections or real flexibility for workers to use their comp time when they need it the most. Nevadans are already struggling to make ends meet while caring for their families. I oppose H.R. 1406 because I believe that our nation needs legislation that will protect working Americans and strengthen the middle class. This legislation does the opposite.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentlelady from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP’s indefensible Mother’s Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother’s Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut’s time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP’s thoughtless Mother’s Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut’s time will be charged.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in opposition to H.R. 1406, the Republican More Work, Less Pay Act.

Hardworking American families deserve reasonable working hours and scheduling flexibility, livable wages, fair overtime pay and job security. Unfortunately, H.R. 1406 is a misguided policy which provides none of these. American workers need real choices in the workplace which put the interests of American families first. They don’t need stunts like H.R. 1406.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlelady from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP’s scandalous Mother’s Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother’s Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut’s time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP’s vile Mother’s Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother’s Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut’s time will be charged.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1406. This bill should be known as the “More Work Less Pay Act.”

Congress passed the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) in 1938 to encourage a 40-hour workweek. FLSA also ensured that hourly workers would be fairly compensated for working over 40 hours a week. 75 years later, we are now debating a bill that will, in effect, eliminate overtime pay for millions of hourly workers.

Last year, nearly 60 percent of the workforce in this country aged 16 and over, were paid an hourly wage. This amounts to 75.3 million people in the United States according to the Bureau of Labor and Statistics.

Further, the Bureau found that 3.6 million of these workers earn wages at or below the federal minimum wage of \$7.25 per hour. I represent the 43rd congressional district of California. In my home state, the minimum wage is 8.00 an hour. The impact of an \$8.00 minimum wage is clear. We have one of the lowest percentages of workers who are earning at or below the federal minimum wage. There are several states that cannot say the same. Yet, like in all states, Californians who earn overtime still rely upon that extra income.

The legislation before us today needlessly targets millions of workers. These workers have come to rely on their overtime to make ends meet. We are not talking about millionaires but everyday hard working men and women. They utilize their added income to pay their rent and mortgages. They are using their overtime to feed their families and clothe their children. Hourly workers in this country are working overtime to pay for gas for their cars or pay their bus fare to get to work.

H.R. 1406 provides absolutely no legitimate incentive for employers to give their employees time off. Under this bill, an employer could defer paying overtime for up to a year. This would, in effect, provide an employer with an interest free loan.

Under this "More Work Less Pay" bill workers are not guaranteed compensatory time, commonly known as "comp" time. An employer retains the right to refuse to grant comp time. Under current law, workers are required to receive their overtime pay in their very next check.

If an employer fails to pay overtime to their employee then the employee has a right to sue his or her employer. In 2011, the Labor Department recovered \$225 million in back wages for employees. In that same year, there were 7,006 wage and hour suits filed in federal court. The numbers of employees suing their employers for back wages has steadily increased.

Today, thousands of workers are currently fighting to ensure they are receiving their earned income. This is not the time to add into the fray, "comp" time flexibility and overtime pay cuts. If this bill did as it claimed and provided hourly workers with flexibility then there would be thousands of workers marching to D.C. championing this bill, instead nearly 200 labor unions and women's organizations oppose this measure.

I believe we can all agree that working families do need flexibility. They need the flexibility that their extra earned income can afford them.

The Jobs Report released last Friday reflected that our economy added 165,000 new jobs in the month of April. Instead of focusing on legislation to create additional jobs, boost our economy, and increase the earning potential of workers in the United States. Repub-

lican leadership has chosen instead to focus on legislation that cuts the pay of working families.

A pay cut called flexibility is still a pay cut. Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP's deplorable Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I join women Democratic Members in opposition to this H.R. 1406—a "more work, less pay bill."

Contrary to the title of this bill, it will take away the right workers currently have to overtime pay and instead authorize employers to substitute compensatory time to private sector employees. This bill is a smoke and mirrors proposal that sets up a deplorable false choice between time and money when working families need both.

H.R. 1406 allows employers to offer comp time in lieu of overtime to their hourly workers without guaranteed right to use the time when they need it, even in time of a personal or family emergency. The Republicans try to compare this benefit to federal employees but this is not a fair comparison. Hourly workers do not have the same rights that salaried employees and federal employees have. Compensatory agreements can be terminate at the will of the employer. This legislation shortchanges workers both financially and logistically.

This must not be done at any time, but certainly not at a time, when households are challenged by rising cost of living, they need cash for their time.

This idea did not work in 1997, 2003 and will not work in 2013.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP's disrespectful Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1406, the misnamed "Working Families Flexibility Act." This bill would take away critical overtime pay from families still struggling from the effects of the Great Recession. It might provide more flexibility for some businesses, but it would create real hardship for everyone else.

Under this bill, employers could offer comp time to replace earned time-and-a-half wages for overtime. But workers who opt for that time off would not be guaranteed to get it when they want it—employers would have the right to deny comp time off requests, even if the request was needed for a personal or family emergency. Employers could dictate when you got your comp time—and they could make those decisions unilaterally. If you want to take comp time to care for a loved one or see your daughter in a school play, your employer can say no. And you have no right to appeal. And if the business closes or lays you off before you have a chance to use your comp time, you get nothing at all.

Under this bill, a worker would have the option of foregoing overtime pay and hoping that sometime in the future she can get time off when she needs it, not when it's convenient for her employer. That's option one—work more and get paid less. Or she can take option two: demand overtime pay and find out that another worker—one who is willing to accept the employer's offer of future comp time—is given the extra hours.

That unfairness is the reason that over 160 organizations representing working women oppose H.R. 1406—groups like Jewish Women International, the Coalition of Labor Union Women, the National Council of Women's Organizations, Wider Opportunities for Women, the National Women's Law Center, and the National Partnership for Women and Families.

The U.S. Women's Chamber of Commerce also opposes this bill. Their CEO Margot Dorfman writes, "H.R. 1406 would reward those employees who agree to "comp time" in lieu of overtime payments. Employees incentivized by a reduced payroll might well give "comp time" employees the preferred shifts, the needed hours, and the promotions. There is no protection in H.R. 1406 against this kind of employer behavior."

The American Sustainable Business Council and Restaurant Opportunities Center United joins in opposition to H.R. 1406, because it "would create headaches for any employer who must track banked hours across multiple employees." They add, it "becomes a scheduling and accounting challenge when employees decide to trade in banked hours, requiring business owners to make unexpected shifts in personnel and paychecks. Obviously, small businesses with fewer resources and employees would be even harder hit by these enormous logistics than larger corporations."

It's true that working women and men need greater flexibility and the ability to balance family and job obligations. That's why today we should be debating the Healthy Families Act to guarantee paid sick leave. We should be debating expansion of the Family and Medical Leave Act to provide the paid leave needed to allow working women and men to address family needs.

Instead, the Republican majority has decided to bring this bill to the floor—a bill that threatens overtime pay and gives employers more ability to determine schedules for their workers. That is no solution for working families.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert

my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP's appalling Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. HAHN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP's dreadful Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP's awful Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

□ 1430

Mr. COURTNEY. I yield to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's revolting Mother's Day gift—more work, less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong and unyielding opposition to H.R. 1406, the so-called "Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013." I thank Mr. COURTNEY for this opportunity to speak on behalf and in support of the working women and men in my District and against this terrible bill, which has been offered repeatedly over several Congresses, and each time it has found strong opposition and ultimate defeat.

This bill should it become law would take income out of the hands of workers and their families. When the economy is weak—workers and their families need more protection not less.

Under current law (the Fair Labor Standards Act), employers are required to pay workers time-and-a-half cash for hours worked in excess of 40 hours per week.

According to statisticians with the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics there is no survey to offer insight on the issues addressed in this bill—the desire of employees to receive "comp time" instead of cash for their work.

We do know that if the Education and the Workforce Committee had accepted Congressman JOE COURTNEY's amendment in the nature of a substitute when the bill was marked up in full Committee—workers would have something to be cheering about today. His amendment would have created 56 hours of paid medical leave for employees to use when they needed it.

The Administration along with many of my colleagues will not support H.R. 1406—and it will not become law for very good reasons. H.R. 1406 supporters say that it would not prevent employers from cutting the overtime hours and reducing the take-home pay of employees who currently have the right to overtime compensation. But will workers be in a position to assert this right given the economic climate and their own situations.

So-called "comp time" or the "company time" legislation would allow employers to pay workers nothing for overtime work at the time the work is performed—in exchange for a promise of time off in the future.

"COMP TIME" WOULD REDUCE NEW WORKER AND COULD JEOPARDIZE EXISTING WORKER TAKE HOME PAY

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics the average weekly overtime hours for manufacturing workers in 2012 was 4.2 hours or over 44 hours a week. In a year 4.2 additional hours of overtime, considering 2 weeks for vacation would total 210 hours.

The average income of a Boilermaker with less than 2 years of experience would earn \$35,856.00 a year or about \$18 an hour. In real dollar terms, a Boilermaker making \$18 an hour, when working overtime would earn \$27 an hour. Under H.R. 1406, the total forgone hours for the average workweek for a manufacturing worker over a year is 210 hours—if the worker is a Boilermaker it means a loss of \$5,670 annually.

The bill's text suggests that existing workers will retain their right to receive overtime pay and that only new employees would fall under the "comp time" provisions. The bill attempts to divide existing workers and new workers by denying one group of workers something as basic as equal pay for equal work. This may lead some employers to prefer their workers who are not protected by wage laws.

The reality is all workers in this economy face the potential fallout from a change in labor laws that reduce protection of monetary compensation for work done.

"COMP TIME" WOULD HURT WORKERS AND THEIR FAMILIES

Another clue that this bill may be way off the mark for what workers need—is the reaction of organized labor to it being brought before the House of Representatives for a vote. Labor is in strong opposition to H.R. 1406 because they know what this bill would mean to workers and their families, just as I and many of you know—it would mean forced labor hours without giving workers the guaranteed right to get paid for their work. The skill acquired by a worker is something they own and can bring to the market place in exchange for

a fair wage. This is an important component of a capitalistic system that should be valued and respected.

The bill fails to mention that workers already have the right to ask for "comp time" within any 40-hour workweek when they need it. What is not allowed is an employer making the decision that workers must take "comp time" when they work overtime.

H.R. 1406 places unnecessary competitive pressure on employees to accept "comp time" because employers believe it is an easy way to reduce operational costs for their businesses. H.R. 1406 provides no meaningful protection against employers pressuring workers to enter into "comp time" agreements.

The first quarter of 2013 according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics recorded an increase of overtime hours worked to 4.3 hours per week for manufacturing jobs this is an increase over the last quarter of 2012. If Congress allows the free market to work then the numbers of employed persons will increase.

"COMP TIME" WOULD THREATEN THE PROTECTIONS OFFERED BY THE 40 HOUR WORKWEEK

The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) of 1938 established the 40-hour workweek to allow employees to spend more time away from work and encourage employers to hire more staff when workloads increase. The FLSA's only incentive for employers to maintain a 40-hour workweek is the requirement that they pay a time-and-a-half cash premium for overtime.

The cost of labor is a factor in helping to expand the numbers of employed persons in our nation. When employers see the cost savings associated with hiring more workers as the hours worked by existing employees increase labor cost due to overtime pay—they hire more workers.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics counts overtime as a benefit not as pay. If the result of the bill is to have employees work more hours, but without the guarantee of compensation—it is flawed.

The 40-hour workweek discourages employers from demanding overtime by making overtime more expensive.

This bill by contrast, encourages employers to demand more overtime by making overtime less expensive.

This gives all of the power to employers to demand their employees work longer hours without adequate compensation.

By making it cheaper for employers to demand overtime, "comp time" would lead to more mandatory overtime, longer hours, and more unpredictable work schedules for workers.

This bill also makes it harder for America's workers to have their rights enforced by the Department of Labor. Amending the law to weaken work for pay requirements would result in even more widespread violation of the overtime law and more workers working longer hours for less pay.

"COMP TIME" IS A PAY CUT FOR AMERICA'S WORKERS

Millions of workers depend on cash overtime to make ends meet and pay their housing, food, and other living expenses.

These workers would see a substantial reduction in their take-home pay if they were compensated with time off rather than cash up front.

It is true that "comp time" is paid leave, but most workers would have been paid anyway if they had not taken the time off, and under

H.R. 1406 they are paid nothing for their overtime work at the time they work it.

Again, H.R. 1406 takes the power out of the hands of the employees. H.R. 1406 does not ensure that workers' choice to reduce their income through "comp time" is truly voluntary.

H.R. 1406 provides no meaningful protection against employers assigning overtime work preferentially to employees who accept "comp time".

Under H.R. 1406, employers can schedule workers to work up to 160 hours of "comp time." Workers will be cheated out of their accrued overtime earnings when their employer goes bankrupt.

I stand today with America's workers. We are united in opposition to H.R. 1406, the Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013.

If Congress wants to do something for workers we should support the President's Budget for state paid leave programs. His proposal would not force workers to choose between taking time off for family needs and receiving income, or even risk losing their jobs. The President's minimum wage proposal would also support working families by making sure that all workers receive enough hourly income to make ends meet.

That is why I oppose H.R. 1406 and urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this terrible legislation.

Mr. COURTNEY. I yield to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's bill. It should be called the Fake Flexibility Act and should more aptly be named More Work For Less Pay For Working Mothers.

Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Majority's so-called Working Families Flexibility Act. The American people should not be deceived by this fake advertising.

True workplace flexibility should be a two-way street for both employees and employers.

I am a longtime sponsor of work-life balance legislation, including the original bill titled the "Working Families Flexibility Act" that provides both employers and employees with protections in discussing flexible work arrangements.

Over the last 50 years there have been tremendous changes to our workforce. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, more than 70 percent of children are raised in families that are headed by either a working single parent or two working parents. In addition, studies show that 60 percent of those who provide care to an adult or to a child with special needs are employed.

The numbers show the real case for flexibility in the workplace.

And yet, Americans must not be deceived about the recycled bill on the floor this week. The more aptly named "More Work, Less Pay Act" undermines the basic guarantees of fair

pay for overtime work and time off from work under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

I urge my colleague to bring to the floor true workplace advancement legislation and oppose the H.R. 1406.

Mr. COURTNEY. I yield to the gentlelady from Arizona (Mrs. Kirkpatrick) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's miserable Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. I yield now to the gentlelady from New Mexico (Ms. LUJAN GRISHAM) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's dubious Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. I yield now to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's unscrupulous Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working mothers. Happy Mother's Day to all mothers.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. I now yield to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. CAPPs) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CAPPs. Thank you to my colleague for yielding.

I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's appalling Mother's Day gift. Happy Mother's Day by giving more work and less pay to working moms.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. I now yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. SPEIER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD opposing the GOP's "shame on you" Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms.

Is this really what we want to give mothers on Mother's Day?

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. I now yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. MATSUI) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MATSUI. Thank you very much.

I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's heartless Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. I yield to my neighbor and good friend, the gentlelady from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. DELAURO. I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD in opposition of a sham bill that, in fact, takes money away from men and women, particularly from women, and that is in no way a way to ensure the economic security of women in this Nation.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. I now yield to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's uncaring Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, if I could be given the time remaining, I'd appreciate it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut has 15¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. COURTNEY. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. May I inquire as to the time remaining on our side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. KLINE. I want to thank my colleagues on the other side. It was an excellent show. It expanded the lexicon in the thesaurus.

I now yield 2 minutes to a member of the committee, a subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1406, and I encourage my colleagues to support this.

In my previous life, I served as an employer for over 30 years, as a single parent and as a mayor of a city.

We had an issue several years ago with our fire department on compensatory pay versus overtime. We agreed with the firefighters. It worked out fine. The firefighters all understood they couldn't all be gone on the same day. They worked with us great, and it was not a problem. It works in the public sector. I don't know why it cannot work in the private sector.

All this bill does is leave the decision to receive comp time. It's completely voluntary. You don't have to do it. You can choose to do it if you want to. Number two, workers can withdraw from the comp time agreement whenever they choose. They can do that. It's not a problem. All existing protections in the Fair Labor Standards Act are maintained, the 40-hour workweek and how overtime compensation is accrued. It is up to the employee to decide when to use his or her comp time as long as there is reasonable notice to the employer.

I certainly have heard mentioned what happens if an employer goes bankrupt. Well, what happens when a city like Stockton, California, goes bankrupt?

I will finish by saying over and over that more work and less pay for working mothers doesn't make it true. I support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do so.

Mr. COURTNEY. I now yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. BASS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BASS. I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the indefensible Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my state-

ment in the RECORD opposing the reprehensible Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. I now yield to the gentlelady from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Thank you.

I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's awful Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is now my honor to yield 1½ minutes to an outstanding colleague on the Education and the Workforce Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. So it's Friday afternoon at the nursing home, and Debbie and Donna are approached by the boss.

The boss says, I have 5 hours of overtime this weekend. You can either have cash or comp time.

Debbie says, I'll take the cash. I need the money.

Donna says, I'll take the comp time.

Donna gets the overtime.

The next Friday rolls around—the same boss, the same request.

Debbie says, I'll take the cash. I'll take the overtime.

Donna says, No. I'll take the comp time.

Donna gets the overtime.

It doesn't take very long for people to figure out what the right answer is when you're asked for overtime. You might say, Well, Donna is going to be okay because she gets all this comp time.

Donna comes back and says, Next Friday is the pageant at my daughter's school for second grade. I want to take the morning off so I can go to my daughter's pageant.

The boss says, No, that's not convenient for me. No.

Now, I suppose in some theoretical universe Donna could hire a lawyer, sue her boss, and try to get to see her daughter's second grade pageant—not in the world that she lives in and the world we live in. The boss decides when she uses the comp time.

The end of the year comes, and she hasn't used it yet. The boss writes a check to Donna without interest. Donna has made an interest-free loan

to her employer. If the employer goes bankrupt in that year, Donna is out of the money altogether.

This is not about flexibility. It's about the conversion of someone's wages and assets. This is an assault on the 40-hour workweek. It is not worthy of this institution. It's wrong for our country. We should vote "no."

□ 1440

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I need to inquire again as to the time remaining because as I listened to my colleagues come down for unanimous consent requests, it seems to me I heard the Speaker saying that the gentleman's time was going to be charged. How did that add up?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut has 13½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota has 14½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KLINE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That's interesting math.

I'm now pleased to yield 2 minutes to a friend and colleague, the gentlelady from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS).

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the committee for all the hard work that you've done, and especially to my good friend and fellow Republican Women's Policy Committee member, Representative MARTHA ROBY, who introduced this very important bill because she realizes that as a mother of two children that the workplace must change to adapt to our increasingly stressful lives.

Americans are struggling to balance their lives, doing everything they can to maintain their careers while still spending time with their families. We in the Congress can help. If H.R. 1406 becomes law, a working mom and dad can choose to use the time and a half overtime he or she earns as actual paid time off instead of cash. They would be able to use this time to see their daughter's piano recital or their son's baseball game when they would otherwise have to be at work.

But, of course, even with this commonsense piece of legislation, there are detractors. Many myths have been spread about this bill. You've heard them here today. And the opponents refer to it as a "pay cut for working moms," but this simply is not true.

Also, I've heard that it's the assault on the 40-hour workweek. It is not. However, what is an assault on the 40-hour workweek is ObamaCare, which will force job creators to cut back their employees from full-time to part-time in order to keep their doors open. The decision to receive comp time is completely voluntary.

This is not a partisan issue. In 1985, Ted Kennedy, HARRY REID, JOE BIDEN, and STENY HOYER all supported giving the public sector employees the flexibility to choose comp time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill. I cannot think of a better Mother's Day gift. This is something we can do right now to help families at a time when they need it most.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding and his leadership.

I rise in opposition to the Republican Party's Working Families Flexibility Act. It should be named the "Fake Flexibility Act." It's a failure to advertise truthfully. If you were true, you would call it the "More Work and Less Pay Act."

Under this bill, workers would lose the basic guarantees of fair pay for overtime work and time off from work under the Fair Labor Standards Act. It would deprive hardworking men and women of their earned income and fail to guarantee them the right to use that overtime when they need to use it for a personal or family emergency.

Shamefully, the United States ranks among the least generous of industrialized countries when it comes to family-friendly policies. We are one of three countries that fail to provide paid leave for the birth of a child. True workplace advancement benefits both businesses and worker interests. Instead, the Republican bill hurts employees by giving them less pay at a time when American wages are stagnant.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation and bring up the Democratic minority's alternatives for paid sick leave, paid leave for the birth of a child, and true flex time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I'm now very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman and I thank Mrs. ROBY for bringing this forward.

It's really about time, because on the deathbed, very few people say, Boy, I wish I had spent more time at the office.

I've got to tell you, from being in business all my life—and I think maybe that's the problem in Washington, not enough of you have actually been on the floor of a business because you think it's always about some kind of a fair treatment. But your definition of "fair" is not fair.

When I look at men and women, I don't look at them as men and women. I look at them as moms and dads and grandpas and grandpas and aunts and uncles. They love to go to soccer games. They love to go to baseball games, and they love to go to all those Cub Scout meetings. But you know what? We want to just give them the flexibility, the same as we do in the public sector.

What an odd concept to actually give people the freedom to do what they want with their time and to work a little overtime so they can pick up extra time. My gosh, what a confusing concept that would be.

And this is not by gender, by the way. If you think this is about working

mothers, it's also about working fathers. Do you know how many times people don't have that time to go see their sons and daughters in a school play or a baseball game? You want to take that away from them with some kind of phony act today, and you'll line up 15 deep? Talk about insincerity and inflexibility; that's your party.

You're supposed to be the party of the women. We're supposed to be the ones that don't like women. We're giving them a gift that you can never give: the gift of time. Nobody has the ability to do that.

This bill makes it possible for people to spend that precious time with those precious few that they want to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, again, as someone who was a private sector employer for over 25 years, there is nothing under existing law that prevents an employer from giving an employee paid time off. I did it many times.

Now it is my privilege to yield 1 minute to my colleague from the State of Florida, Congresswoman DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the real effect that the Working Families Flexibility Act would have on our families.

Contrary to its name, this bill does not protect working families. Many hourly workers in south Florida and across the country depend on the opportunity to collect their hard-earned overtime pay to support their families and make ends meet. This antifamily, antiworker bill would make it harder for employees to provide for their families and easier for employers to pay less for overtime work with hazy promises of time off later. The bottom line is that comp time doesn't pay the bills.

This legislation provides no guarantee that employees would get to use their time off when they need it; or if an employer goes out of business, workers may never get compensated at all.

I've heard no one on the other side of the aisle answer what happens when a boss says "no" to a request for comp time for that school play or taking their child to a doctor.

Employees who depend on overtime pay to put food on the table may be forced to compete with fellow employees who are willing to trade their overtime wages for comp time.

Passing this bill would deepen the financial insecurity of wage workers, especially Hispanic women who are more likely to be hourly wage workers, more likely to be responsible for family caregiving, and less likely to have negotiating power in their jobs.

There are other bills on the table that offer far more meaningful solutions, and I urge the Republican majority to take them up and take care of America's working families instead of

giving them the short end of the stick as this bill does.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I'm now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this piece of legislation.

This Sunday is Mother's Day. It's a very bittersweet day for me. As a father of three children, I am constantly reminding my wife how important this day is and how important her job as a mother is. But it's 14 years ago this month that I lost my mother, my inspiration, my teacher, someone that I think about every single Mother's Day.

I ask myself what would my mom, Sally Davis, say when we give the option to provide more flexibility to working mothers. In Illinois alone, my home State, there are over 1 million single parents that need this flexibility to be able to make the decisions they need to raise their families.

As a father of three school-aged children, I've coached baseball games, I've watched my daughter cheer, and I've shuttled my kids to doctor appointments. It's part of raising kids and being a parent. However, more than 60 percent of employees feel they do not have enough time to spend with their families. Why not give these families the same flexibility that those in the public sector—many of my constituents in Springfield, Illinois, and throughout have the same opportunity to use? Why not to give them that flexibility? Just last year, employees at the IRS took more than 246,000 hours of comp time instead of additional government pay.

No legislation is perfect, Mr. Speaker, but this legislation gives families, gives mothers, gives fathers the opportunity to choose and work with their employers to do so.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to think of their mother and ask them what would they do.

□ 1450

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a champion for working families and my neighbor.

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in strong opposition to the bill before us. It aims to end overtime pay, bring to an end the 40-hour workweek. This is another attempt by the House majority to accelerate a race to the bottom, strip workers of basic rights and protections, and undermine the foundations of the American middle class.

The Working Families Flexibility Act does exactly the opposite of what it describes. There is no flexibility. The legislation guts the 75-year-old statute guaranteeing overtime pay for work over a 40-hour workweek, overtime pay that those single moms need. Hardworking American families, they rely on it. It allows employers, if they so

choose, to provide comp time for all of this extra work, except there are no guarantees that workers can take the time when they need it, and there are no avenues for workers to file grievances if employers do not comply. This bill forces employees to work extra hours without overtime pay and get nothing in return.

Yes, we need serious economic solutions to the problems that families are facing. Wages have stagnated for decades. Forty percent of Americans make less today than what the minimum wage was worth in 1968. And in America today, unlike in every other competitive economy in the world, 42 million workers cannot take off time when they are sick, when they need to care for a sick child or an ailing relative.

We need legislation that provides employees with paid time off if they need it. The Healthy Families Act would allow workers up to seven job-protected paid sick days for each year. It builds on and reflects pro-family policies that have been passed in Connecticut; Seattle; Portland, Oregon; San Francisco; Washington, D.C. This majority has said “no” to an airing of this legislation. They want to eliminate worker protections and further undermine workers’ paychecks and benefits.

And America’s families, they sent us here to represent their interests and address their needs, not to further erode their economic instability. Vote against this bill. Support paid leave, minimum wage, and pay equity if you want to help Americans families.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), the chairman of the Workforce Protection Subcommittee.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

I find it unbelievable to sit here and listen to the divisive, erroneous, fear-mongering information that’s being put forth by the other side of the aisle. It’s unbecoming. Today’s workplaces are a lot different than they were just a generation ago. Technology continues to alter the way goods and services reach consumers, and cultural changes have transformed the nature of America’s workforce.

This important legislation, this compassionate legislation, allows private sector employees to choose—and I say “choose,” Mr. Speaker—choose paid time off or comp time as compensation for working overtime hours, and this policy has already proven extremely successful.

For nearly 30 years, government sector workers have been able to earn comp time. In fact, last year employees at the IRS took more than 246,000 hours of comp time in lieu of overtime pay. No complaints. Yet working parents and individuals in the private sector are not afforded with this same choice.

This is simply not right. Certainly every employee faces a unique set of

circumstances and challenges and responsibilities. For some, taking time at home is a good thing for them. Additional pay is not necessary for them at that point, but having the opportunity to spend time with their children, to go to parent-teacher conferences and do other things with family is more valuable than a few extra dollars in the bank.

Choice and flexibility helps employees meet the demands of their jobs and address the needs of their families. That’s why I’m proud to support this bill, this pro-family, this pro-worker bill. This is what is meant for this time, and I encourage my colleagues to get off the divisive rhetoric and get to the unifying effect of saying, We will encourage people in their lives, their families, and their incomes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to my colleague from the State of Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013. The bill would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to authorize private employers to provide comp time or compensatory time off to private employees at the rate of 1.5 hours per hour of employment for which overtime compensation is required.

Essentially, workers would be promised comp time instead of overtime pay. Many families depend on overtime pay to make ends meet. The Fair Labor Standards Act guarantees workers will receive overtime pay for over 40 hours per week. The bill only promises the potential for future comp time without any real protections for the workers. Hardworking Americans would be unprotected against long hours and less pay without the guarantee of any compensation. H.R. 1406 falsely promises more time with their loved ones by allowing them to choose paid time off. Unfortunately, workers will only get more time with their families after they’ve spent long hours, for less pay, at the approval of the employer.

I stand with America’s workers to oppose this legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same. The 40-hour week has stood for 75 years, and it should continue.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the majority leader, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for his leadership in bringing this bill forward, as well as the bill’s sponsor, the gentlelady from Alabama, a working mom whose inspiration is her kids at home and her husband that she is responsible for and with in order to make life work for them in Alabama. So I want to appreciate her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the bill, the Working Families Flexibility Act. If you are a working parent in this country, you know from experience that there’s hardly ever enough time to spend with your family.

Recently, I spoke with a constituent from Richmond. Her name is Nicole

Lambert. She’s a working mom who runs an early childhood education center. It’s quite often that Nicole is approached by one of her employees requesting more flexibility with how they can use their overtime. Some of her employees need to take off to take their child to the doctor, some need to go and meet with a teacher. But under the current law, Nicole is not able to present her hardworking staff with this option. She understands that this bill would give her employees more flexibility to balance both work and their lives at home.

Mr. Speaker, for too long working families in the private sector have not been able to choose a more flexible schedule when working overtime; but for the past 30 years, government employees have been afforded this luxury. It’s time for all of us to present all parents in America with this option.

As a father of three, I can tell you as a working parent I know that it is very necessary to be there for your children. And I bet no matter who you are as a working parent, if you asked a mom or a dad what they need more of, it’s time. Washington should not be standing in the way of any employer voluntarily offering this benefit for any employee choosing more time. That’s the bottom line, Mr. Speaker. Washington should not be in the way of more freedom in the workplace.

I know this policy will work, from speaking with local government employees who already enjoy this advantage.

Vicki is a working mom and a police officer in my district. She works long hours, and she raises her children.

□ 1500

She tells me her life is made a little easier because she’s allowed to work a few extra hours, save it up in case there’s a sick day or an after-school event that she must attend.

It’s simply unfair for those who work for Nicole in the private sector to be prohibited from receiving the benefits that Vicki does, a government employee.

This is a bill that should easily garner bipartisan support because, frankly, it puts parents before politics and will give people more freedom to make their lives work. There’s simply no good reason to deny hardworking parents the opportunity to take their children to the doctor or to attend a parent-teacher conference.

I want to thank my constituents for their relaying stories to me about their life story, about how this bill helps.

And again, I’m very grateful to the leadership and the role model that the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) and Chairman KLINE have set forth in this effort. This act will help parents all across America, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP), my colleague from the Education and Workforce Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. COURTNEY for yielding, and for his leadership on this issue.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 1406. I have a great many concerns about this bill, but let me focus on just one. There is little question that this bill will result in unjust actions being taken against employees who choose the traditional overtime pay option over the comp time arrangement.

Under this legislation, employers have the right to only schedule employees that have agreed to enter into comp time arrangements without consequence. Suddenly, workers who rely on overtime income to help feed their family or put a child through college will see their hours curtailed and instead given to workers who choose comp time arrangements.

There is not one word in this legislation that would protect a worker who needs cash for his or her overtime hours. They will clearly lose out to those workers who are willing to take paid time off or compensatory time off, as opposed to time-and-a-half overtime.

There are a great many workers, and I grew up in a family that had one of those workers, that rely on overtime to pay the bills, to put their kids through college, and to see to it that they get to live lives of dignity. This legislation will take away that ability from those families.

Republicans claim that this is somehow part of a new, family friendly approach to governing. Well, one of the first votes I cast as a member of the Education Committee, as a new Member of Congress in 2003, was against a bill called the Family Time Flexibility Act. The bill in front of us today is literally identical to that 2003 bill, minus the title.

I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 1406.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), my friend and colleague, a leader in so many areas.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his work on this effort. And I also want to say thank to you Mrs. ROBY from Alabama for the outstanding job that she has done on the Working Families Flexibility Act.

I have loved talking with my constituents about this issue. And it is absolutely amazing, when you say, tell me what you think about this. Would you like to have the option, the ability to control what your compensation method is going to be? And so many of my constituents, whether they're rearing families, whether they have teenagers that they're working with, whether they're caring for elderly relatives, say, this is a great idea. And it is so worthy of discussion, and it is about time for Congress to do something that's just plain old good common sense.

Mr. Speaker, the reason for this is, take a look at what is happening now.

In 1975, when I was newly married and beginning to start a family, there were only 37 percent of all the families where both parents were working outside of the home.

Look at what is happening now that my children are having their careers, and my daughter has two children. You've got just under 60 percent where both parents are working outside of the home. On top of this, you have those of us who are caring for elderly relatives.

And as the majority leader just said, any time you run a survey and ask women what they want, they would love to have more time, and they also want more control over how they're able to manage their lives and the lives of their families. And this is a piece of legislation that does that.

I agree with what some of my colleagues have said. This Obama economy has really forced more families than ever to work more than one job. It has been very difficult. And having more options makes it easier for those families to manage.

I thank the leadership for the work on the bill.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire as to the time left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 4¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding and ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's shameful Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's deplorable Mother's Day gift—more work, less pay for working moms. No way to say Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday morning, millions of mothers nationwide will wake up to the excited faces of their children wishing them a "happy Mother's Day."

Mothers will receive gifts of all kinds from their sons and daughters—tokens of love and gratitude for all that moms do every day.

MORE WORK, LESS PAY

Yet today, House Republicans are offering up a different Mother's Day gift: more work, less pay.

House Republicans are putting forward the so-called "Working Families Flexibility Act."

The name may make it sound appealing, but don't be fooled—this bill is nothing more than smoke and mirrors meant to hide its true purpose:

To end the 40-hour work week;

To cut pay for women;

To undermine the economic security of the middle class.

This legislation claims the mantle of flexibility, yet only means greater flexibility for employers and lower wages for workers.

This proposal is simply another ideological assault on workers, another mean-spirited attack on workers' rights, and another Republican message bill that will never become law.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

More work, less pay—that's what this bill is about.

It guts protections for workers and removes flexibility for working families.

It amounts to an interest-free loan to employers—paid for by workers' wages and unused comp time hours.

It is nothing more than a mirage—claiming to give flexibility to workers to take time off to care for family or attend a parent-teacher conference while actually handing flexibility to their bosses to cut pay or call for more hours.

SAYING "NO" TO WORKERS

This legislation is brought to you by the same people who attack and undermine working families at every turn—the same people who say:

"No" to raising the minimum wage.

"No" to the Paycheck Fairness Act

"No" to extending unemployment benefits that strengthen our economy.

"No" to any measure that could expand the middle class.

The same people who will only say "yes" to more hardship for workers, to more pain for the middle class, to more work and less pay.

OPPOSITION

No wonder this bill is opposed by more than 160 women's organizations across the country, from Arkansas and Arizona to Washington and Wisconsin, who wrote a letter to Congress calling this measure "an empty promise [that] would cause considerably more harm than good."

No wonder President Obama has pledged to veto this bill, declaring that "this legislation undermines the existing right to hard-earned overtime pay, on which many working families rely to make ends meet, while misrepresenting itself as a workplace flexibility measure . . ."

CLOSE

The Republican proposal is the last gift anyone should give our families on Mother's Day.

That's why I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation and to work together on steps to invest in working families, to bolster small businesses, to create jobs, and to build a strong, thriving middle class.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's callous Mother's Day gift—more work and

less pay for working moms. Not a Happy Mother's Day.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. BEATTY. I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD opposing the GOP's appalling Mother's Day gift—more work and less pay for working moms. And that's a Happy Mother's Day?

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut's time will be charged.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, you've seen them, many, many women, hourly workers. You've seen them with their sneakers on, their rubber-soled shoes, standing at bus stops, getting on buses in order to get to work and to get back in time to be with their children.

But those workers need cash, Mr. Speaker. They need cash to make ends meet in housing, food and other living expenses. It's also our men as well.

These workers would see a substantial reduction in their take-home pay if they were compensated with time off rather than cash up front. We know that if H.R. 1406 was passed they would be paid nothing for their overtime work at the time they work.

We also realize that employers can schedule workers to work up to 160 hours of comp time. Workers will be cheated out of the accrued overtime earnings, these same mothers and many, many men who depend on this overtime pay. You've seen them.

The same mothers that will receive for their gift on Mother's Day a little outstretched hand with maybe a daffodil or a rose in it from a little 5-year old, mothers who need the cash.

Let me tell you that the U.S. Women's Chamber of Commerce is against this legislation because they know that there will be preferential treatment. There will be pets, and the employers will pick those who have taken the comp time.

You've seen these mothers. They get the outstretched hand and the little flower. Pay them their money.

This is a bad bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong and unyielding opposition to H.R. 1406, the so-called "Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013." I thank Ranking Member MILLER for this opportunity to speak on behalf and in support of the working women and men in my District and against

this terrible bill, which has been offered repeatedly over several Congresses, and each time it has found strong opposition and ultimate defeat.

Under current law (the Fair Labor Standards Act), employers are required to pay workers time-and-a-half cash for hours worked in excess of 40 hours per week.

Workers can request "comp time" during any 40 hour work week if they need it.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics the average weekly overtime hours for manufacturing workers in 2012 was 4.2 hours or over 44 hours a week. In a year 4.2 additional hours of overtime, considering 2 weeks for vacation would total 210 hours.

A Boilermaker with less than 2 years of experience earns \$35,856.00 a year or \$18 an hour. A Boilermaker making \$18 an hour working overtime would earn \$27 an hour.

In 2012 manufacturer workers overtime averaged 4.2 hours a week that would be 210 hours for 50 weeks of work.

A Boilermaker over a year could accrue 210 hours in overtime—if this bill becomes law this could mean a loss of \$5,670 annually.

The first quarter of 2013 according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics recorded an increase of overtime hours worked to 4.3 hours per week for manufacturing jobs this is an increase over the last quarter of 2012. If Congress allows the free market to work then the numbers of employed persons will increase.

Labor is in strong opposition to H.R. 1406 because—this bill would mean forced labor hours without giving workers the guaranteed right to get paid for their work.

Workers already have the right to ask for "comp time" within any 40 hour workweek when they need it.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics counts overtime as a benefit not as pay. If the result of the bill is to have employees work more hours, but without the guarantee of compensation—it is flawed.

If Congress wants to do something for workers we should support the President's Budget for state paid leave programs. His proposal would not force workers to choose between taking time off for family needs and receiving income, or even risk losing their jobs. The President's minimum wage proposal would also support working families by making sure that all workers receive enough hourly income to make ends meet.

That is why I oppose H.R. 1406 and urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this terrible legislation.

□ 1510

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT).

Mr. HURT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding. I appreciate the committee's leadership on this important measure.

I rise today in support of the Working Families Flexibility Act, a House of Representatives initiative that will give families and individuals across the Fifth District the freedom of workplace choice and limit the Federal overreach in our daily lives. At a time when our economy is struggling, we must look for ways to help our hard-working families and individuals.

Under current law, public employees can choose between using overtime

hours for pay or for paid time off. Unfortunately, this same option is not afforded to those who work for private companies. With small businesses and family farms being the engine of our rural economy, this option is therefore not available to many of my constituents.

This bill before us today changes all of that. By ensuring private workers can accrue paid time off instead of overtime compensation, we will provide Fifth District Virginians greater flexibility in balancing their work schedules with the demands of family life. And we will take these important decisions out of the hands of Federal bureaucrats and place them into the hands of hardworking Americans.

It is high time that this outdated regulation be replaced with the principles of individual freedom and individual choice. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation.

I thank Representative ROBY for sponsoring this important initiative.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, it's now my privilege to yield 1 minute to my colleague from the State of Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. This really is an insidious bill. I've been listening to the debate on the floor, Mr. Speaker, and I have to tell you there are some things I heard that I think need correcting.

First of all, median hourly wages in this country are \$12.80 an hour. That's about \$26,000 a year. And what that means is that for most workers, for some of our workers who are hourly workers, this bill really goes at the heart of the 40-hour workweek. In fact, what it does is it puts in jeopardy some of our most vulnerable in the workforce. Ninety percent of our hourly workers don't work under collective bargaining agreements, and that means that they don't have the protections that public sector workers have who get to enjoy comp time when it's available to them. They really do need the time and a half.

It's not like the other side is proposing that we have earned sick leave, earned vacation, earned maternity leave. Instead, they want to take away pay and get a no-interest loan from workers instead of paying them time and a half for their overtime. There's no flexibility. The power is only in the hands of the employer who gets to decide when the comp time can be taken, whether it can be taken, and how it should be paid.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, if I could just inquire through you, again, we have no further speakers, so I'm prepared to close.

Mr. KLINE. We have no further speakers, either.

Mr. COURTNEY. Could the Chair give me one last update in terms of how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 3½ minutes remaining.

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

We've probably reached the point where enough has been said where the full 4½ minutes maybe isn't necessary, but again, I would just like to reiterate a few points. And again, as somebody who was an employer in the private sector for over 20 years, and, again, the notion that somehow existing labor law makes it impossible for employers to respond to their staff's family emergencies, to vacations is really just a myth.

The fact of the matter is that over the last 75 years under the Fair Labor Standards Act, which protects the 40-hour workweek, employers in tens of thousands of workplaces all across America have always made accommodations for their staffs with paid time. What is different about this bill is it's basically tying that flexibility to sacrificing your right under the Fair Labor Standards Act to time and a half for every hour earned over 40 hours. Given the fact that we're living in a time right now where the median income of this country has basically been as flat as a pancake for the last 30 years, that is basically tipping the scales once again against working families in an unacceptable fashion.

If you read this bill closely, you have to execute a written agreement every time you want to set up a comp time arrangement. Can you imagine small employers out there, basically, and their workers have to sit down and write like a mini labor agreement every time they want to come up with one of these arrangements? It doesn't allow for emergencies when you have a system like that.

The enforcement mechanism, which would be through the State Department of Labor's Wage and Hour Division—if anybody has ever dealt with them before, they know that is mission impossible. There is no way that that unit—which, again, today benefits from a bright line system where you just check the payroll hours. If you hit 40 hours, you've got to pay the time and a half. Nobody has the time to go through and examine that agreement to see if it was free and voluntary and whether or not the exercise of comp time was done in accordance with it. You're basically creating a labor relations board in every State, in every workplace across America.

Careful what you wish for as employers if you read this bill closer.

But the fact of the matter is that at the end of the day, it does not empower employees or workers in terms of giving them the ability to basically support their family and have time to deal with the important family issues, whether it's the birth of a child, making sure you're there on important school dates, or making sure that they're there when they're ill or in need of family and parental assistance.

The fact of the matter is paid sick time is the way that you do that. That's the way you empower people.

And that is what exists in the public sector. That's why comp time works in the public sector. Paid sick time is something that is part of every collective bargaining agreement in all 50 States in the public sector.

Small employers, is that what the majority really wants to impose on every private employer in this country?

The fact of the matter is that we need to scrap this bill which is before us for the fifth time since 1996 and go back and have a real dialogue in a real bipartisan collaboration in terms of coming up with real solutions for working families.

I actually am an optimist and believe we can do that. I respect the chairman. I respect my chairman of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections. But the fact is we can do far better than this recycled, reshaped bill which, again, has been rejected by over 160 organizations which represent working families and women.

Again, let's vote this bill down, go back, and as a real body, deliberative body, come up with a better solution for working families.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of our time.

I agree with some of the comments made by my colleague. The gentleman from Connecticut has talked about the years that we, Congress, have tried to extend the use of comp time to the private sector employees so they can access the same benefits that those in the public sector have enjoyed for almost 30 years. Yet powerful special interests have stood in the way through a constant campaign of misinformation.

We've heard a lot of those same, tired talking points from the other side today. We've seen some political stunts. We've heard divisive language, and we've heard just plain misinformation, things that this bill does not say.

We've heard, for example, that an employer could coerce an employee into taking comp time instead of overtime wages. That is simply not true. The bill specifically prohibits employers from doing that. An employer "shall not directly or indirectly intimidate, threaten, or coerce or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce any employee for the purpose of interfering with such employee's rights under this subsection to request or not request compensatory time off."

There are extensive protections in this bill for employees and for employers. But we've seen the straw men, we've seen the accusations, and we've heard some things that, frankly, are just absolutely preposterous.

Let's go over some of the basics.

The Working Families Flexibility Act allows for the voluntary—the voluntary—use of comp time. Any worker who wants to receive cash wages is free to do so and can do so at any time, even if the worker has made an agreement, and not every time, and not some extensive legal document. It can

be as simple as checking a block or just signing a piece of paper that says I would like to take comp time in lieu of cash overtime. And they can do it once a year.

Even after they've signed such an agreement, if the employee says, "Do you know what? I really do need that cash. I wanted the time; now I need the cash. Another emergency has arisen," the employee can demand the cash and get it and must get it.

The Working Families Flexibility Act puts workers in control of their time. They get to take the time off when they want to. These are exactly the same standards that have been working almost 30 years in the public sector. They simply can't unduly disrupt the business. That's worked for almost 30 years in the public sector, and it will work in the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, despite all the rhetoric, despite all the accusations and despite all the misinformation, we know that millions of mothers for Mother's Day would like to have time. Time is more important to them than money. This legislation would give them the option, the choice—the voluntary choice—to take that time.

We heard an example of a young, 5-year-old child coming forward with a flower. A lot of moms would like to take that time to spend with that 5-year-old. They can't do it under the current law. We want to give that mother and that father that time.

□ 1520

This is a commonsense proposal. It will help hardworking Americans balance the demands of work and family. We need to do that for them. This doesn't balance the budget, but it will help families.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1406, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GIBSON

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Redesignate section 5 as section 6 and insert after section 4 the following:

SEC. 5. G.A.O. REPORT.

Beginning 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act and each of the 3 years thereafter, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to Congress providing, with respect to the reporting period immediately prior to each such report—

(1) data concerning the extent to which employers provide compensatory time pursuant to section 7(s) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as added by this Act, and the extent to which employees opt to receive compensatory time;

(2) the number of complaints alleging a violation of such section filed by any employee with the Secretary of Labor;

(3) the number of enforcement actions commenced by the Secretary or commenced by the Secretary on behalf of any employee for alleged violations of such section;

(4) the disposition or status of such complaints and actions described in paragraphs (2) and (3); and

(5) an account of any unpaid wages, damages, penalties, injunctive relief, or other remedies obtained or sought by the Secretary in connection with such actions described in paragraph (3).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 198, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GIBSON. I thank the chairman. And I thank the gentlelady from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) for bringing the bill.

I have an amendment, but I first want to say that I support the underlying bill.

I take a look at the fact that almost 30 years ago, right here in these halls, in bipartisan work, Democrats and Republicans worked together here, led by the Democratically controlled Congress, and worked with the President—then President Reagan—to provide comp time for State and local workers. What we're doing today is taking that same concept and extending it out to the private sector.

I reflect on my constituents. I think about the busy lives that all our workers have, and I think about how challenging it is to bring balance to those lives. I think this is an important concept to bring forward, to think about those who are pursuing higher education, mothers and fathers that are looking to bring balance to the workplace, but also to raising their children, and how important that is for our families, for individuals, and for our country. So I think it's important that we extend this concept to the private sector.

Now, I have friends who have concerns, and we've heard some of the concerns here today. I have reflected very extensively on those. I will tell you that what I see in this bill—and the chairman actually, I think, summed it up very well just moments ago—is, first and foremost, that this is a choice for the worker on whether or not they want to join this program. I recognize that there are arguments that are concerning on that score. But also, if the worker decides to enter the comp time program and decides to take comp time and then something unexpected happens where they choose to change their mind, there are provisions in this bill where the individual can notify their employer, and within 30 days the business needs to pay the employee.

So as I reflect on the wording in this bill, I think there is a balance. But I also recognize that there are still concerns out there, and I want those voices to be heard. So this is the purpose of my amendment. I think we should hear from our government, hear from the GAO to talk about the implementation on how well it's going. This amendment says that after 2 years of implementation of this law, that the GAO would report out to us on how

well that's going, and also provide us data if there are abuses and what's being done about those abuses.

So I see this as yet another protection to ensure that as we look to extend this concept from the State and local governments, that we have protections in there to ensure that our workers are having justice.

So I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I just want to again recognize my colleague's hard work. He is a person that I respect and admire greatly.

Again, I do not oppose the amendment. It's hard to oppose a GAO study of almost anything because the more we know and the more we learn, it's always a good thing. However, what I would say, just in observation, in passing, is that if you look at the scope of the study, which is to basically look at actual adjudicated complaints before the Secretary of Labor, and looking again at the scope of the U.S. economy in the private sector, the fact of the matter is it is not going to be a very accurate picture really in terms of the operation of this bill—again, an attempt albeit, but nonetheless not something that I think is really going to give us a very accurate picture in terms of all of the day-to-day sort of conflicts. Blurring the lines of the Fair Labor Standards Act and creating an almost chaotic system of executing written agreements in every instance where a person wants to negotiate an overtime comp arrangement really, I think, is even beyond the scope and great powers of the Government Accountability Office—which does do great work.

Because, again, will this study tell us how many workers were fired or discriminated against for their choices? No. Because there is no right to reinstatement or rescheduling under this bill. Will this study tell us how many times a worker was denied the precise day he or she asked for? No. Because the bill provides no right to use comp time on that specific day.

I want to go back to that point. If you go to page 8 of the bill, use of comp time is, again, under the veto power of the employer. The notion that somehow employees have unilateral choice or power over using that comp time is not the way this bill is written.

As far as the public sector is concerned, again, in all of those instances you have an elaborate grievance system which exists at State government levels, city government levels, which doesn't exist in the private sector. And it certainly doesn't exist in the Department of Labor's Wage and Hours Division—which, again, Mrs. ROBY and I, in

all of our back and forth, fleshed out the fact that that ultimately is where complaints would go and reside.

So, again, a GAO study is fine, and I'm certainly going to join the gentleman in supporting his amendment, but this does not fix a flawed bill. Once we get past this amendment, I think all of the arguments that you've heard over the last hour or so in opposition to the bill still trump any benefit that Mr. GIBSON's good-faith amendment brings to the bill.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBSON. I just want to say that the gentleman from Connecticut is somebody whom I've very much enjoyed working with. I think he is a very thoughtful Member. I consider him a friend. I have listened very carefully to his comments and certainly will give him further consideration. I still believe that this amendment will be helpful.

At this point, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

Mrs. ROBY. I thank my friend, Representative GIBSON, for offering this amendment, which I strongly support.

Let me start by highlighting a provision of the Working Families Flexibility Act that is meant to ensure this policy works today and into the future. Section 5 of the bill states:

This act and the amendments made by this act shall expire 5 years after the date of enactment of this act.

The intent here is clear: Congress has an opportunity and a responsibility to review the use of comp time by private sector employers and employees, if need be, to make adjustments in the law before authorizing its continued use.

Even though comp time has worked well in the public sector for decades, Congress should examine its use in the private sector to make sure that workers are protected. To further support this oversight of the law the Gibson amendment would require GAO to regularly review private sector use of comp time and provide information to Congress relating to changes that might be needed. This commonsense addition to the bill will help inform Congress as it continues to oversee the use of comp time by private sector employees.

The Gibson amendment is about transparency and accountability, and will help ensure the use of comp time in the private sector is a net benefit to employers and employees.

Mr. Speaker, the Working Families Flexibility Act will help more Americans balance family and work. Because the Gibson amendment would strengthen this important effort, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider H.R. 1406, inaccurately named the Working Families Flexibility Act. Instead of helping hard-working

Americans earn an honest wage and more flexible work hours, this bill makes it harder on folks already struggling to make ends meet. The reality is that under this bill, workers will lose personal control over their schedule and their pay. In addition, the system this bill imposes is ripe for potential workplace manipulation and abuse.

Under this bill, workers will not get paid more than 40 hours per week, no matter how much overtime they put in. Overtime earnings would become an interest-free loan out of workers' pockets. Workers' overtime pay will be held until the end of each fiscal year or allocated as time-off, all at the discretion of the employer. There is no guarantee in this bill that workers could even get the time off that they might need for a family emergency or doctor's appointment when they need it. Workers could even jeopardize their job security by refusing to go along with this new system.

Mr. Speaker, in Michigan, we believe that hard work merits fair pay. We believe that anyone who works hard and plays by the rules should get a shot at the American Dream. Last year, the average Michigan household income was \$43,970. Adjusted for inflation, this is the same as the average household in 1989. This bill makes it harder for people who are already working hard and playing by the rules to make life better for their family by not allowing them to decide what's best for them and their family. If they work more, they should get paid more.

When I talk to folks in my district, I ask about the concerns they are raising around the dinner table. Michigan families worry about how to stretch work schedules and each dollar earned to meet the needs of their family. There is no part of that discussion where Michiganders want Washington to force them to sacrifice their personal decision-making about whether overtime pay or comp time is the right choice for them.

Too many families in my district and across our country are still trying to recover from the worst economic crisis in generations. Why then, instead of working towards common-sense ways we can ease the financial burden on working families, is Washington forcing a personal decision to forfeit their overtime pay? Why is Washington dredging up deeply flawed proposals that have already been rejected time and time again?

Now more than ever, we need ways to support our middle class so families in Michigan and across the nation can thrive. We can develop solutions that make raising a family easier for everyone. We have a lot of work ahead to rebuild our economy and strengthen our middle class, but this bill does neither.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1406, the so-called "Working Families Flexibility Act."

This bill, which might more accurately be titled the "More Work, Less Pay Act," would undermine the right to overtime pay and further weaken worker protections. Instead of actual money, employers would be authorized to provide compensatory time off at a rate of 1.5 hours per hour of overtime worked.

While this might sound like a good deal in theory, it's a raw deal in practice. First, it could end up denying countless workers the opportunity to earn extra money they may desperately need to pay their mortgage, cover medical bills, or provide a good education for their children. Just as unfairly, there is no

guarantee that a worker will be able to take off the comp time they accrue. This bill would allow employers to claim that a request for time off—time that the employee has worked extra hours to earn—is "unduly disruptive," and the request would be denied without any follow-up. We all know that you can't plan for medical emergencies and sometimes parent-teacher conferences don't fit easily into the workday. But unless your employer agrees to allow you to use the comp time you've earned, you're out of luck.

The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) implemented the 40-hour work week to allow workers time to be with their families; and to increase demand for workers when a firm has larger workloads. This bill would effectively put an end to the 40-hour work week without any guarantee of proper compensation for extra time worked, and would strip employees of the flexibility to meet workplace and family needs.

Instead of making life more difficult for hard-working American families, we should be considering legislation to establish a fair minimum wage, equal pay for women, or the Healthy Families Act, which makes earned paid sick days available to millions of workers.

American workers deserve better than this misleading and misguided bill, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1406, the Working Families Flexibility Act. It outrages me that my Republican colleagues continue to clothe despicable bills in inventive titles. In point of fact, H.R. 1406 offers no flexibility to working families. It does, however, grant employers the flexibility not to pay their employees overtime.

The Working Families Flexibility Act is nothing short of an assault on American working families. It will put an end to the 40-hour work week that my father fought so hard to enact in the Fair Labor Standards Act. The bill will force employees to work longer hours without guarantee of fair pay. It contains no provision to allow employees to contest employer decisions not to grant time off for personal or family emergencies. In short, the bill's sole purpose is to empower employers and disenfranchise the American middle class.

I urge my colleagues to recognize H.R. 1406 for the evil it is and call on them to stand up for working families by voting it down.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1406, the Working Families Flexibility Act. A more accurate name would be the Employer Flexibility Act, because the bill would give employers the flexibility to deny their workers overtime pay.

H.R. 1406 would overturn a key provision of the landmark 1938 Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) that ensures workers who work beyond the 40 hour standard work week are to be paid overtime—a rate that is set higher than the normal rate in order to keep the number of hours workers are asked to work reasonable. H.R. 1406 would undo this important provision so that an employer could, in lieu of making overtime payments to an hourly worker, make the promise of some future time off.

And this legislation goes one step further. The time off promised in lieu of overtime payment would be up to the discretion of the employer. The employer could deny requests for time off for up to a year before the legislation would require employers pay out the equivalent in wages. This is great for bosses, but it doesn't do much for working families.

Let's call this effort what it is: it is an anti-worker bill. Its effect would be to harm our nation's hourly workers: housekeepers, fast food workers, store clerks and other vulnerable members of our community. These individuals need their overtime wages the most.

This bill would also have a disproportionate impact on women, who have increasingly become the breadwinners in American families. A Center for American Progress study demonstrates that in more than two thirds of our families, women earn at least a quarter of the family income, and in many cases earn as much or more than their spouse. Among families with children in 2011, some 40 percent were headed by two working parents. Our federal policies must take this reality into account and meet our families half way by granting genuine flexibility while maintaining the important protections, like overtime pay, that help families thrive.

Unfortunately, this is not the first time that Republican Party leaders have sought to roll back worker protections. The past few years we have seen Republican Governors attempt to break up public sector unions and more recently, House Republicans repeatedly offered legislation to eviscerate the National Labor Relations Board.

If House Republicans wanted to help working families have more flexibility, they could start by undoing earlier efforts to make life harder for American workers and join Democrats in calling for a vote on the Paycheck Fairness Act so that women are paid the wages they deserve, or the Healthy Families Act so that families struggling with a child's illness or other crisis could get time off to deal with those challenges without jeopardizing their families' future. Another important improvement for working families Republicans have refused is to increase the minimum wage of \$2.13 per hour for tipped workers—a wage that has not been increased in nearly twenty years.

H.R. 1406 has no chance of becoming law. It will not be taken up in the Senate, and the White House has promised to veto it. Why are we wasting valuable time on it? I urge my colleagues to take action for U.S. workers now, and support family friendly policies that will help our workers, restore the economic vitality of our middle class, and strengthen the social and economic bonds that knit us together as a people.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1406, the so-called "Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013." After reviewing the text, I must confess I am confused about how the Majority came up with the name for this bill. The "Pay Working Families Less Act of 2013" certainly does not have the same ring to it—but it would be a fair title for legislation that undermines the rights that workers have struggled for generations to secure. By repealing overtime protections in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, this legislation offers flexibility for bosses eager to exploit their workforce and roll back pro-family reforms that 21st century families need. In their place, is the illusion of flexibility wherein an employee can take overtime compensation in time rather than pay—but only when the employer decides it is convenient.

However, just giving employers more flexibility is not what this bill is really about—H.R. 1406's ultimate goal is the systematic evisceration of overtime laws and all the benefits

they guarantee. No longer will employers have an incentive to boost employment by hiring enough workers to do the job. No longer will employers be forced to do something as basic as treat employees equally. No longer will employees be forced to pay every employee time-and-a-half for working more than 40 hours a week. Instead, they can shuffle overtime hours to employees who agree to take time rather than compensation.

Of course, this bill purports to protect against such manipulation. H.R. 1406's sponsor has said that the bill addresses these concerns because it bans employers from intimidating, coercing, and threatening workers. However, she also very clearly and very tellingly failed to include protections against discrimination. This lets employers force their employees to compete against one another for who will do the most work for the least amount of compensation.

If my friends across the aisle were serious about being friendly to families, they would find a way to help them without gutting important wage and hour protections that middle class families need to survive. If my friends across the aisle were serious about workers' familial responsibilities, they would support Representative DELAURO's Health Families Act. If they wanted to ensure that an illness did not bankrupt a family, they would help working families save by supporting the Fair Minimum Wage Act. If they cared about working mothers, they would support the Paycheck Fairness Act so that women aren't receiving 77 cents for every dollar a man earns.

Unfortunately, they simply are not serious—at least not about helping working class families find the stability and security that a flexible work environment offers.

I urge my colleagues to provide working families with legislation that provides real workplace flexibility and oppose this flawed and disingenuous bill.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the so called "Working Families Flexibility Act," which more accurately should be called the "Less Pay for Middle Class Families Act." I voted against similar legislation in 1997 and continue to strongly oppose this policy. In effect, this bill takes pay from the pockets of American families and loans it to their employers, with no condition that they pay it back for up to a year. If enacted, this policy would make life even more difficult for millions of middle class Americans. Even the bill's promise of flexibility is only true for the employer, which can determine on its own when the employee could use any accrued compensatory time. Enactment of this bill would translate into less money for American workers, more power for their employers, and breaks the time-honored tradition that extra work means extra pay.

This bill is an affront to middle class families across America. I oppose it.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my strong opposition to the egregiously misnamed Working Families Flexibility Act. It should be named the Working Families Inflexibility Act. This bill takes all of the control and choice out of the hands of workers and hands it right over to employers!

H.R. 1406 denies workers their earned overtime pay and deprives them of any promise of future compensation. It strips them of any guarantees of time off for personal or family emergencies. It would, however, guarantee them longer work hours and less control over their own schedules.

H.R. 1406 would also mean a pay cut for the millions of workers who need cash overtime to help pay their housing, food, and medical bills. Middle-income and low-income workers living paycheck to paycheck are already struggling to make ends meet and have come to rely on their overtime pay. After all, time off does not pay the bills.

The Fair Labor Standards Act and the 40-hour work week has been extremely successful for decades, why does the Majority want to change that other than to cater to employers and continue their war on the working American?

Mr. Speaker, under the guise of family-friendly public policy, the Working Families Flexibility Act is simply another assault on workers' rights. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by allowing employers to deny overtime pay, by substituting compensatory time off for overtime at the discretion of employers and by denying guaranteed time off for workers when they need it, the Republican attempt to give the nation's mothers a Mother's Day bill gets jeers instead of cheers. This same bill has died in committee or failed three times since 1996 and the President has pledged to veto it this time. We need new ideas for hard-pressed working mothers, not a redux that takes more than it gives. This was a message bill, not a serious attempt to help working mothers. The Senate won't touch it. So, happy Mother's Day. We can and will do better.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 198, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON).

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

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 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) at 5 p.m.

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT OF 2013—Continued

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1406) to

amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pending is the demand of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) for the yeas and nays on the question of adopting the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON). Those in support of the request for the yeas and nays will rise and be counted.

A sufficient number having risen, the yeas and nays are ordered. Members will record their votes by electronic device.

Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the amendment will be followed by 5-minute votes on a motion to recommit H.R. 1406, if ordered; passage of H.R. 1406, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 202; and adoption of House Resolution 202, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 384, nays 42, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

YEAS—384

Aderholt	Chaffetz	Fleischmann
Alexander	Chu	Fleming
Amash	Cicilline	Flores
Amodei	Clarke	Forbes
Bachmann	Clay	Fortenberry
Bachus	Cleaver	Foster
Barber	Clyburn	Fox
Barletta	Coble	Franks (AZ)
Barr	Coffman	Frelinghuysen
Barrow (GA)	Cohen	Fudge
Barton	Cole	Gabbard
Bass	Collins (GA)	Gallego
Beatty	Collins (NY)	Garcia
Becerra	Conaway	Gardner
Benishek	Connolly	Gerlach
Bentivolio	Cook	Gibbs
Bera (CA)	Cotton	Gibson
Bilirakis	Courtney	Gingrey (GA)
Bishop (GA)	Cramer	Goodlatte
Bishop (NY)	Crawford	Gosar
Bishop (UT)	Crenshaw	Gowdy
Black	Cuellar	Granger
Blackburn	Culberson	Graves (GA)
Blumenauer	Cummings	Graves (MO)
Bonamici	Daines	Grayson
Bonner	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Boustany	Davis, Danny	Green, Gene
Brady (TX)	Davis, Rodney	Griffin (AR)
Braley (IA)	DeFazio	Griffith (VA)
Bridenstine	DeGette	Grimm
Brooks (IN)	Delaney	Guthrie
Brown (FL)	DeLauro	Gutierrez
Brownley (CA)	DelBene	Hahn
Buchanan	Denham	Hall
Bucshon	Dent	Hanabusa
Burgess	DeSantis	Hanna
Bustos	DesJarlais	Harper
Butterfield	Diaz-Balart	Harris
Calvert	Doggett	Hartzler
Camp	Duckworth	Hastings (FL)
Campbell	Duffy	Hastings (WA)
Cantor	Duncan (TN)	Heck (NV)
Capito	Edwards	Heck (WA)
Capps	Ellison	Hensarling
Capuano	Ellmers	Herrera Beutler
Cárdenas	Engel	Higgins
Carney	Eshoo	Himes
Carson (IN)	Esty	Hinojosa
Carter	Farenthold	Holding
Cassidy	Farr	Holt
Castro (TX)	Fincher	Horsford
Chabot	Fitzpatrick	Hoyer

Hudson	Meehan	Sanchez, Loretta
Huelskamp	Meeks	Sarbanes
Huffman	Meng	Scalise
Huizenga (MI)	Messer	Schiff
Hultgren	Mica	Schneider
Hunter	Michaud	Schock
Hurt	Miller (FL)	Schrader
Israel	Miller (MI)	Schwartz
Issa	Miller, Gary	Schweikert
Jenkins	Miller, George	Scott (VA)
Johnson (GA)	Moran	Scott, Austin
Johnson (OH)	Mullin	Scott, David
Johnson, E. B.	Mulvaney	Sensenbrenner
Johnson, Sam	Murphy (FL)	Serrano
Jones	Murphy (PA)	Sessions
Joyce	Napolitano	Sewell (AL)
Keating	Neal	Shea-Porter
Kelly (IL)	Negrete McLeod	Sherman
Kelly (PA)	Neugebauer	Shimkus
Kennedy	Noem	Shuster
Kilmer	Nugent	Simpson
Kind	Nunes	Sinema
King (IA)	Nunnelee	Smith (NE)
King (NY)	O'Rourke	Smith (NJ)
Kingston	Olson	Smith (TX)
Kinzinger (IL)	Owens	Southerland
Kirkpatrick	Pallone	Speier
Kline	Pascrell	Stewart
Kuster	Pastor (AZ)	Stivers
Labrador	Paulsen	Stockman
LaMalfa	Payne	Swalwell (CA)
Lamborn	Pelosi	Terry
Lance	Perry	Thompson (CA)
Langevin	Peters (CA)	Thompson (MS)
Lankford	Peters (MI)	Thompson (PA)
Larsen (WA)	Peterson	Thornberry
Larson (CT)	Petri	Tiberi
Latham	Pingree (ME)	Tierney
Latta	Pittenger	Tipton
Lee (CA)	Pitts	Titus
Levin	Poe (TX)	Tonko
Lewis	Polis	Tsongas
Lipinski	Pompeo	Turner
LoBiondo	Posey	Upton
Loeback	Price (GA)	Valadao
Lofgren	Price (NC)	Van Hollen
Long	Quigley	Vargas
Lowe	Radel	Veasey
Lucas	Rangel	Vela
Luetkemeyer	Reed	Velázquez
Lujan Grisham	Reichert	Visclosky
(NM)	Renacci	Wagner
Lujan, Ben Ray	Ribble	Walberg
(NM)	Rice (SC)	Walden
Lummis	Richmond	Walorski
Lynch	Rigell	Walz
Maffei	Roby	Watt
Maloney,	Roe (TN)	Waxman
Carolyn	Rogers (AL)	Weber (TX)
Maloney, Sean	Rogers (KY)	Welch
Marchant	Rogers (MI)	Wenstrup
Marino	Rohrabacher	Rokita
Massie	Rokita	Westmoreland
Matheson	Rooney	Whitfield
Matsui	Ros-Lehtinen	Williams
McCarthy (CA)	Roskam	Wilson (FL)
McCaull	Ross	Wilson (SC)
McClintock	Rothfus	Wittman
McCollum	Roybal-Allard	Wolf
McDermott	Ruiz	Womack
McHenry	Runyan	Woodall
McIntyre	Ruppersberger	Yarmuth
McKeon	Rush	Yoder
McKinley	Ryan (OH)	Yoho
McMorris	Ryan (WI)	Young (AK)
Rodgers	Salmon	Young (FL)
McNerney	Sánchez, Linda	Young (IN)
Meadows	T.	

NAYS—42

Andrews	Fattah	Nolan
Brady (PA)	Frankel (FL)	Palazzo
Brooks (AL)	Garamendi	Perlmutter
Broun (GA)	Garrett	Pocan
Cartwright	Grijalva	Rahall
Castor (FL)	Honda	Schakowsky
Conyers	Jackson Lee	Sires
Cooper	Jeffries	Slaughter
Costa	Kaptur	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Kildee	Takano
Deutch	Lowenthal	Wasserman
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Schultz
Doyle	McGovern	Waters
Duncan (SC)	Moore	
Enyart	Nadler	

NOT VOTING—6

Gohmert	Markey	Royce
Jordan	Pearce	Webster (FL)

□ 1728

Messrs. CROWLEY, BRADY of Pennsylvania, DUNCAN of South Carolina, and SMITH of Washington changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. NEAL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Messrs. ELLISON, LEVIN, BARBER, ENGEL, LARSEN of Washington, and McDERMOTT, Ms. SINEMA, and Messrs. KEATING, LARSON of Connecticut, and WHITFIELD changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Shea-Porter moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 1406, to the Committee on Education and the Workforce with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 8, after line 9, insert the following:

“(8) GUARANTEED EMPLOYEE CHOICE FOR USE OF COMP TIME FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—An employee may not be denied use of earned compensation time for the specific date and time requested by the employee for the following family or medical purposes:

“(A) To attend a medical appointment, including a medical appointment for a family member.

“(B) To care for a sick child or other family member or because the employee is sick.

“(C) To attend counseling or rehabilitation appointments in relation to injuries sustained by the employee as a member of the Armed Forces.

“(9) EXCLUSION OF EMPLOYERS THAT VIOLATE EQUAL PAY PROTECTIONS FOR WOMEN.—An employer that has been found to have violated section 6(d) (as added by the Equal Pay Act of 1963) shall not be eligible to replace monetary overtime compensation with compensatory time under this subsection.”

Page 8, line 10, strike “(8)” and insert “(10)”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New Hampshire is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill and to offer the final amendment, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

The amendment I offer today would reject this bill's attack on workers and their families. The base bill brought to the floor today effectively ends the 40-hour workweek and offers comp time in lieu of overtime pay.

The Republican bill boils down to this: more work, less pay. This continues the House Republican no jobs agenda that undermines American workers, weakens worker checkbooks, and harms the middle class. This legislation does not guarantee that workers will be able to use the time they have earned when they need it the most. Instead, the comp time earned by workers would go into a pot that would be controlled by their employer. This is not more flexibility for workers; it's less pay for workers.

Under this bill, employers could schedule excessive overtime hours and only offer overtime work to workers who agree to take comp time instead of overtime wages. An employer can refuse to allow a worker to take time off to deal with a family member or to attend a parent-teacher conference. And under this bill, if employers choose not to allow the time off, workers will get paid at the end of the year, having kindly provided their boss with an interest-free loan. And let's hope the year's worth of accounting is accurate.

So this amendment presents the House with a choice: support hardworking Americans and their families, or side with interest groups and corporate lobbyists.

This final amendment says that workers may not be denied use of earned compensation time to attend a medical appointment, care for a sick child or a family member, or for veterans to attend counseling or rehabilitation appointments for injuries suffered in combat. Finally, if you are an employer that has violated the Equal Pay Act, my amendment ensures that you can't cut workers' overtime pay also. That's just common sense.

Today, as the gap between the very wealthy and middle class Americans is widening, a pay cut is the last thing that hardworking Americans who are struggling to provide for their families need. That's why President Obama has pledged to veto this legislation, and that's why more than 160 organizations oppose it, including women's organizations, labor organizations, and civil rights organizations.

Now, I'm passionate about workers' rights because that's where I come from. I worked on the floor of a manufacturing plant to pay for college. I took all the overtime I could work, second and third shifts, and I needed that money. I remember the tough conditions in that plant. Workers were afraid to question management. Anyone who thinks this won't happen to many workers who try to get comp time when they need it is fooling themselves.

Workers need the guarantees provided in this final amendment in order to make sure they're not trading overtime pay for comp time they might

never be able to use. Instead of asking employees to work more and get paid less, I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment and protect veterans, women, and working families.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. My friends on the other side of the aisle are again refusing to work with us to help American families. Instead, they are spending their time taking political shots and, in fact, politicizing Mother's Day in order to do it.

Despite having taken the underlying bill through the committee process before bringing it to the floor, my Democratic colleagues have made no real attempt to engage in meaningful conversations on this bill. In fact, while they originally offered a related provision as an amendment to floor consideration, it was quickly withdrawn. I guess they've decided they score more political points by waiting until now, when the process is about to conclude, than offering up meaningful suggestions during the months we've been debating this issue.

Americans are tired of this game. They're tired of watching us fight each other when we should be fighting for them. That is why it is time that we pass the Working Families Flexibility Act. Our bill gives private sector employees the same choice government workers have enjoyed for decades: the choice to receive comp time instead of wages for overtime.

Again, this is something that the public sector has engaged in for many, many years—decades, in fact. If it's good enough for the Federal Government, it ought to be good enough for the private sector.

I'm a mom. Riley and I have two beautiful children, Margaret and George. Margaret is 8 and George is 4. I understand the pulls on working families as we balance our workplace and our home time. This is about helping working moms and dads. This is about providing the ability to spend time at home that's so needed in today's hectic time. I know this firsthand. And this is important and will provide help for many working families. This could change lives.

It is time to do the right thing for working families. It is time we do the right thing for American families. Let's pass the Working Families Flexibility Act. I encourage my colleagues to defeat this motion to recommit, and 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 noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 200, noes 227, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

AYES—200

Andrews	Green, Gene	Nolan
Barber	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Barrow (GA)	Gutierrez	Owens
Bass	Hahn	Pallone
Beatty	Hanabusa	Pascrell
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Bera (CA)	Heck (WA)	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Pelosi
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Peters (CA)
Bonamici	Holt	Peters (MI)
Brady (PA)	Honda	Peterson
Braley (IA)	Horsford	Pingree (ME)
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Polis
Bustos	Israel	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Capps	Jeffries	Rahall
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Rangel
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Jones	Ruiz
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Keating	Rush
Castor (FL)	Keely (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda T.
Chu	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clarke	Kind	Schakowsky
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Cleaver	Kuster	Schneider
Clyburn	Langevin	Schrader
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Scott, David
Cooper	Levin	Serrano
Costa	Lewis	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lipinski	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Loeb sack	Sherman
Cuellar	Loftgren	Sinema
Cummings	Lowenthal	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lowe y	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham	Smith (WA)
DeGette	(NM)	Speier
DeLaney	Luján, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	(NM)	Takano
DelBene	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
Deutch	Maffei	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Maloney,	Tierney
Doggett	Carolyn	Titus
Doyle	Maloney, Sean	Tonko
Duckworth	Matheson	Tsongas
Edwards	Matsui	Van Hollen
Ellison	McCarthy (NY)	Vargas
Engel	McCollum	Veasey
Enyart	McDermott	Vela
Eshoo	McGovern	Velázquez
Farr	McIntyre	Visclosky
Fattah	McNerney	Walz
Foster	Meeks	Wasserman
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Schultz
Fudge	Michaud	Waters
Gabbard	Miller, George	Watt
Gallego	Moore	Waxman
Garamendi	Moran	Welch
Garcia	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Grayson	Nadler	Yarmuth
Green, Al	Napolitano	
	Neal	
	Negrete McLeod	

NOES—227

Aderholt	Black	Camp
Alexander	Blackburn	Campbell
Amash	Bonner	Cantor
Amodei	Boustany	Capito
Bachmann	Brady (TX)	Carter
Bachus	Bridenstine	Cassidy
Barletta	Brooks (AL)	Chabot
Barr	Brooks (IN)	Chaffetz
Barton	Broun (GA)	Coble
Benishek	Buchanan	Coffman
Bentivolio	Bucshon	Cole
Bilirakis	Burgess	Collins (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Calvert	Collins (NY)

Conaway	Jenkins	Renacci
Cook	Johnson (OH)	Ribble
Cotton	Johnson, Sam	Rice (SC)
Cramer	Jordan	Rigell
Crawford	Joyce	Roby
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Roe (TN)
Culberson	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)
Daines	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Davis, Rodney	Kingston	Rogers (MI)
Denham	Kinzinger (IL)	Rohrabacher
Dent	Kline	Rokita
DeSantis	Labrador	Rooney
DesJarlais	LaMalifa	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Roskam
Duffy	Lance	Ross
Duncan (SC)	Lankford	Rothfus
Duncan (TN)	Latham	Runyan
Ellmers	Latta	Ryan (WI)
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Salmon
Fincher	Long	Scalise
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Schock
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert
Fleming	Lummis	Scott, Austin
Flores	Marchant	Sensenbrenner
Forbes	Marino	Sessions
Fortenberry	Massie	Shimkus
Fox	McCarthy (CA)	Shuster
Franks (AZ)	McCaul	Simpson
Frelinghuysen	McClintock	Smith (NE)
Gardner	McHenry	Smith (NJ)
Garrett	McKeon	Smith (TX)
Gerlach	McKinley	Southerland
Gibbs	McMorris	Stewart
Gibson	Rodgers	Stivers
Gingrey (GA)	Meadows	Stockman
Gohmert	Meehan	Stutzman
Goodlatte	Messer	Terry
Gosar	Mica	Thompson (PA)
Gowdy	Miller (FL)	Thornberry
Granger	Miller (MI)	Tiberi
Graves (GA)	Miller, Gary	Tipton
Graves (MO)	Mullin	Turner
Griffin (AR)	Mulvaney	Upton
Griffith (VA)	Murphy (PA)	Valadao
Grimm	Neugebauer	Wagner
Guthrie	Noem	Walberg
Hall	Nugent	Walden
Hanna	Nunes	Walorski
Harper	Nunnelee	Weber (TX)
Harris	Olson	Wenstrup
Hartzler	Palazzo	Westmoreland
Hastings (WA)	Paulsen	Whitfield
Heck (NV)	Perry	Williams
Hensarling	Petri	Wilson (SC)
Herrera Beutler	Pittenger	Wittman
Holding	Pitts	Wolf
Hudson	Poe (TX)	Womack
Huelskamp	Pompeo	Woodall
Huizenga (MI)	Posey	Yoder
Hultgren	Price (GA)	Yoho
Hunter	Radel	Young (AK)
Hurt	Reed	Young (FL)
Issa	Reichert	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—5

Markey	Richmond	Webster (FL)
Pearce	Royce	

□ 1746

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 204, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 137]

AYES—223

Aderholt	Amodei	Barletta
Alexander	Bachmann	Barr
Amash	Bachus	Barton

Benishek	Graves (MO)	Peterson	Heck (WA)	Matsui	Sánchez, Linda	[Roll No. 138]	
Bentivolio	Griffin (AR)	Petri	Higgins	McCarthy (NY)	T.		
Bilirakis	Griffith (VA)	Pittenger	Himes	McCollum	Sanchez, Loretta	YEAS—227	
Bishop (UT)	Guthrie	Pitts	Hinojosa	McDermott	Sarbanes	Aderholt	Gosar
Black	Hall	Poe (TX)	Holt	McGovern	Schakowsky	Alexander	Gowdy
Blackburn	Harper	Pompeo	Honda	McIntyre	Schiff	Amash	Granger
Bonner	Harris	Posey	Horsford	McNeerney	Schneider	Amodei	Graves (GA)
Boustany	Hartzler	Price (GA)	Hoyer	Meehan	Schrader	Bachmann	Graves (MO)
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Radel	Huffman	Meeke	Schwartz	Bachus	Griffin (AR)
Bridenstine	Heck (NV)	Reed	Israel	Meng	Scott (VA)	Barletta	Griffith (VA)
Brooks (AL)	Hensarling	Reichert	Jackson Lee	Michaud	Scott, David	Barr	Grimm
Brooks (IN)	Herrera Beutler	Renacci	Jeffries	Miller, George	Serrano	Barton	Guthrie
Broun (GA)	Holding	Ribble	Johnson (GA)	Moore	Sewell (AL)	Benishek	Hall
Buchanan	Hudson	Rice (SC)	Johnson, E. B.	Moran	Shea-Porter	Bentivolio	Hanna
Bucshon	Huelskamp	Rigell	Joyce	Murphy (FL)	Sherman	Bilirakis	Harper
Burgess	Huizenga (MI)	Roby	Kaptur	Nadler	Sinema	Bishop (UT)	Harris
Calvert	Hultgren	Roe (TN)	Keating	Sires	Napolitano	Black	Hartzler
Camp	Hunter	Rogers (AL)	Kelly (IL)	Napolitano	Neal	Blackburn	Hastings (WA)
Campbell	Hurt	Rogers (KY)	Kennedy	Negrete McLeod	Smith (NJ)	Bonner	Heck (NV)
Cantor	Issa	Rogers (MI)	Kildee	Nolan	Smith (WA)	Boustany	Rigell
Capito	Jenkins	Rohrabacher	Kilmer	O'Rourke	Speier	Brady (TX)	Herrera Beutler
Carter	Johnson (OH)	Rokita	Kind	Owens	Swalwell (CA)	Bridenstine	Holding
Cassidy	Johnson, Sam	Rooney	Kirkpatrick	Pallone	Takano	Brooks (AL)	Hudson
Chabot	Jones	Ros-Lehtinen	Kuster	Pallone	Thompson (CA)	Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)
Chaffetz	Jordan	Roskam	Langevin	Pascrell	Thompson (MS)	Broun (GA)	Hultgren
Coble	Kelly (PA)	Ross	Larsen (WA)	Pastor (AZ)	Tierney	Buchanan	Hunter
Coffman	King (IA)	Rothfus	Larsen (CT)	Payne	Titus	Bucshon	Hurt
Cole	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)	Lee (CA)	Pelosi	Tonko	Burgess	Issa
Collins (GA)	Kingston	Salmon	Levin	Perlmutter	Tsongas	Calvert	Jenkins
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Scalise	Lewis	Peters (CA)	Van Hollen	Camp	Johnson (OH)
Conaway	Kline	Schock	Lipinski	Peters (MI)	Vargas	Campbell	Johnson, Sam
Cook	Labrador	Schweikert	LoBiondo	Pingree (ME)	Veasey	Cantor	Jones
Cotton	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin	Loeb	Pocan	Vela	Capito	Jordan
Cramer	Lamborn	Scott, Ryan	Lofgren	Polis	Velazquez	Carter	Joyce
Crawford	Lance	Sensenbrenner	Lowenthal	Price (NC)	Visclosky	Cassidy	Kelly (PA)
Crenshaw	Lankford	Sessions	Lowe	Quigley	Walz	Chabot	King (IA)
Cuellar	Latham	Shimkus	Lujan Grisham	Rahall	Wasserman	Chaffetz	King (NY)
Culberson	Latta	Shuster	(NM)	Rangel	Schultz	Coble	Kingston
Daines	Long	Simpson	Lujan, Ben Ray	Richmond	Waters	Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Smith (NE)	(NM)	Roybal-Allard	Watt	Cole	Kline
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)	Lynch	Ruiz	Waxman	Collins (GA)	Labrador
Dent	Lummis	Southerland	Maffei	Runyan	Welch	Collins (NY)	LaMalfa
DeSantis	Marchant	Stewart	Maloney,	Ruppersberger	Wilson (FL)	Conaway	Lamborn
DesJarlais	Marino	Stivers	Carolyn	Rush	Yarmuth	Cook	Lance
Diaz-Balart	Massie	Stockman	Maloney, Sean	Ryan (OH)	Young (AK)	Cotton	Lankford
Duffy	Matheson	Stutzman				Cramer	Latham
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy (CA)	Terry				Crawford	Latta
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Thompson (PA)				Crenshaw	LoBiondo
Ellmers	McClintock	Thornberry				Culberson	Long
Farenthold	McHenry	Tiberi				Daines	Lucas
Fincher	McKeon	Tipton				Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer
Fitzpatrick	McKinley	Turner				Denham	Lummis
Fleischmann	McMorris	Upton				Duffy	Marchant
Fleming	Rodgers	Valadao				Duncan (SC)	Marino
Flores	Meadows	Wagner				Duncan (TN)	Massie
Forbes	Messer	Walberg				Ellmers	McCarthy (CA)
Fortenberry	Mica	Walden				Farenthold	McCaul
Fox	Miller (FL)	Walorski				Fincher	McClintock
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Weber (TX)				Fitzpatrick	McHenry
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Gary	Wenstrup				Fleischmann	McKeon
Gardner	Mullin	Westmoreland				Fleming	McKinley
Garrett	Mulvaney	Whitfield				Flores	McMorris
Gerlach	Murphy (PA)	Williams				Forbes	Rodgers
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)				Fortenberry	Meadows
Gibson	Noem	Wittman				Franks (AZ)	McKinley
Gingrey (GA)	Nugent	Wolf				Frelinghuysen	McMorris
Gohmert	Nunes	Womack				Gardner	Rodgers
Goodlatte	Nunnelee	Woodall				Garrett	Fleischmann
Gosar	Olson	Yoder				Gerlach	Fleming
Gowdy	Palazzo	Yoho				Gibbs	Flores
Granger	Paulsen	Young (FL)				Gibson	Forbes
Graves (GA)	Perry	Young (IN)				Gingrey (GA)	Fortenberry
						Gohmert	Miller (FL)
						Goodlatte	Miller (MI)
							Miller, Gary
							Mullin
							Mulvaney
							Murphy (PA)
							Neugebauer
							Noem
							Nugent
							Nunes
							Nunnelee
							Olson

NOT VOTING—5

Pearce
Royce
Webster (FL)

□ 1753

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 137, I am not recorded because I was absent from the House of Representatives for personal reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 807, FULL FAITH AND CREDIT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 202) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 807) to require that the Government prioritize all obligations on the debt held by the public in the event that the debt limit is reached, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 199, not voting 6, as follows:

Andrews	Chu	Duckworth	Barber	Cicilline	Edwards	Barrow (GA)	Clarke	Ellison	Barber	Capuano	Courtney
Bass	Clay	Engel	Bass	Cleaver	Enyart	Beatty	Clyburn	Esty	Becerra	Cárdenas	Crowley
Becerra	Cohen	Farr	Bera (CA)	Connolly	Fattah	Bishop (GA)	Conyers	Foster	Barrow (GA)	Carney	Cuellar
Bishop (NY)	Cooper	Frankel (FL)	Blumenauer	Costa	Fudge	Bass	Courtney	Gabbard	Beatty	Carson (IN)	Cummings
Bonamici	Crowley	Gallo	Brady (PA)	Crowley	Garamendi	Beatty	Becerra	Gallego	Becerra	Cartwright	Davis (CA)
Brady (IA)	Cummings	Garcia	Braley (IA)	Davis (CA)	Grayson	Becerra	Bera (CA)	Green, Al	Bera (CA)	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny
Brown (FL)	Davis, Danny	Green, Gene	Brown (FL)	DeFazio	Grijalva	Bishop (NY)	Bishop (GA)	Grimm	Bishop (GA)	Castro (TX)	DeFazio
Brownley (CA)	DeFazio	Hahn	Bustos	DelBene	Hahn	Blumenauer	Bishop (NY)	Hahn	Bishop (NY)	Chu	DeGette
Butterfield	DelBene	Hastings (FL)	Capuano	DeLauro	Hastings (FL)	Bonamici	Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Brown (NY)	Cicilline	Delaney
Capps	DeLauro		Capuano	DelBene		Brady (PA)	Brady (PA)		Blumenauer	Clarke	DeLauro
Capuano	Delaney		Cárdenas	DeLauro		Braley (IA)	Braley (IA)		Brady (PA)	Cleaver	Deutch
Cárdenas	DeLauro		Barber	DeLauro		Brown (FL)	Brown (FL)		Brady (PA)	Clyburn	Dingell
Crowley	DeLauro		Barber	DeLauro		Brownley (CA)	Brownley (CA)		Brady (PA)	Cohen	Doggett
Cuellar	DeLauro		Barber	DeLauro		Bustos	Bustos		Brady (PA)	Connolly	Doyle
Cummings	DeLauro		Barber	DeLauro		Butterfield	Butterfield		Brady (PA)	Conyers	Duckworth
Davis (CA)	DeLauro		Barber	DeLauro		Capps	Capps		Brady (PA)	Cooper	Edwards
Davis, Danny	DeLauro		Barber	DeLauro					Brady (PA)	Costa	Ellison
DeFazio	DeLauro		Barber	DeLauro					Brady (PA)		
DeGette	DeLauro		Barber	DeLauro					Brady (PA)		
Delaney	DeLauro		Barber	DeLauro					Brady (PA)		
DeLauro	DeLauro		Barber	DeLauro					Brady (PA)		
DelBene	DeLauro		Barber	DeLauro					Brady (PA)		
Deutch	DeLauro		Barber	DeLauro					Brady (PA)		
Dingell	DeLauro		Barber	DeLauro					Brady (PA)		
Doggett	DeLauro		Barber	DeLauro					Brady (PA)		
Doyle	DeLauro		Barber	DeLauro					Brady (PA)		
Duckworth	DeLauro		Barber	DeLauro					Brady (PA)		
Edwards	DeLauro		Barber	DeLauro					Brady (PA)		
Ellison	DeLauro		Barber	DeLauro					Brady (PA)		

Engel	Lipinski	Rahall	Fincher	Lamborn	Rogers (KY)	McCarthy (NY)	Pingree (ME)	Sinema
Enyart	Loeb sack	Rangel	Fitzpatrick	Lance	Rogers (MI)	McCollum	Pocan	Sires
Eshoo	Lofgren	Richmond	Fleischmann	Lankford	Rohrabacher	McDermott	Polis	Slaughter
Esty	Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard	Fleming	Latham	Rokita	McGovern	Price (NC)	Smith (WA)
Farr	Lowe y	Ruiz	Flores	Latta	Rooney	McIntyre	Quigley	Speier
Fattah	Lujan Grisham	Ruppersberger	Forbes	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen	McNerney	Rahall	Swalwell (CA)
Foster	(NM)	Ruiz	Fortenberry	Lung	Roskam	Meeks	Rangel	Takano
Frankel (FL)	Lujan, Ben Ray	Ryan (OH)	Foxx	Lucas	Ross	Meng	Richmond	Thompson (CA)
Fudge	(NM)	Sánchez, Linda	Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer	Rothfus	Michaud	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (MS)
Gabbard	Lynch	T.	Frelinghuysen	Lummis	Runyan	Miller, George	Ruiz	Tierney
Gallego	Maffei	Sanchez, Loretta	Gardner	Marchant	Ryan (WI)	Moran	Ruppersberger	Titus
Garamendi	Maloney,	Sarbanes	Garrett	Marino	Salmon	Murphy (FL)	Rush	Tonko
Garcia	Carolyn	Schakowsky	Gerlach	Massie	Scalise	Nadler	Ryan (OH)	Tsongas
Grayson	Maloney, Sean	Schiff	Gibbs	McCarthy (CA)	Schock	Napolitano	Sánchez, Linda	Van Hollen
Green, Al	Matheson	Schneider	Gibson	McCaul	Schweikert	Neal	T.	Vargas
Green, Gene	Matsui	Schrader	Gingrey (GA)	McClintock	Scott, Austin	Negrete McLeod	Sanchez, Loretta	Veasey
Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Schwartz	Goodlatte	McHenry	Nolan	O'Rourke	Sarbanes	Vela
Gutierrez	McCollum	Scott (VA)	Gosar	McKeon	Sensenbrenner	Owens	Schakowsky	Velázquez
Hahn	McDermott	Scott, David	Gowdy	McKinley	Sessions	Pallone	Schiff	Visclosky
Hanabusa	McGovern	Serrano	Granger	McMorris	Shimkus	Pascrell	Schneider	Walz
Hastings (FL)	McIntyre	Sewell (AL)	Graves (GA)	Rodgers	Shuster	Pastor (AZ)	Schrader	Wasserman
Heck (WA)	McNerney	Shea-Porter	Graves (MO)	Meadows	Simpson	Payne	Schwartz	Vela
Higgins	Meeks	Sherman	Griffin (AR)	Meehan	Smith (NE)	Pelosi	Scott (VA)	Waters
Himes	Meng	Sinema	Griffith (VA)	Messer	Smith (NJ)	Perlmutter	Scott, David	Watt
Hinojosa	Michaud	Sires	Grimm	Mica	Smith (TX)	Peters (CA)	Serrano	Waxman
Holt	Miller, George	Slaughter	Guthrie	Miller (FL)	Southerland	Peters (MI)	Sewell (AL)	Welch
Honda	Moore	Smith (WA)	Hall	Miller (MI)	Stewart	Peterson	Shea-Porter	Wilson (FL)
Horsford	Moran	Swalwell (CA)	Hanna	Miller, Gary	Stivers		Sherman	Yarmuth
Hoyer	Murphy (FL)	Takano	Harper	Mullin	Stockman			
Huffman	Nadler	Thompson (CA)	Harris	Mulvaney	Stutzman			
Israel	Napolitano	Thompson (MS)	Hartzler	Murphy (PA)	Terry	Bachus	Moore	Webster (FL)
Jackson Lee	Neal	Tierney	Hastings (WA)	Neugebauer	Thompson (PA)	Gohmert	Pearce	
Jeffries	Negrete McLeod	Titus	Heck (NV)	Noem	Thornberry	Markey	Royce	
Johnson (GA)	Nolan	Tonko	Hensarling	Nugent	Tiberi			
Johnson, E. B.	O'Rourke	Tsongas	Herrera Beutler	Nunes	Tipton			
Kaptur	Owens	Van Hollen	Holding	Nunnelee	Turner			
Keating	Pallone	Vargas	Hudson	Olson	Upton			
Kelly (IL)	Pascrell	Veasey	Huelskamp	Palazzo	Valadao			
Kennedy	Pastor (AZ)	Vela	Huizenga (MI)	Paulsen	Wagner			
Kildee	Payne	Velázquez	Hultgren	Perry	Walberg			
Kilmer	Pelosi	Visclosky	Hunter	Petri	Walden			
Kind	Perlmutter	Walz	Hurt	Pittenger	Walorski			
Kirkpatrick	Peters (CA)	Wasserman	Issa	Pitts	Weber (TX)			
Kuster	Peters (MI)	Schultz	Jenkins	Poe (TX)	Wenstrup			
Langevin	Peterson	Waters	Johnson (OH)	Pompeo	Westmoreland			
Larsen (WA)	Pingree (ME)	Watt	Johnson, Sam	Posey	Whitfield			
Larson (CT)	Pocan	Waxman	Jones	Price (GA)	Williams			
Lee (CA)	Polis	Welch	Jordan	Radel	Wilson (SC)			
Levin	Price (NC)	Wilson (FL)	Joyce	Reed	Wittman			
Lewis	Quigley	Yarmuth	Kelly (PA)	Reichert	Wolf			
			King (IA)	Renacci	Womack			
			King (NY)	Ribble	Woodall			
			Kingston	Rice (SC)	Yoder			
			Kinzinger (IL)	Rigell	Yoho			
			Kline	Roby	Young (AK)			
			Labrador	Roe (TN)	Young (FL)			
			LaMalfa	Rogers (AL)	Young (IN)			

NOT VOTING—7

Bachus
Gohmert
Markey
Moore
Pearce
Royce

□ 1812

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding my recent absence from the House on Wednesday, May 8th. During this time, as Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I travelled back to Southern California to participate in the official visit of President Park Geun-hye of South Korea. Because of this absence, I missed several important votes on the House floor, and would like to submit how I would have voted had I been in attendance. The votes were:

Rollcall No. 135, on Agreeing to the Amendment to H.R. 1406, the Gibson of New York Amendment No. 1. I would have voted "aye."
Rollcall No. 136, on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 1406 with instructions, I would have voted "no."
Rollcall No. 137, on Passage of H.R. 1406, the Working Families Flexibility Act, I would have voted "aye."
Rollcall No. 138, on Ordering the Previous Question for H. Res. 202, To Provide for Consideration of H.R. 807, the Full Faith and Credit Act I would have voted "aye."
Rollcall No. 139, on H. Res. 202, Providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 807, the Full Faith and Credit Act I would have voted "aye."

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?
There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1286

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1286.

NOT VOTING—6

Huelskamp
Markey
Pearce
Royce
Speier
Webster (FL)

□ 1800

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 resolution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. 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 226, nays 199, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 139]

YEAS—226

Aderholt	Brooks (IN)	Conaway
Alexander	Broun (GA)	Cook
Amash	Buchanan	Cotton
Amodi	Bucshon	Cramer
Bachmann	Burgess	Crawford
Barletta	Calvert	Crenshaw
Barr	Camp	Culberson
Barton	Campbell	Daines
Benishek	Cantor	Davis, Rodney
Bentivolio	Capito	Denham
Bilirakis	Carter	Dent
Bishop (UT)	Cassidy	DeSantis
Black	Chabot	DesJarlais
Blackburn	Chaffetz	Diaz-Balart
Bonner	Coble	Duffy
Boustany	Coffman	Duncan (SC)
Brady (TX)	Cole	Duncan (TN)
Bridenstine	Collins (GA)	Ellmers
Brooks (AL)	Collins (NY)	Farenthold

NAYS—199

Andrews	Davis (CA)	Honda
Barber	Davis, Danny	Horsford
Barrow (GA)	DeFazio	Hoyer
Bass	DeGette	Huffman
Beatty	Delaney	Israel
Becerra	DeLauro	Jackson Lee
Bera (CA)	DelBene	Jeffries
Bishop (GA)	Deutch	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Dingell	Johnson, E. B.
Blumenauer	Doggett	Kaptur
Bonamici	Doyle	Keating
Brady (PA)	Duckworth	Kelly (IL)
Bralley (IA)	Edwards	Kennedy
Brown (FL)	Ellison	Kildee
Brownley (CA)	Engel	Kilmer
Bustos	Enyart	Kind
Butterfield	Eshoo	Kirkpatrick
Capps	Esty	Kuster
Capuano	Farr	Langevin
Cárdenas	Fattah	Larsen (WA)
Carney	Foster	Larson (CT)
Carson (IN)	Frankel (FL)	Lee (CA)
Cartwright	Fudge	Levin
Castor (FL)	Gabbard	Lewis
Castro (TX)	Gallego	Lipinski
Chu	Garamendi	Loeb sack
Cicilline	Garcia	Lofgren
Clarke	Grayson	Lowenthal
Clay	Green, Al	Lowe y
Cleaver	Green, Gene	Lujan Grisham
Clyburn	Grijalva	(NM)
Cohen	Gutierrez	Luján, Ben Ray
Connolly	Hahn	(NM)
Conyers	Hanabusa	Lynch
Cooper	Hastings (FL)	Maffei
Costa	Heck (WA)	Maloney,
Courtney	Higgins	Carolyn
Crowley	Himes	Maloney, Sean
Cuellar	Hinojosa	Matheson
Cummings	Holt	Matsui

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

There was no objection.

HONORING JOSEPH FANDINO

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in memory of Mr. Joseph Gregory Fandino, a resident of south Florida and a hero who lost his life while serving our Nation in Vietnam in 1972.

Last Friday, on Foreign Affairs Day, Joseph was honored by the Department of State and the American Foreign Service Association, who commemorated their colleagues who died in the line of duty overseas.

Joseph was one of the first Hispanic-born service officers who, despite being told by classmates that he had the wrong kind of ethnic background, served the United States valiantly for many years.

Joseph also served in the Air Force during the Korean war and as a Foreign Service officer in Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, Spain and Canada where he worked with large numbers of refugees fleeing Cuba.

Joseph put himself in harm's way, choosing to sacrifice his safety in order to assist others and advance freedom and peace around the world.

His commitment to our American ideals, his courage and his good humor during difficult times will be forever remembered.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to salute our heroes.

FOSTER YOUTH MONTH

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Foster Care Month and on behalf of the foster youth across this country.

I'd like to commend Representatives KAREN BASS, TOM MARINO, JIM McDERMOTT, and MICHELE BACHMANN for their leadership of the bipartisan Foster Youth Caucus and for their work on this important issue.

Foster youth are some of the most at-risk children in our society. They are often the victims of abuse or neglect, and too many face trials and tribulations beyond their years.

So much of what we take for granted—a stable home, living with our siblings or returning to the same school year after year—are constant obstacles for these children.

However, the month of May and, in fact, every day should serve as a reminder of the opportunities that we all have to make a positive difference in their lives.

Growing up, my parents welcomed many foster children into our family

and provided them with a loving, stable and nurturing environment.

Mr. Speaker, these children belong to all of us, and we are all responsible for them.

HYDRAULIC FRACTURING

(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. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of serving as co-chairman of the Congressional Natural Gas Caucus, a bipartisan group working to identify challenges and further utilizing this clean, abundant energy resource.

One of these challenges has to do with the swarm of misinformation that surrounds the process of hydraulic fracturing, the extraction process which is stringently regulated at the State level.

On April 29, after a 16-month investigation, regulators in my home State of Pennsylvania found that hydraulic fracturing, contrary to highly publicized claims, is not to blame for high methane levels found in drinking water in the town of Franklin Forks. Instead, it was due to naturally occurring methane. The same incident was used by environmentalists as an example of the dangers of fracking and the subject of numerous media reports.

Mr. Speaker, science and facts—not rhetoric and scare tactics—must guide our energy policy. The fact of the matter is that there has been no confirmed reports of groundwater contamination from hydraulic fracturing. Even former EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson has testified to this fact.

□ 1820

HONORING AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM AT UC DAVIS

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the University of California, Davis. This historic land grant university excels in a wide range and variety of fields, including medicine, physics, law, and agriculture.

Today, the University of California, Davis, agriculture and forestry program was recognized as the best in the world by QS World University Rankings, a respected firm that measures publications and citations in scientific journals and the program's reputation among both academics and employers in the field. I offer my highest congratulations to the school's faculty, students, and staff.

For decades, the University of California, Davis, has developed cutting-edge farm practices, research, and local partnerships. Right now, they're studying genetics, nutrition, milk, wine grapes, and so much more. As epitomized

by the mechanical tomato harvester and other inventions developed there, this work directly boosts agricultural production and profits.

As we write the new farm bill, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting agricultural studies and research.

VICTOR FROM HUFFMAN, TEXAS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Victor from Huffman, Texas, writes me this:

I work. I pay my taxes. In order to earn that paycheck, I work on construction projects. Every morning we file into a job site like cattle. We are searched, scanned and tested. But the government hands out our money to those who don't work for free houses, cars, food, and the list just gets longer. I work 84 hours a week just to make ends meet. The more I work, the more I get taxed. We have families that we only see at night, if at all. We work outages, turnarounds, and shutdowns. If I don't pay my taxes, I go to jail. If I don't do my job, I'm fired. We work extra to have extra, not so we can pay for more government programs.

Mr. Speaker, workers are tired of their taxes going up just so the government can get more people dependent on government.

And that's just the way it is.

CONGRATULATING HIGH TECH HIGH

(Mr. PETERS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, today, along with my colleague, SUSAN DAVIS, I rise in recognition of the High Tech High robotics team, nicknamed the Holy Cows, who recently won a world championship robotics competition. High Tech High is located in the Point Loma neighborhood of San Diego in the 52nd District.

The team beat out more than 10,000 other students to win the prized Chairman's Award at the For Inspiration Recognition of Science and Technology event.

This group of talented young students has used their expertise to develop a smart phone app for robotics, and they even took time to help other San Diego robotics teams along the way.

I'm proud that High Tech High and local high-tech companies in San Diego, including Qualcomm, SAIC, and Nordson Asymtek, have supported these scholars as they won multiple regional championships on the road to their world title. The success of these students demonstrates what can be done in a school culture that celebrates STEM education. Investments in the field of science, technology, engineering, and math education must continue to be at the forefront of our national school priorities.

With that in mind, I congratulate the High Tech High team, and look forward to their future successes.

HONORING POLICE OFFICERS' SERVICE AND SACRIFICE

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, this week marks Police Week, an annual tribute to those serving in law enforcement, with May 15 set aside as Peace Officers Memorial Day, as designated in 1962 by President Kennedy.

We honor those who dedicate their lives to safeguarding their fellow citizens, with May 15 the day to remember the fallen with deepest gratitude and prayers. We cherish the memory of all heroes and public servants, and especially for Pennsylvanians, Montgomery County police officer Brad Fox who lost his life last September on the eve of his 35th birthday.

Prior to becoming a police officer, Brad Fox was a United States Marine staff sergeant who served his country for 10 years, including tours of duty in Iraq. We join those who hold these honorable individuals in the highest esteem as we, again, acknowledge the service and sacrifice of all law enforcement officers throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and this great Nation.

HONORING HIGH TECH HIGH

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, Mr. PETERS, and rise to congratulate the remarkable achievement of San Diego's very own High Tech High robotics team.

This past week, the team participated in the largest and more prestigious school robotics world championship, and then came home taking the event's biggest prize. On behalf of San Diegans, we couldn't be any more proud of these remarkable and talented students, who are destined to change our world with their ideas and innovations.

High Tech High represents all that is possible in K-12 education. Some of these students never envisioned themselves in a STEM field, and now they have internships at some of the top STEM companies in the country.

I was able to visit and see the robotics team in action, and it was clear to me that the spirit of teamwork and cooperation I witnessed will make them successful in STEM fields and beyond. These students represent the best and the brightest in our Nation, and we stand and congratulate their hard-earned win and know that there is more to come.

HONORING RAYMOND CLARK THOMPSON

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that on Sunday, Vietnam war veteran Raymond Clark Thompson's name is being added to the Vietnam War Memorial Wall where he will be remembered for his valiant service in the Army and extraordinary sacrifice for our country.

A native of Indiana and the oldest of six children, Ray served in the Vietnam War as a radio specialist.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to waive my time, and I will try again in a few minutes.

ACCESS TO EDUCATION AND TRAINING ACT

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a commonsense bill that I will be introducing to give more flexibility to students eligible for the Pell Grant program.

Last month, I had the privilege of spending a week on the road, touring and meeting with educators, students, business people, and others at the seven community colleges that serve my congressional district. On this tour I learned more about the ways local community colleges and businesses are coming together to address the skills gap, increase American manufacturing, and put people back to work.

However, the one disappointment I learned during this tour is that the Pell Grant program doesn't give students who want to go to school year-round enough flexibility. Due to senseless changes in 2011, Pell Grants are no longer available for use during the summer semester under too many circumstances.

The bill I am introducing, called the Access to Education and Training Act, would give more flexibility to the Pell Grant program to allow students to receive assistance year-round. This is important because many of the students I've met are interested in accelerated training courses that take place over the course of an entire year. Many of those who would benefit most are non-traditional students who want to complete their courses faster, simply so they can get back to the workforce. I want to make sure that community colleges are accessible and affordable for all Americans who want to get an education, learn a skill, and acquire the training they need to excel in today's economy.

Giving more flexibility to the Pell Grant program would help ensure success for hardworking students simply looking to get ahead.

□ 1830

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL NURSES WEEK

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Nurses Week and to support one of the most important nurses I know, my wife, Shannon.

Shannon is the mother to our three children and has been a nurse for 18 years. She now teaches our next generation of nurses in Springfield, Illinois, at St. John's College.

It's important for us to recognize the more than 3.1 million nurses across this great country. They are truly the backbone of our Nation's hospitals, clinics, and doctors' offices.

I know firsthand that nurses work every day to ensure that their patients are receiving the quality care they need and deserve. In fact, most of the time, they are the first and last contact patients and their families receive. This is not always an easy task, but one that has greatly contributed to making our health care system one of the greatest in the world.

This week we celebrate all of our nurses who work long, hard hours and go the extra mile to provide safe, high-quality care to their patients and pave the way for a more innovative and efficient health care system.

Thank you, Shannon, and thank you to all the nurses who care for our families each and every day.

RECOGNIZING THE 2013 WOODHAVEN SCHOLARSHIP RECIPIENTS

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor eight exceptional students from my hometown of Fort Worth, Texas, who are all Woodhaven Scholarship recipients.

Ambar Aguilera from Amon Carter-Riverside High School, Carolyn Estrada and Rasheda Bellat, Eastern Hills High School, Maria Barragan at Nolan Catholic High School, Ta'lor at Dunbar High School, Kimberlee Sims at Temple Christian School, David Detrick at Polytechnic High School, and Sierra Wilson at Northside High School.

Created in 1998 to support the educational needs of the East Fort Worth community, the Woodhaven Scholarship helps students who are looking to pursue their dream of higher education.

Woodhaven Scholarships are given to East Fort Worth high school seniors who plan to attend Texas colleges and universities. Scholarships are awarded to students attending 4-year institutions as well as those attending 2-year colleges. The funds can be used for college tuition, educational fees, equipment, supplies, as well as on-campus housing expenses.

The eight students chosen will spread their talents across different prestigious institutions in the great State

of Texas. I'm sure they will continue to succeed in their pursuit of higher education.

Mr. Speaker, again I would like to congratulate these students on their accomplishments and the honors presented to them.

THE END OF THE 40-HOUR WORKWEEK

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today was one of the saddest days this House of Representatives has probably ever seen. The 40-hour workweek, a great part of our heritage since 1938, destroyed. Don't get overtime, get comp time. Employer decides if you get comp time, when you get it, when he wants you to have it.

Assuming that everybody around here that's working is working 40 hours and wants to get some extra time is well-heelled and got time to take off and doesn't need that extra money, that time-and-a-half overtime, and they've got time to go out and play 18 holes of golf or something.

Most hardworking Americans need that overtime to take care of their families and to get through from day to day. But today this House voted to take away that opportunity for employees to have the 40-hour week and overtime thereafter. It was a shameless day.

We need to look out for our workers and preserve American rights, not give more to the 1 percent, more control and more money away from the 99 percent.

HONORING RAYMOND CLARK THOMPSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Without objection, the first 1-minute speech of the gentlewoman from Florida is vacated.

There was no objection.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that on Sunday, the Vietnam War veteran, Raymond Clark Thompson's name is being added to the Vietnam War Memorial wall, where he will be remembered for his valiant service in the Army and the extraordinary sacrifice for our country.

A native of Indiana and the oldest of six children, Ray served in the Vietnam War as a radio specialist. On June 6, 1969, rockets were fired into Raymond's base camp, causing shrapnel to explode into his body from head to toe as he showered.

Despite suffering severe wounds, Raymond, at age 21, persevered and went on to have a full life, later marrying his wife, Patricia, and fathering three children. And he later worked as a health technician in the VA Medical Center in West Palm Beach, my hometown, where he gave back to veterans like himself. Sadly, he fell ill in recent years to old war injuries and passed in October of 2010.

With Raymond's name joining all the other valiant men and women at the Vietnam War Memorial, we're reminded every day of the bravery of the men and women who serve in our military and who are willing to sacrifice their lives for our own freedoms.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am here and rise today on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus for a Special Order hour on a topic. However, before we start that Special Order hour, I would like to yield to the lady from the Ninth District of Arizona (Ms. SINEMA).

THE STEADY ACT

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud college instructor of over a decade and perhaps, most importantly, a proud Sun Devil from Arizona State University in Tempe, Arizona, the largest and, yes, the brightest public university in our country.

May 9 is Graduation Day for many of my students, and while I cannot be with them on their special day, I introduce a bill today in their honor, in honor of their hard work and their future contributions to our community and our economy.

Today, I have introduced the Stability to Ensure the American Dream for Youth Act, the STEADY Act. The STEADY Act extends the 3.4 percent for Stafford student loans until June 30 of 2017.

As we all know, if Congress fails to act by June 30 of this year, the interest rate on student loans will double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. This will have an enormous impact on the cash flow and economic participation of students entering the workforce, starting a family, planning for the future.

In college communities like the one I have the pleasure of representing, the economics of higher education are directly linked to every part of our daily economic activity. Consumer spending, home ownership, and employment opportunity are inexorably tied to the cost of education.

My bill ensures that those who are in college or planning for college can continue to do so without worry of cutting their paychecks by an additional \$1,000 of interest a year paid to the Federal Government.

The STEADY Act ensures that they can plan for their future, plan for their family's future, and continue to contribute to our local economy. It allows added stability to get the education they need and find the job they want.

Our communities sent us to Congress to fight for them and get things done. Today I'm thinking of my students who need a voice in this Congress. It's my hope that we will get this done for them.

I think about Ariel Carlos, my student in ASU's School of Social Work. Ariel hopes to give back to our community as a social worker for seniors. He wants to help seniors who have worked and contributed their entire lives, help them continue to do so with health and support.

Ariel and his wife, May, have kids, and they support each other by working hard. Ariel has had to work for a paycheck. He worked hard through his entire college career, taking out student loans along the way so that he and May could care for their family while he studied. At the end of his college career, Ariel found himself with a student loan debt of \$45,000.

I would be remiss if I didn't mention that a new social worker in Arizona is likely to start his career making about \$30,000 a year or less. For Ariel and his family, an added expense of \$1,000 a year means less money for child care, less money for school books, less money for groceries.

□ 1840

\$1,000 a year from his family's budget—to pay to the Federal Government—means less spending in our local economy and less savings for the future.

The New York Federal Reserve recently noted that student loan debt is slowing our economy. Those with large student debt participate less in their local economies, delaying home ownership and family planning while foregoing long-term job opportunities. Students who should be planning their lives are instead nervous about their future and concerned about debt impeding their ability to get ahead.

We have the opportunity to set things right for Ariel and May, to maintain a steady road for our economic future, and to make certain that the hard work that goes into our community stays in our community and pays off in our community.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in support of the STEADY Act of 2013.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you. And thank you for introducing that important bill to help students and families across the country.

Today during the Special Order hour for the Progressive Caucus, we are here to specifically talk about the issue of income inequality in America and the growing gap between the wealthiest and the average person.

Just today, Mr. Speaker, while we voted on legislation, we voted on a bill,

the ironically titled Working Families Flexibility Act, which, in reality, would mean more work and less pay for hardworking Americans in my State of Wisconsin and across the country.

As many of my colleagues have spoken on the floor this week, what this bill will do is to deny workers compensation for overtime—any hours that they would work over 40 hours a week. This is, in essence, an attack on workplace flexibility and an attack on the hard-earned wages Americans rely on.

But what makes this bill even more onerous, though, is a topic of importance to our caucus, the Progressive Caucus, and to workers across America: the growing income inequality in our country.

Mr. Speaker, it's hard to imagine why some of our colleagues are interested in reducing wages for Americans when multiple reports this week show that despite the fact that stock markets and corporate profits are close to all-time highs, wages in this country are stagnant at best.

In fact, according to the St. Louis Fed, wages as a percentage of the economy have hit an all-time low. What does that mean in real dollars? Well, adjusted for inflation, an average worker who was paid \$49,650 at the end of 2009 makes \$545 less now, even before taxes and deductions. Meanwhile, because companies have slowed down hiring to control costs, many are operating with fewer employees, meaning there's more work for those with a job, even though their wages aren't moving upward. To summarize, Americans are working harder while getting paid less, even before the bill the Republicans put on the floor this week.

Mr. Speaker, given that our economy is still recovering from the recent recession, and close to 12 million Americans are still looking for work, it would make sense if all areas of the economy were facing tough times. But that's not the case. In fact, the stock markets and corporate profits are breaking records. Standard & Poor's 500 corporations hit a record in the first quarter of the year; and last week, including today, the blue-chip Dow Jones Industrial Average crossed 15,000 for the first time in quite a while.

The wealthiest Americans only are getting richer. According to tax expert David Cay Johnston, in the first 2 years of our recovery, from 2009 to 2011, close to 150 percent of the increased income in this country went to the top 10 percent of earners. Why? Because incomes fell for the bottom 90 percent of Americans.

If you dive deeper into those numbers, the increasing inequity becomes even more staggering. Just in the past 2 years, the top 1 percent saw 81 percent of all this country's increased income. Almost 40 percent of the increased income since 2009 went to the top 1 percent of the top 1 percent, or those making at least \$8 million a year. What does that mean? Our country, our Nation, has 158.4 million

households, and only about 16,000 of those households have accounted for 40 cents of every dollar of increased income in this country in the last the 2 years.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this trend of a growing income inequality can be traced back to more than just the 2 years following the recession. You can go all the way back to 1966 to find the last time the average adjusted gross income was lower in this country than it was in 2011. In between this time, 45 years, the bottom 90 percent Americans saw their income increase by an average of \$59.

What about the top 10 percent? Well, from 1966 to 2011, their income increased by an average of approximately \$116,000. And what about the top 1 percent? Their income increased by an average of \$629,000. And the top 1 percent of the top 1 percent, the wealthiest in this country, have seen their income rise \$18.4 million on average in the last 45 years.

Let me say that again. In the past 45 years, since 1966, the vast majority of Americans, 90 percent, have seen their average incomes increase by an average of \$59, and the top 1 percent of the top 1 percent have seen their incomes increase by an average of \$18.4 million.

It's almost impossible to comprehend, but Mr. Johnston found a way. If you represented these increases in a line chart, and 1 inch is equivalent to \$59, the top 10 percent's would go to over 163 feet. The top 1 percent's line would go to 884 feet, and the top 1 percent of the top 1 percent would go for 5 miles. One inch of increase, 5 miles of increase for the top 1 percent of the top 1 percent.

So while the majority of us have gained only an inch over the last 40 years, the uberwealthy have gained not just inches but miles. Put another way, for every extra dollar of annual income earned by the top 90 percent of Americans, an extra 311,000 went to the households in the top 1 percent of 1 percent.

This growing income disparity, what does it mean? Well, it's bad for the economy. It's bad for our deficit, and it's bad for the most vulnerable in our society, and, of course, that's bad for the American Dream.

As Mark Zandi, chief economist for Moody's Analytics recently said, for the economy to thrive, we need everyone participating: When a majority of Americans are left behind in the recovery, our economy will never truly thrive. In fact, there have been a number of studies that have said that the way to get the economy going is to make sure those who have the least have the money because they'll spend it. They'll put it immediately into the economy. When the wealthiest have the extra income, it often goes into savings. But for the average person, that 90 percent, when they get the money, it goes right back into the economy and stimulates the economy. But when the average 90 percent of

Americans only see a \$59 wage increase in 45 years, that just doesn't put money back into the economy.

Consumer spending, which constitutes 70 percent of our economy, is strained when wages decrease. This is particularly acute when low- and moderate-income workers spend nearly all of their paychecks as those studies have shown us. And when there's a lack of demand, there will be a lack of economic growth, which means a lack of jobs, which means a lack of opportunities for Americans.

When we have vast income inequality, reducing our debt and our deficits becomes nearly impossible. When people are making less, we collect less in revenue. And at that point, the only way to balance our budget would be to drastically reduce funding for programs that primarily serve those with, guess what, decreasing incomes. It is a lose-lose proposition, and we shouldn't pursue it.

What else is this bad for? Well, it's bad for college affordability. It's bad for health care costs, and it's bad for programs that help the elderly, including programs like Social Security. Multiple studies have shown us that huge income inequality makes Americans more pessimistic and less likely to believe that they have little in common with anyone else unlike themselves.

The basic tenets of the American Dream are at risk when the income gap is so wide. When 90 percent of the country is so far behind the top tiers of the country, it's hard to make the case that if you work hard, you can get ahead. In fact, studies have demonstrated that the higher the income inequality gets in this country, the harder it is for people to move up and make a better life for themselves and their parents.

□ 1850

Let's just look at CEO pay, just to give you an idea how CEO pay has increased. In the last three decades, CEO pay has skyrocketed at a rate of 127 times faster than worker pay. In fact, from 1978 to 2011, CEO compensation increased more than 725 percent—faster than the stock market, and painfully faster than the 5.7 percent growth in worker compensation in the same period.

The ratio of CEO-to-worker pay has increased since 1950 by 1,000 percent, according to data from Bloomberg. And the AFL-CIO, the American Federation of Labor, has found that CEO pay has reached a high of 354 times that of the average employee. Just decades ago, that ratio was in the 20 to 30 times average for the lowest paid employee, and now 354 times. CEO pay has absolutely taken off, while everyone else's pay has been stagnant now for decades.

I've recently started reading a book, "Who Stole the American Dream?," by Hedrick Smith, a book that our whip, Mr. HOYER, has often referred to for our caucus to read. It details exactly

how the middle class has been under attack for the last 40 years largely due to a corporate takeover of our culture. I highly recommend this book to every American.

This is a book that says Americans are willing to accept inequality in our society, to a degree. They understand that if you work harder, you should be able to get ahead. But they want it within a percent that makes sense and that we've had in this country for so long.

This massive wealth gap in our country—where the top 1 percent captured 93 percent of the Nation's gains in 2010—undermines our social fabric and our ideal of equal opportunity. This has been caused by the way corporate interests have taken over our lives, our laws and our elections in the last several decades.

According to "Who Stole the American Dream?" up until the seventies, the middle class had thrived as increases in productivity were matched by increases in wages. When prosperity was shared, there was a stable relationship between business and government and labor. Everyone pitched in, and everyone benefited and gained.

Then, around the time President Nixon was in—when he put in place some very good business regulations—corporate interests decided to fight back. And we've seen over these decades how they fought back.

One, they started importing cheap foreign workers for a wide range of occupations.

They've moved jobs offshore, so many of our Nation's previously unionized blue collar jobs—even calling centers—have been sent overseas.

And they've changed our laws, from bankruptcy laws to Tax Code changes, so that just in Tax Code changes alone workers could supplement existing pension plans with individual retirement accounts. But the result is corporations got rid of the robust pension programs to help people when they retire. Now workers cover 50 percent of their retirement costs, compared to 11 percent in the 1950s.

Finally, there has been a race to the bottom. We compete now with Asian sweatshops, we import cheap foreign goods that undermine American small businesses, and there are major U.S. business operations that have moved overseas.

So the bottom line is we need to have a thriving middle class, not the inequality of a \$59 increase in the last 45 years for the bottom 90 percent of the population, and the top 1 percent have an increase of \$628,000. And the top 1 percent of the top 1 percent received an increase that's the equivalent of 5 miles to the 1 inch of increase that the bottom 90 percent have made.

So what do we need to do? I think the Center for American Progress has noted a strong middle class can help promote the development of human capital and a well-educated population. It can create a stable source of de-

mands for goods and services. One of the key findings of that book is that people, when they had that income matched by their productivity, it went back into buying more goods and kept the economy stable. When those changes took place, since the Nixon administration, that's what has helped to create the strong inequality.

It incubates the next generation of entrepreneurs and supports inclusive political and economic institutions to make sure we have solid economic growth.

So what do we need to do differently? One, we need to have tax rules that are fair for everyone. We need to make sure that everyone pays their fair share. We don't incentivize companies to ship jobs overseas. And we promote the creation of jobs here at home.

We look at things like capital gains like any other way we would tax, not differently for those with the most money, who make money off of money rather than off of their hard work. But we need to make sure there is equal tax treatment for everyone under the laws. And those companies that want to outsource their headquarters overseas to avoid paying taxes aren't allowed to do that. It's an important part of changing our Tax Code to get the equality back that we need to.

Next, we need to invest in American workers. That means investing in education, investing in research and development, and investing in job training. Especially at a time that we have 12 million Americans out of work, we need to get people the skills so they can get back to work and work at jobs back here in America.

We need to establish a livable—not a minimum, but a livable—wage so that people who are in that 90 percent, who are making so little gains right now, can put that money back into the economy and stimulate the economy from the bottom up, from the grassroots. That's what we need to do.

Bottom line, we need to have trade policies that reward jobs in America and not reward jobs overseas. We've lost way too many jobs through many of our trade agreements overseas.

And fundamentally, we need to change the way we finance our elections in Wisconsin and across the country. I can tell you from my practical viewpoint of spending 14 years in the Wisconsin Legislature and my time here, there is no question that we have seen a lurching of corporate influence and big-dollar influence in our elections that have influenced the bottom-line policies that have created this sort of inequality.

So to summarize, we need prosperity over austerity in this country. And those are some of the things that we need to move toward.

I could talk more about income inequality, but I just want to address for a minute if I can another part of this inequality, which is going specifically to the sequester.

The sequester we have talked about now for a number of weeks, the ill ef-

fects on the economy of the sequester. We know 700,000 jobs between now and September 30 are at risk, including almost 36,000 jobs in the State of Wisconsin. The verdict on the sequester is clear and predictable, as we said. These mindless, reckless cuts are slowing our economic growth and taking away valuable resources to get the economy up and going.

Congress continues to defy logic in this area. We're dealing with the sequester piece by piece. During the continuing resolution, we fixed meat inspectors. A few weeks ago, we fixed people who wait in line at airports. But what we haven't done is addressed those who aren't as well connected in this country and the problems that they're seeing on a daily basis with the sequester. That means for Wisconsin seniors, they're receiving fewer Meals on Wheels that help seniors—for many of which 50 percent of their daily nutrition comes from the Meals on Wheels program, those who receive that program.

Close to 1,000 Wisconsin children and families will lose access to Head Start services. Just last week, I was in Beloit, Wisconsin, which is in a county, Rock County, that Representative PAUL RYAN and I share. While we were down visiting that Head Start program, they told us that they were going to have to have fewer students in the program next year. And they already have a waiting list for low-income families to participate in these programs to give them a fair start in education.

In the Bayview neighborhood of Madison, Wisconsin—one of my very first county board district and local governments—this neighborhood center, one of their very first programs was the Head Start program. That program will be closing because of the sequester and what we've done to that.

Cancer patients and HIV patients are being turned away from cancer clinics and other clinics because of cuts to Medicare payments caused by the sequester. And nearly 125,000 low-income Americans will not receive rental assistance. In Dane County, that means people are going to lose that critical assistance right back in my district.

Finally, over the Easter break I visited with people at UW-Madison, one of the world's premier research institutions. They're going to see a \$35 million cut in funding—\$17 million just in research alone—from NIH cuts.

So that FAA solution that we did a few weeks ago was anything but a solution—it was barely a bandaid. In fact, that bandaid will only get us through September 30, and we're going to be back to long lines in airports and not having meat inspectors for companies that need to have meat inspectors to have people go to work every day.

The bottom line is we need to fix the sequester now holistically, and we need to deal with that in this House.

This piecemeal approach is irresponsible, it's inadequate, and it's offensive

to the people of Wisconsin and the country who are caught in the political cross-fires of Washington, D.C. And it does nothing to help our economy or create jobs—in fact, just the opposite; it will be shrinking the economy between now and September 30.

□ 1900

The people of this country deserve a comprehensive national budget. I don't know why we can't get the Republicans to appoint conferees so we can have that budget. But until they do, we're going to continue to have the squabbles that you find all too often in Congress that don't address the sequester and don't give this country a roadmap for our finance's budget. Once again, we are likely not to have a national budget.

I would urge my Republican colleagues to appoint the budget conferees immediately so that we can not only pass a budget, but we can replace the sequester cuts for everyone, not just those who are the most well connected.

I would like to talk just briefly in closing about the income gap that we have. There's another way of talking about this chart. When you talked about the bottom 1 percent being an inch to the 5 miles represented by the top 1 percent of the top 1 percent, let me share another statistic that was shared with me.

If you talk about that 1 inch being a football field, the top 1 percent of the top 1 percent is equivalent to 86 football fields. So 1 inch of a football field to 86 football fields. That's the gap in wages that we have with this inequality.

With that, Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Caucus was glad to be able to talk tonight about income inequality.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ROYCE (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of his par-

ticipation in the official visit of President Park Geun-hye of South Korea to Los Angeles County.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1071. An act to specify the size of the precious-metal blanks that will be used in the production of the National Baseball Hall of Fame commemorative coins.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 9, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first quarter of 2013 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Paul Terry	1/10	1/15	Germany		1,363.59						1,363.59
	1/15	1/17	Sweden		845.24						845.24
	1/17	1/19	United Kingdom		1,013.14						1,013.14
	1/19		United States		8.60						8.60
Commercial Airfare							5,298.78				5,298.78
Miscellaneous Transportation Costs							154.14				154.14
Hon. Jack Kingston	1/25	1/26	Israel		498.00		(³)				498.00
	1/26	1/27	Bangladesh		294.94		(³)				294.94
	1/27	2/2	India		1,982.19		(³)				1,982.19
	2/2	2/3	Portugal		278.00		(³)				278.00
Miscellaneous Embassy Costs								4,322.12			4,322.12
Hon. Adam B. Schiff	1/25	1/26	Israel		498.00		(³)				498.00
	1/26	1/27	Bangladesh		294.94		(³)				294.94
	1/27	2/2	India		1,954.48		(³)				1,954.48
	2/2	2/3	Portugal		264.00		(³)				264.00
Miscellaneous Embassy Costs								4,322.12			4,322.12
John Bartrum	1/25	1/26	Israel		498.00		(³)				498.00
	1/26	1/27	Bangladesh		294.94		(³)				294.94
	1/27	2/2	India		1,954.48		(³)				1,954.48
	2/2	2/3	Portugal		264.00		(³)				264.00
Miscellaneous Delegation Costs								4,322.12			4,322.12
Tom O'Brien	1/25	1/26	Israel		498.00		(³)				498.00
	1/26	1/27	Bangladesh		294.00		(³)				294.00
	1/27	2/2	India		1,954.48		(³)				1,954.48
	2/2	2/3	Portugal		264.00		(³)				264.00
Miscellaneous Delegation Costs								4,322.12			4,322.12
Betsy Bina	1/25	1/26	Israel		498.00		(³)				498.00
	1/26	1/27	Bangladesh		294.94		(³)				294.94
	1/27	2/2	India		1,954.48		(³)				1,954.48
	2/2	2/3	Portugal		264.00		(³)				264.00
Miscellaneous Delegation Costs								4,322.12			4,322.12
Hon. Jo Bonner	2/21	2/23	Philippines		474.00		(³)				474.00
Miscellaneous Delegation Expenses								28.35			28.35
Hon. Frank Wolf		2/17	United States								
	2/18	2/20	Lebanon		84.00						84.00
	2/20	2/22	Egypt		184.00						184.00
	2/22		United States								
Return of Unused Per Diem					-151.00						-151.00
Commercial Airfare							9,123.00				9,123.00
Committee total					18,920.35		14,575.92		21,638.95		55,135.22

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Ed Whitfield	1/25	1/26	Israel		498.00		(³)		1,724.08		2,222.08
	1/26	1/27	Bangladesh		294.93		(³)		224.03		518.96
	1/27	2/02	India		1,954.48		(³)		1,904.26		3,858.74
	2/02	2/03	Portugal		278.00		(³)		469.75		747.75
Committee total				3,025.41				4,322.12		7,347.53	

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Kevin Fitzpatrick	3/23	3/25	Cambodia		424.00		16,754.00		4,288.52		17,466.52
	3/25	3/28	Vietnam		967.00				470.49		1,037.49
Priscilla Koepke	3/23	3/25	Cambodia		419.00		16,754.00				17,173.00
	3/25	3/28	Vietnam		964.00						964.00
Hon. Edward R. Royce	1/25	1/26	Japan		361.00		(³)				361.00
	1/26	1/28	Taiwan		426.00		(³)				426.00
	1/28	1/30	Philippines		300.00		(³)		4,515.10		5,456.10
	1/30	2/1	China		458.00		(³)				458.00
Hon. Eliot Engel	2/1	2/2	South Korea		316.00		(³)				316.00
	1/25	1/26	Japan		416.00		(³)				416.00
	1/26	1/28	Taiwan		556.00		(³)				556.00
	1/28	1/30	Philippines		490.00		(³)				490.00
Hon. Matt Salmon	1/30	2/1	China		538.00		(³)				538.00
	2/1	2/2	South Korea		330.00		(³)				330.00
	1/25	1/26	Japan		436.00		(³)				436.00
	1/26	1/28	Taiwan		576.00		(³)				576.00
Hon. Tom Marino	1/28	1/30	Philippines		510.00		(³)				510.00
	1/30	2/1	China		558.00		(³)				558.00
	2/1	2/2	South Korea		350.00		(³)				350.00
	1/25	1/26	Japan		436.00		(³)				436.00
Hon. Gregory Meeks	1/26	1/28	Taiwan		576.00		(³)				576.00
	1/28	1/30	Philippines		510.00		(³)				510.00
	1/30	2/1	China		558.00		(³)				558.00
	2/1	2/2	South Korea		350.00		(³)				350.00
Nien Su	1/25	1/26	Japan		436.00		(³)				436.00
	1/26	1/28	Taiwan		576.00		(³)				576.00
	1/28	1/30	Philippines		410.00		(³)				410.00
	1/30	2/1	China		458.00		(³)				458.00
Melissa Medina	2/1	2/2	South Korea		275.00		(³)				275.00
	1/25	1/26	Japan		334.00		(³)				334.00
	1/26	1/28	Taiwan		566.00		(³)				566.00
	1/28	1/30	Philippines		491.00		(³)				491.00
Elizabeth Heng	1/30	2/1	China		499.00		(³)				499.00
	2/1	2/2	South Korea		322.00		(³)				322.00
	1/25	1/26	Japan		330.00		(³)				330.00
	1/26	1/28	Taiwan		576.00		(³)				576.00
JJ Ong	1/28	1/30	Philippines		490.00		(³)				490.00
	1/30	2/1	China		523.00		(³)				523.00
	2/1	2/2	South Korea		302.00		(³)				302.00
	1/25	1/26	Japan		436.00		(³)				436.00
Gregory Simpkins	1/26	1/28	Taiwan		576.00		(³)				576.00
	1/28	1/30	Philippines		510.00		(³)				510.00
	1/30	2/1	China		558.00		(³)				558.00
	2/1	2/2	South Korea		350.00		(³)				350.00
Worku Gachou	2/16	2/21	Kenya		1,575.00		5,201.02				6,776.02
	2/16	2/21	Kenya		1,575.00		5,236.12				6,811.12
	2/16	2/21	Kenya		1,575.00		4,703.02				6,278.02
	2/16	2/18	France		1,074.00		(³)		4,650.00		7,624.00
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	2/18	2/20	Uzbekistan		502.00		(³)		4,10,747.16		11,249.16
	2/20	2/23	Georgia		898.00		(³)		4,2,242.33		3,140.33
	2/23	2/25	United Kingdom		1,104.00		(³)		4,3,000		4,104.00
	2/16	2/18	France		761.00		(³)				761.00
Hon. Ted Poe	2/18	2/20	Uzbekistan		376.00		(³)				376.00
	2/20	2/23	Georgia		749.13		(³)				749.13
	2/23	2/25	United Kingdom		868.00		(³)				868.00
	2/16	2/18	France		1,074.00		(³)				1,074.00
Hon. Brian Higgins	2/18	2/20	Uzbekistan		498.00		(³)				498.00
	2/20	2/23	Georgia		898.00		(³)				898.00
	2/23	2/25	United Kingdom		1,073.77		(³)				1,073.77
	2/16	2/18	France		1,074.00		(³)				1,074.00
Hon. Paul Cook	2/18	2/20	Uzbekistan		502.00		(³)				502.00
	2/20	2/23	Georgia		898.00		(³)				898.00
	2/23	2/25	United Kingdom		1,104.00		(³)				1,104.00
	2/16	2/18	France		1,074.00		(³)				1,074.00
Paul Berkowitz	2/18	2/20	Uzbekistan		498.00		(³)				498.00
	2/20	2/23	Georgia		898.00		(³)				898.00
	2/23	2/25	United Kingdom		1,104.00		(³)				1,104.00
	2/16	2/18	France		1,074.00		(³)				1,074.00
Jesper Pedersen	2/18	2/20	Uzbekistan		458.00		(³)				458.00
	2/20	2/23	Georgia		873.00		(³)				873.00
	2/23	2/25	United Kingdom		1,104.00		(³)				1,104.00
	2/16	2/18	France		1,074.00		(³)				1,074.00
Hon. Albio Sires	2/18	2/20	Uzbekistan		458.00		(³)				458.00
	2/20	2/23	Georgia		873.00		(³)				873.00
	2/23	2/25	United Kingdom		1,104.00		(³)				1,104.00
	2/17	2/19	South Korea		470.00		13,537.00		4,1,235.64		15,242.64
Hon. Ted Poe	2/19	2/21	Vietnam		376.00		(³)		4,568.62		944.62
	2/21	2/22	Cambodia		227.00		(³)		4,459.78		686.78
	1/24	1/26	Germany		340.16		(³)				340.16
	1/26	1/28	Israel		704.35		(³)				704.35
Hon. Ted Deutch	1/28	1/30	Turkey		402.28		(³)				402.28
	1/30	1/31	Italy		139.00		(³)				139.00
	2/1	2/3	Germany		1,359.74		(³)				1,359.74
	1/31	2/3	Germany		1,054.44		(³)				1,054.44
Hon. Tom Cotton	2/18	2/19	Senegal		167.09		(³)				167.09
	2/18	2/18	Mali				(³)				
	2/19	2/22	South Africa		1,538.81		(³)				1,538.81

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Eric Williams	2/22	2/24	Democratic Republic of the Congo		396.00		(³)				396.00
	2/24	2/25	Morocco		171.43		(³)				171.43
	2/18	2/19	Senegal		167.09		(³)				167.09
	2/18	2/18	Mali				(³)				
	2/19	2/22	South Africa		1,538.81		(³)				1,538.81
	2/22	2/24	Democratic Republic of the Congo		396.00		(³)				396.00
	2/24	2/25	Morocco		171.43		(³)				171.43
Committee total					56,511.53		65,201.16		30,318.64		152,031.33

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.
⁴ Delegation costs.

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Jeff Miller	2/21	2/22	Philippines	474.00	(³)						474.00
Hon. Gus Bilirakis	2/21	2/22	Philippines	474.00							474.00
Hon. Michael Michaud	2/21	2/22	Philippines	474.00							474.00
Hon. Timothy Walz	2/21	2/22	Philippines	474.00							474.00
Helen Tolar	2/21	2/22	Philippines	474.00							474.00
Jian Iza Zapata	2/21	2/22	Philippines	474.00							474.00
Committee totals					2,844						2,844.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

HON. JEFF MILLER, Chairman, Apr. 18, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Darren Dick	1/08	1/16	Asia		224.00		(³)				224.00
Chelsey Campbell	1/08	1/16	Asia		224.00		(³)				224.00
Hon. Mike Rogers	2/01	2/01	Africa		280.91						280.91
	2/01	2/03	Europe		1,763.12		(³)				2,044.03
Hon. Mike Thompson	2/16	2/19	Middle East		1,494.00						1,494.00
Commercial Air							9,321.87				9,321.87
Linda Cohen	2/16	2/19	Middle East		1,494.00						1,494.00
Commercial Air							8,656.87				8,656.87
"In accordance with title 22, United States Code, Section 1754(b)(2), information as would identify the foreign countries in which Committee Members and staff have traveled is omitted."											
Committee total					5,480.03		17,978.74				23,458.77

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MIKE ROGERS of Michigan, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2013.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1411. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's annual report for 2012 on Voting Practices in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1412. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-632, "Local Budget Autonomy Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1413. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No: FAA-2012-0413; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-257-AD; Amendment 39-17441; AD 2013-08-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1414. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0000; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-271-AD; Amendment 39-17425; AD 2013-08-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1415. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada (Bell) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1127; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-035-AD; Amendment 39-17423; AD 2013-08-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1416. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Air-

worthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1105; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-137-AD; Amendment 39-17406; AD 2013-07-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1417. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0630; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-010-AD; Amendment 39-17409; AD 2013-07-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1418. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0809; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-135-AD; Amendment 39-17361; AD 2013-04-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1419. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1087; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-32-AD; Amendment 39-17424; AD 2013-08-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1420. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30893; Amdt. No. 3528] received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1421. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Grob-Werke Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0013; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-046-AD; Amendment 39-17421; AD 2013-08-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1422. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30894; Amdt. No. 3529] received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1423. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Caldwell, NJ [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0609; Airspace Docket No. 12-AEA-10] received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1424. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Reading, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1270; Airspace Docket No. 12-AEA-16] received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1425. A letter from the Aeronautical Information Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30895; Amdt. No. 506] received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1426. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tariff of Tolls (RIN: 2435-AA32) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1427. A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting the Commission's 2012 Annual Report on operations under the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. app. 2008 and 22 U.S.C. 1622a; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and the Judiciary.

1428. A letter from the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, transmitting the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction (SIGIR) April 2013 Quarterly Report; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

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 Mr. TURNER (for himself and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 1867. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the Uniform Code of Military Justice related to sex-related offenses committed by members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 1868. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to establish joint resolutions on the budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, 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. RIBBLE (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. POCAN, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. DUFFY):

H.R. 1869. A bill to establish biennial budgets for the United States Government; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Oversight and Government Reform, 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. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 1870. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide for a legislative line-item veto to expedite consideration of rescissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. WOODALL (for himself, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 1871. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to reform the budget baseline; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. AMASH, and Mr. HENSARLING):

H.R. 1872. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to increase transparency in Federal budgeting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. CHAFFETZ (for himself and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 1873. A bill to require greater accountability in discretionary and direct spending programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Judiciary, 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. PRICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. COTTON, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. RADEL, Mr. REED, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. BARR, Mr. TERRY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. YODER, and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H.R. 1874. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for macroeconomic analysis of the impact of legislation; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. PETRI, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 1875. A bill to support evidence-based social and emotional learning programming; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 1876. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for Federal Direct Stafford Loans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. ESTY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SIRES, Ms. HAHN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. TITUS, Mr. WALZ, and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 1877. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. DIAZ-BALART (for himself, Mr. SIRES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 1878. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to enhance existing programs providing mitigation assistance by encouraging States to adopt and actively enforce State building codes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 1879. A bill to provide for the safe disposal of Federal Government-owned transuranic waste for the benefit of all Americans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Mr. AMODEI (for himself, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Ms. TRIVUS, and Mr. HORSFORD):

H.R. 1880. A bill to prohibit an agency or department of the United States from establishing or implementing an internal policy that discourages or prohibits the selection of a resort or vacation destination as the location for a conference or event, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 1881. A bill to stimulate the economy, produce domestic energy, and create jobs at no cost to the taxpayers, and without borrowing money from foreign governments for which our children and grandchildren will be responsible, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Judiciary, 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. BLACK:

H.R. 1882. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to prohibit the Department of Agriculture from entering into partnerships with foreign governments to promote enrollment in the supplemental nutrition assistance program and to terminate the current Partnership for Nutrition Assistance Initiative between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign 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 Mr. CARTER (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 1883. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a deduction for the purchase of secure gun storage or safety device for the securing of firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. COOPER (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. KIND, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. OWENS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MATHESSON, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. BARBER):

H.R. 1884. A bill to provide that Members of Congress shall be paid last whenever the Treasury is unable to satisfy the obligations of the United States Government in a timely manner because the public debt limit has been reached; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 1885. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow eligible veterans to use qualified veterans mortgage bonds to refinance home loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan):

H.R. 1886. A bill to prohibit land border crossing fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 1887. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny certain tax benefits to persons responsible for an oil spill if such person commits certain additional violations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 1888. A bill to make payments by the Department of Homeland Security to a State contingent on a State providing the Federal Bureau of Investigation with certain statistics, to require Federal agencies, departments, and courts to provide such statistics to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and to require the Federal Bureau of Investigation to publish such statistics; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. LATTA (for himself, Mr. LOESACK, Mr. WITTMAN, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 1889. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to recognize the dependent children of members of the Armed Forces who are serving on active duty or who have served on active duty through the presentation of an official lapel button; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. FARR, Mr. KIND, Mr. MORAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 1890. A bill to modernize the conservation title of the Food Security Act of 1985, protect long term taxpayer investment, increase small and midsize farmer's access to programs, and prioritize modern-day conservation needs through management practices, local engagement, and stewardship; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BERA of California, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 1891. A bill to establish a position of Science Laureate of the United States; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 1892. A bill to amend section 1201 of title 17, United States Code, to require the infringement of a copyright for a violation of such section, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. POLIS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 1893. A bill to prevent and reduce the use of physical restraint and seclusion in schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1894. A bill to establish an Office of Tribal Relations in the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1895. A bill to respond to the extreme fire hazard and unsafe conditions resulting from pine beetle infestation, drought, disease, or storm damage by declaring a state of emergency and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately implement hazardous fuels reduction projects in the manner provided in title I of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. REED, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. RENACCI):

H.R. 1896. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to ensure that the United States can comply fully with the obligations of the Hague Convention of 23 November 2007 on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and the Judiciary, 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. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. WOLF, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 1897. A bill to promote freedom and democracy in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 1898. A bill to protect the child custody rights of deployed members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VISCLOSKEY:

H.R. 1899. A bill to prohibit business enterprises that lay off a greater percentage of their United States workers than workers in other countries from receiving any Federal assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FINCHER (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. STUTZMAN):

H. Res. 206. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress and the States should investigate and correct abusive, unsanitary, and illegal abortion practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. KILMER (for himself, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H. Res. 207. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the first ascent of Mt. Everest by United States citizens; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MORAN:

H. Res. 208. A resolution expressing opposition to the use of carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, nitrogen, nitrous oxide, argon, or other gases to euthanize shelter animals and support for State laws that require the use of the more humane euthanasia by injection method; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALZ (for himself, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. ELLISON):

H. Res. 209. A resolution recognizing the 150th anniversary of the founding of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen, and congratulating the members and officers of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen for the union's many achievements; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

22. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 4 urging the Congress to maintain operation of the 179th Airlift Wing at Mansfield-Lahm Regional Airport; to the Committee on Armed Services.

23. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 31 urging the President and the Congress to preserve full funding and support for the Department of Defense STARBASE youth science and technology program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

24. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a Senate Resolution requesting the Federal Government provide sufficient funding and personnel to process veterans' claims in a more timely manner; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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 Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 1867.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Military Regulation: Article I, Section 8, Clauses 14 and 18

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces; and 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. BLACK:

H.R. 1868.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 1869.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin:

H.R. 1870.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WOODALL:

H.R. 1871.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 1872.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1873.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 1874.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution which provides that, "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. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 1875.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Defines social and emotional learning (SEL) and amends the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) to allow funding for teacher and principal training and professional development to be used for SEL programming.

The above mentioned legislation is based upon the following Section 8 statement:

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 Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 1876.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the general welfare of the United States; as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 1877.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART:

H.R. 1878.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 1879.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1880.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution states "To regulate Commerce with

foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution states "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. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 1881.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 1882.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress under Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution. Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution bestows upon Congress the authority "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes." Congress is within its constitutionally prescribed role to reform, limit, or abolish programs maintained by the United States Department of Agriculture, a body which has regulated interstate commerce under the auspices of Congress continue

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 1883.

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; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 1884.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sections 8 and 9 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1885.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 1886.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (the Commerce Clause)

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1887.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 1888.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 4, section 4 of the United States Constitution: The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 1889.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

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; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1890.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass legislation regarding federal agriculture programs and public expenditures in support of those programs.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 1891.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 1892.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 1893.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1894.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which delegates power to Congress "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes"

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1895.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3: 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. REICHERT:

H.R. 1896.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, Section 10, Clause 3 (relating to the power to enter into foreign compacts on behalf of States).

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 1897.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 1898.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Military Regulation: Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

Necessary and Proper Regulations to Effectuate Powers:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: 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 the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. VISCLOSKY:

H.R. 1899.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 45: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. RADEL, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. HALL, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. YOHO, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. YODER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. STEWART, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BARTON, Mr. LATTA, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. AMASH, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 164: Mr. BERA of California and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 176: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 177: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 241: Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 311: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 318: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 335: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 351: Mr. COLE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 357: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 401: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 419: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 483: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 500: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 508: Mr. RUSH and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 523: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 525: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 543: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 569: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 612: Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 627: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 630: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MARINO, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 631: Mr. JONES and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 647: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 666: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 676: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 689: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 698: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 714: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 721: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 724: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 725: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 744: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 755: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 760: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 761: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 763: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 792: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 809: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 833: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 836: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 846: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. RUNYAN, Mrs. NOEM, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. JOHN-

SON of Georgia, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 847: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 850: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. GRIF-FITH of Virginia.

H.R. 855: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 900: Mr. VELA and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 904: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 935: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 979: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 991: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 992: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1020: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 1024: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1026: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1029: Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 1038: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1072: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 1074: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HALL, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1093: Mr. COBLE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1143: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 1144: Mr. BENISHEK and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1146: Mr. ROKITA and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1148: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 1151: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois and Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 1155: Mr. RUSH and Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 1173: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 1179: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1209: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. FORTEN-BERRY, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1219: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1240: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1247: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1250: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. HARPER, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1288: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. KILMER, Mr. GRIMM, and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1298: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1304: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1313: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1351: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1354: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 1386: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1405: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LANCE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1416: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 1427: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1440: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 1449: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LONG, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 1451: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1472: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1474: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1492: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 1494: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1496: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 1498: Mr. TAKANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1499: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1507: Mr. KLINE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LONG, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania,

Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. CHU, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1521: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1528: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. GRIF-FITH of Virginia.

H.R. 1551: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1560: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HAS-TINGS of Florida, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1572: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1591: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1595: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 1598: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 1623: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1638: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 1667: Mr. JONES and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1693: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1699: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1701: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 1727: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1731: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. PIN-GREE of Maine, and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 1735: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1740: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. KLINE, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1749: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1762: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 1763: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. POLLS,

Mr. SIRES, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Ms. HER-RERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 1764: Mr. COLE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MEAD-OWS, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H. R. 1780: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 1781: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1795: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. SIRES, Ms. TITUS, Mr. RUP-PERSBERGER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 1796: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. WALZ, Mr. COOK, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 1797: Mr. TERRY and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1809: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1814: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. YODER.

H.R. 1825: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 1826: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1830: Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GER-LACH, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 1847: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. CAMP-BELL, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BARTON, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1851: Ms. SCHWARTZ and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 1857: Ms. NORTON and Mr. RANGEL.

H. Con. Res. 16: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRIS-HAM of New Mexico, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. WHIT-FIELD, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. MARCHANT.

H. Res. 30: Mr. MARINO and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H. Res. 36: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. ROKITA.

H. Res. 78: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H. Res. 132: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. SABLAN.

H. Res. 134: Mr. BERA of California.

H. Res. 160: Mr. ROKITA.

H. Res. 167: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H. Res. 170: Mr. COTTON.

H. Res. 174: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. VELA.

H. Res. 182: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H. Res. 190: Mr. PERRY.

H. Res. 195: Ms. NORTON.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolu-tions as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of May 7, 2013]

H.R. 632: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. POMPEO.

[Submitted May 8, 2013]

H.R. 1286: Mr. WELCH.