United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, APRIL 12, 2013 No. 49

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, April 15, 2013, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, APRIL 12, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 12, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LYNN A. WESTMORELAND 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:

God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Under Your divine providence, this Nation was established and has been guided through the years. Through turmoil, strife, disaster, and even war, You have brought Your people to renewed faith, greater strength, and a deeper longing for peace.

Be with us now. Guide and enable the Members of this people's House today as they consider the ongoing business of the Nation, be they issues of economy, immigration, domestic safety and security, or matters beyond our shores. Bless their efforts as they seek to protect and defend their fellow citizens.

May all that is done this day 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.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MCNERNEY 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. The Chair will now entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

THE FEAR OF APRIL 15TH

(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, it's that time of year again—April 15. You know what they say: the only things certain in life are death and more taxes.

The day April 15th brings fear and trepidation into the hearts and souls of Americans across the fruited plain. The taxacrats have created a language that Americans really can't understand.

When the Tax Code was created, it was about 400 pages. Today, it's over 70,000 pages long. And get this: each year it takes Americans 6 billion hours to prepare their income tax, and American taxpayers spend $168 billion just to file their taxes every year.

Just this week, President Obama unveiled his 2-month-late budget that includes, of course, $1.2 trillion in new taxes. Mr. Speaker, almost half of Americans pay no Federal income tax at all. What we need are more taxpayers, not more taxes.

We should eliminate the burdensome, unfair income Tax Code and go to the fair tax—the national sales tax concept—or the flat tax, because everyone should pay their fair share to live in America.

And that's just the way it is.

Printed on recycled paper.

REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS AND RELIANCE ON FOSSIL FUELS

(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 to shine the light on the importance of reducing our carbon emissions and the role of electric vehicles in accomplishing that mission.

Today, we import about half the oil we consume, and approximately 70 percent of that is used in transportation. Consumers should have access to affordable transportation, such as electric vehicles that use little or no gasoline.

Our Nation's businesses are becoming more energy efficient, improving energy sources, and investing in cleaner transportation. The EV industry is a great job creator. For example, in my district, there is an EV company that is producing great vehicles and bringing hundreds of jobs to the region. Moreover, there's a regional transit district that's utilizing electric and hybrid vehicles.

EVs are one part of the solution to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and fighting climate change. They also play an important role in advancing a diverse American energy policy.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting clean electric vehicles on our roads and to make a commitment to reducing our reliance on fossil fuels.

IN MEMORY OF WADE WALTERS

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

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, it's with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the memory of a young man from my district killed in an industrial accident at Arkansas Nuclear One power generating facility.

Wade Walters was 24. He was a Russellville, Arkansas, resident and a graduate of Pottsville High School. He loved his job as an ironworker at Precision Surveillance Corporation and embraced all the outdoors had to offer, including bow fishing, hunting, shooting, canoeing, roping, and knife collecting.

Wade is survived by his father, James Keith Walters, of Dover, Arkansas; his mother, Susan Allen, and husband, Rusty; a sister, Chelsy; his grandparents, Tom and Bonnie Underhill; and the love of his life, Alyssa Alvey, all of Russellville.

Mr. Speaker, Wade gave a lot of himself. As a member of Russellville Christian Center, Wade went on numerous mission trips to Mexico to build housing for those in need. He had a big heart for his family and friends and was a constant source of inspiration to all he met.

We pray for peace and understanding for his family during this difficult time.

HONORING FRANCIS ''DUTCH'' HOWLAN

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Francis ''Dutch'' Howlan, who had resided in Amsterdam, New York, and who was posthumously inducted into the New York State Basketball Hall of Fame last month.

From 1953 to 1987, Dutch amassed 468 wins coaching at St. Mary's Institute and Bishop Scully High School, both in Amsterdam, New York. But he meant so much more than that impressive win total to our community and to the hundreds of student athletes he taught and mentored. His friends and former players remember him as a dedicated coach, an inspiring mentor, and a determined winner. As a fierce competitor, he preached a never-give-up attitude.

Twenty-four years after his passing, I am so pleased that Dutch has finally received this distinction. It is truly a testament to his character that his friends and players never gave up on their former coach's legacy, making this long overdue honor possible.

MEETING OUR DEBT CRISIS FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, the President submitted his budget this week. His plan not only fails to get control of our debt, it makes it even worse—to the tune of nearly $61,000 of debt for every American family.

American families know the consequences of living with debt. Credit card debt, mortgages, and student loans are just a few of the burdens working families and young adults struggle with—and budget to get out of—every month. Washington must do the same.

Our national debt eats away at the buying power of working families, seniors on fixed incomes, and students working their way through school, leading to higher prices for things like bread and milk and eroding hard-earned family savings.

We owe our families better. Politicians have talked long enough in Washington about tackling our debt. It's time for the President to get serious about the national debt and join us in putting our priority back on jobs and opportunity for American families. By acting boldly, we can translate talk into meaningful results.

□ 1010

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1120. I was raised in a union family. Labor, in fact, is the backbone of the middle class of America. This legislation is just another example of the Republican's assault on workers' rights.

H.R. 1120 effectively shuts down the National Labor Relations Board, strips away its enforcement powers, and leaves workers without any recourse to address employee intimidation, inadequate safety standards, and other unfair practices.

Throughout its history, 20 members have been recess-appointed to the NLRB, including 12 Republicans. In fact, every President since Ronald Reagan has appointed a member to the board through a recess appointments clause. Why should President Obama be treated any differently?

The bill is neither fair, nor is it just. I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure.

MILITARY JUDICIAL REFORM ACT

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, just earlier this week, I was able to join with my colleague, Representative SPEIER from California, introducing legislation to protect victims of military sexual assault. That's the Military Judicial Reform Act.

In recognition of a victim who, having had a jury at a court-martial find a finding of guilt against an assailant, had it overturned by a general who convened that, now we are faced with a new opportunity in which new information is being put out outside the scope of that trial.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we end this archaic practice and stop putting the victim on trial again and again.

This week Secretary Hagel called on Congress to remove the provisions of the Uniform Code of Military Justice that allow this proceeding to take place, and I urge my colleagues now to act together to end this archaic practice.

THE JOBS ACT

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

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the number one concern I hear when I'm home in southern Illinois is from families who are worried about jobs. They're worried about how to find a job and get back on their feet.

In southern Illinois, we know all too well how bad trade deals in Washington have given our working families a bum rap. We see good manufacturing jobs leave us. We see the empty factories, high unemployment rates, and lose faith in the future.

I believe in helping to attract and create new jobs and in protecting and saving the good ones we have. That's why I am proud to introduce my new initiative, the Job Opportunities Between Our Shores, or JOBS, Act. The JOBS Act will address the challenge industry faces of growing jobs without workers who have the necessary skills to fill them locally.

Southern Illinois has the advanced manufacturers who are leading the way for the future of manufacturing and creating new, good jobs. We have talented workers, and we have the educational programs to get them a great, new job that can support their family.

My JOBS Act is a way of bringing communities, workers, and employers together to protect good jobs and invest in our future.

SENATE GUN CONTROL PROPOSALS HOLD SERIOUS THREATS TO SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, today, on the other side of the Capitol, our friends in the Senate are considering a number of proposals that hold serious threats to our Second Amendment rights.

I agree that we need to have a serious conversation about how to reduce violent crime. But the Senate's recent decision to focus debate on restricting the rights of law-abiding citizens is the wrong approach. These proposals will do nothing but expand Washington bureaucracy and further complicate the ability of law-abiding Montanans to purchase firearms while doing little to actually address the underlying problems behind violent crimes.

Thousands of Montanans have reached out to my office, expressing their concern over these threats to their Second Amendment rights. As a fifth-generation Montanan and lifelong sportsman, I too am deeply concerned about the Senate's proposal to expand background checks for private sales to Montana citizens, which would criminalize the private transfer of firearms between law-abiding Montanans.

Let me point out, the Second Amendment is not about hunting; it is about freedom. So let me be clear. I am strongly opposed to and will fight back against any efforts that infringe upon Montanans' Second Amendment rights.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I stand here on behalf of my district's seniors, veterans, and working families to say that I strongly oppose cuts to Social Security in the President's budget. Every week, my case workers in Arizona report back to me about our constituents, and every week I hear about another senior who is struggling or another veteran who is struggling.

Our rural towns are filled with hard workers, but work is hard to find. These are folks who may never have the protections of a pension, so they must have the protection of Social Security.

The President's budget uses a formula called chained CPI. It recalculates how the cost of living is calculated, and it will not keep up with inflation.

So let's call this formula what it really is: a shrinking Social Security check for the people who need it most. Yes, we have to make cuts, and we need to do more with less, but seniors and veterans are already doing that. We can do better than sticking them with the tab.

PREVENTING GREATER UNCERTAINTY IN LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 146, I call up the bill (H.R. 1120) to prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from taking any action that requires a quorum of the members of the Board until such time as Board constituting a quorum shall have been confirmed by the Senate, the Supreme Court issues a decision on the constitutionality of the appointments to the Board made in January 2012, or the adjournment sine die of the first session of the 113th Congress, 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 146, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–6 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 1120

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 ''Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relations Act''.

SEC. 2. ACTIVITIES BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD PROHIBITED.

Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, the National Labor Relations Board shall cease all activity that requires a quorum of the members of the Board, as set forth in the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 151 et seq.). The Board shall not appoint any personnel nor implement, administer, or enforce any decision, rule, vote, or other action decided, undertaken, adopted, issued, or finalized on or after January 4, 2012, that requires a quorum of the members of the Board, as set forth in such Act.

SEC. 3. TERMINATION.

The provisions of this Act shall terminate on the date on which—

(1) all members of the National Labor Relations Board are confirmed with the advice and consent of the Senate, in accordance with clause 2 of section 2 of article II of the Constitution, in a number sufficient to constitute a quorum, as set forth in the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 151 et seq.);

(2) the Supreme Court issues a decision on the constitutionality of the appointments to the Board made in January 2012; or

(3) the adjournment sine die of the first session of the 113th Congress.

SEC. 4. EFFECT OF CERTAIN BOARD ACTIONS.

In the event that this Act terminates pursuant to paragraphs (1) or (3) of section 3, no appointment, decision, rule, vote, or other action decided, undertaken, adopted, issued, or finalized by the Board on or after January 4, 2012, that requires authorization by not less than a quorum of the members of the Board, as set forth in the National Labor Relations Act, may be implemented, administered, or enforced unless and until it is considered and acted upon by a Board constituting a quorum, as set forth in the National Labor Relations Act, or the Supreme Court issues a decision on the constitutionality of the appointments to the Board made in January 2012.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

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. 1120.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relations Act, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

America's workplaces are facing significant challenges. Consumer demand remains weak. Threats of new regulations and higher taxes continue. And a looming debt crisis threatens the growth and prosperity our Nation is working so hard to attain. Washington should not be in the business of making these challenges worse. That is why we are here today.

Many Americans may not even know a Federal labor board exists, let alone the role it plays in their everyday lives. Despite its obscurity, the authority of the National Labor Relations Board governs virtually every private business across the country. Our Nation needs a labor board that will appropriately and responsibly administer the law, or else the rights of both workers and employers are diminished.

Unfortunately, partisan politics have left the board in a state of dysfunction. A year ago, President Obama made three recess appointments to the board while Congress was not in recess.

□ 1020

The President's action was unprecedented, and a Federal appeals court has ruled it was also unconstitutional.

As a result, the work of the Board is tainted. Every decision it issues is ripe for appeal on the basis that the Board itself is not legitimate. In fact, employers and unions are now citing the recent court ruling as a reason why Board decisions should be overturned.

A story in The Wall Street Journal helps illustrate the real-life consequence of the President's recess appointment scheme. Five years ago, a truck driver alleged that her union failed to follow the rules and assign her work. The NLRB agreed and ordered the union to pay the driver back wages and benefits. So far, the union has refused, and the current chaos offers a new opportunity to toss out the Board's decision. According to the union's attorney:

> I'll explore every opportunity to make sure my client doesn't have to pay anything.

This is the reality we now face. Unions, employers, and workers are forced to spend more time and money defending themselves before the Board and in Federal court. Our Nation has relied upon the Board for more than 75 years. Never has it faced this level of confusion and uncertainty.

The current crisis began with the President's power grab, and it is up to him to fix it. Just this week, the President announced he was submitting three Board nominees to the Senate for its approval. This is certainly welcome news and long overdue. However, it does nothing to mitigate the chaos surrounding the NLRB. Roughly 600 Board decisions are constitutionally suspect, and that number continues to grow.

The legislation before us today simply tells the Board to stop exacerbating the problem that is already wreaking havoc across the country. H.R. 1120 prevents the Board from taking action that requires a quorum until one of three events occurs: the Supreme Court rules on the constitutionality of the appointments; a Board quorum is constitutionally confirmed; or the terms of the so-called ''appointees'' expire.

The bill does not—I repeat—does not stop the NLRB from overseeing union elections or processing claims of wrongdoing. The narrow scope of the bill is directed at the Board and only the Board.

The Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relations Act is an appropriate congressional response to an unprecedented situation. I expect we will hear a lot of false accusations today from our friends on the other side of the aisle, but I doubt we'll hear any denial of the serious challenges facing the Board.

The question then is this: Should we do nothing, or should we advance responsible legislation to help prevent further harm?

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to myself.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, this is a Friday across our country, and there are millions of Americans who are going to work under circumstances that exist because of the union movement and collective bargaining in the history of this country.

If they work the 41st hour, they'll get time-and-a-half for working overtime. Many find themselves protected by good health benefits and good pension benefits that will guarantee their family a good situation while they're working and a safe and secure retirement. The whole concept of the weekend—that for many American workers will begin this afternoon—exists because of the hard-fought gains of collective bargaining.

We wouldn't have a strong America without a strong middle class, and we would not have a strong middle class without collective bargaining. This bill strikes at the heart of collective bargaining by paralyzing the agency that enforces the ground rules of collective bargaining, the National Labor Relations Board.

This is really part 2 of a strategy by the Republican majority in the House and the Republican minority in the other body to paralyze the rights of Americans to organize and bargain collectively.

Act 1 has occurred since President Obama took office. He has made nominations to the National Labor Relations Board, and not one of those nominees has ever received a vote on the floor of the other body. Understand this: the minority in the other body has not voted against these nominees; they just refuse to put the nominees up for a vote.

Today, there are five nominations pending before the other body. If the Senate were to act on those nominations and reject them, the President would presumably make other nominees until he could find people who could clear the process. If the other body were to confirm those nominees, we would not be here having this discussion today because the Board would be functioning.

But a functioning Board is clearly not the objective of the other side here. So then act 2 comes along, and this is act 2. This bill says that the National Labor Relations Board can do effectively nothing. My friend, the chairman, referenced the story of a woman who is seeking back pay because of alleged violations of her rights by her union, and she's unable to proceed with the collection of that remedy because the minority in the other body has refused to confirm or refused to even consider any nominees of the National Labor Relations Board; and should this legislation go through here today, we are guaranteeing that nothing will happen because the Board cannot go to court to enforce one of its orders if the Board cannot act. Under this proposed statute, the Board could not act.

We are here today because a recalcitrant minority in the other body has steadfastly refused to even take a vote on the President's nominees to the National Labor Relations Board. This bill compounds that travesty. This bill creates chaos. It says that decisions of the Board cannot be taken to court to be enforced, which means as a practical matter those decisions will never be enforced. It says that 11 regional directors of the National Labor Relations Board now have their appointments in jeopardy since their appointments were made since January of 2012 when this bill—it says anything following that is invalid.

Employers and employees and unions go to the regional offices of the NLRB to resolve disputes, to prevent strikes, to achieve justice; but this bill paralyzes that effort.

There are some who believe that an America in which the bosses make all the decisions and the rest of us stand up, salute and say, yes, sir, is how the country should function. We do not believe that. We believe in a country where workers can freely organize, speak for themselves, sit at the bargaining table, and stand up for their rights.

The agency entrusted by law to enforce those rights is being paralyzed by this bill, collective bargaining is being paralyzed by this bill, and we should oppose it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to our next speaker, I would just note that the remarks made by my good friend and colleague, frankly, I believe, ignore the reality of the crisis that currently exists. No one, employer, worker, or union, can rely upon a Board decision today. A court of appeals has ruled that it's not constitutional, and it is that same court to which every appeal is made.

Now I'm very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Health Subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1120, the Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relations Act.

First, some history. The National Labor Relations Act was passed in the mid-thirties, and the National Labor Relations Board of five members—three from the majority party and two of the minority party—are to act as a fair arbiter. Basically, the referee for disputes.

And there was a ruling of the Supreme Court not long ago with regard to New Process Steel that said that two members—one Democrat and one Republican—both who agreed on over 600 decisions, that a quorum was not present and all of those decisions had to be thrown out. Therein calls the question.

The President made a pro forma recess appointment. Presidents, as has been stated here many times, have

made recess appointments to various boards and they had the constitutional right to do that; but no President has ever made a recess appointment during a pro forma session. Let me read here from the Senate CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 16, 2007. This is Leader REID:

□ 1030

Mr. President, the Senate will be coming in for pro forma sessions during the Thanksgiving holiday to prevent recess appointments.

The recent ruling of Noel Canning stated that the appointments were unconstitutional. The unique part of the National Labor Relations Board is that any other court circuit ruling in the country can be appealed to the D.C. circuit. So they have standing, and the standing says that the aggrieved party can do one of two things: they can ask for a vote of the entire court or they can appeal it to the Supreme Court.

This is a very simple bill. It does several things, and it asks the following:

One, that the Supreme Court rule;

Two, that the President go ahead and make the appointments;

Three, that the Board not issue any further rulings that may be overturned and create this uncertainty; and that once a board is approved, that it goes back and reviews all of the various rulings that have been made in order to get rid of this uncertainty.

We need the certainty for both labor and management to move forward. It's a very confusing time, and I would ask for the support of this bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, President George W. Bush used the same legal authority to make appointments to the National Labor Relations Board that President Obama used here. There was not a word of challenge from the other side ever in that process.

At this time, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the leading champion of workers' rights in the House of Representatives, the senior Democrat on the House Education and the Workforce Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, more than 75 years ago, Congress empowered the American worker through the National Labor Relations Act to form or join a union and bargain for a better life. That law and the rights it guarantees have served this country well—it has built the middle class; it has brought us the 40-hour workweek; it has brought us safe workplaces. These rights have given to millions of families economic security and the prospect that their children could build even better lives, but for the last 2 years, these rights have been under persistent and unrelenting attack by this House and this Republican leadership.

There are more unemployed workers in this country today than private sector union members. Instead of working to create decent jobs for the unemployed, the majority insists on attacking the rights of the employed. At a time of stagnant wages and when businesses across the country are explaining that their number one problem is a lack of customer demand, we could be doing something useful today, like raising the minimum wage. Instead, we are debating a bill that undermines the ability of workers to bargain for better wages or for decent pensions or for safe workplaces.

H.R. 1120 would stop the National Labor Relations Board from enforcing labor law. While the bill is in effect, the agency would not be permitted to issue any new decisions, enforce existing decisions, or advance any rulemaking. That means it's open season on working people. The bill tells employers: if you want to retaliate against a worker for trying to speak out or to organize, if you want to fire her, go ahead, because there won't be any effective government response. By eliminating the authority of the government to enforce the law, this bill effectively takes away every labor right that Congress gave workers to help them better their own lives.

It's that simple.

Take, for instance, a single mother who works at a hospital, changing bedpans, lifting patients day in and day out. She works hard. She likes her job, but she thinks that she and her fellow employees deserve a raise. After her shift, a supervisor overhears her chatting with a coworker about organizing a union. The next day, she is called into the manager's office, and she is fired for talking union—something that is a protected right under the law.

This firing is illegal, and she is entitled to her job back, but under H.R. 1120, she would be out of luck. Not only would she be out of luck, but over 23,000 workers a year would be out of luck because they simply exercised the rights that are legal under the law. The law says that employers don't get to retaliate, but for those thousands of workers now, they will have lost their jobs, lost their livelihoods, lost the ability to support their families. They will have no recourse because of this legislation if it becomes law.

How fair can that possibly be?

I would also add that, in 2010, about 17,000 unfair labor practices were filed against employers by employees, but over 6,000 were filed against the unions for unfair labor practices.

The fact of the matter is, for this legislation, it works against both employers and employees, and it brings chaos to the workplace. It gives the right to illegal strikes. It gives the right to illegal firings. It gives the right to illegally take away the wages of a worker. That simply cannot be tolerated in this country, but that's what this legislation does. It's an effort that started out a number of years ago on this committee with the Republicans attacking the National Labor Relations Act and the National Labor Relations Board, and we should not allow this to stand.

We understand that they're upset with the recess appointments, but they weren't upset with some 300 other recess appointments. In fact, Mr. ROE just said that those were constitutional, but that's not what the court said. The court said that all of these recess appointments were unconstitutional.

So where are we today?

We have sitting before the Senate, offered by the President, a panel of appointments that they can approve, and they can cure this problem if this problem, in fact, really exists. We don't know that yet because the Supreme Court hasn't ruled on it.

While we are waiting for the Supreme Court to rule, they want to pass this legislation; and if they pass this legislation, the fact of the matter is both employers and employees are going to be hurt. It's going to cost them a great deal of money, and it's going to cause a great deal of chaos in the workplace because of what the circuit court said.

I worry, while they complain about the recess appointments, that it's the very filibusters by the Republicans that demanded that the recess appointments take place.

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1120.

This bill is important for our employers, employees, and our Constitution. It has already been said, but I'd like to make that point again: the President does not have the authority to decide when the Senate is in session. His recess appointment of three members to the National Labor Relations Board was against the law and the tradition of separated powers inherent in the Constitution.

Some on the other side will say that the impasse at the NLRB is the fault of Republicans, that our colleagues in the Senate are acting as obstructionists; but I will remind my colleagues that, during the Bush administration, Senator REID used pro forma sessions to block recess appointments just the same, and he did not make recess appointments when the Senate was in pro forma session, which is different than the situation here.

The real solution isn't to appoint board members that a Democratically-controlled Senate can't approve; it is to nominate reasonable individuals who will adjudicate our Nation's labor laws without bias and with an eye towards the goal we all share—a healthy economy with adequate worker protection. That's what this bill before us does.

This bill would prohibit the NLRB from enforcing any actions that required a quorum, or from issuing new decisions requiring a quorum, until a

Board quorum is confirmed with the advice and consent of the Senate, the Supreme Court rules on the constitutionality of the January 2012 recess appointments, or the term of the 2012 recess appointments expires.

Unless Congress provides relief, employers and unions will be forced to either comply with costly orders that may be overturned or to litigate them on a case-by-case basis. Both of these paths are cost prohibitive. I urge the passage of this important bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, what President George W. Bush did 171 times—the legal authority he relied on 171 times—is the legal authority relied on by President Obama, which is the subject of this discussion this morning.

I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to someone who understands the value of collective bargaining to America's middle class, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

□ 1040

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, there is a basic principle of Anglo-American common law that reaches back to antiquity that goes as follows:

Without a remedy, there is no right. Ubi jus, ibi remedium.

That is the common-law doctrine which was the cornerstone of the National Labor Relations Act, which recognized that workers' rights only exist when there is a place to go to enforce fair elections, unlawful terminations, and retaliation cases. In fact, it is that legal doctrine which formed the basis of the Supreme Court's decision of Marbury v. Madison, which basically established the legal authority of the U.S. Supreme Court.

This law shamefully tramples on that decision and strips the National Labor Relations Act of its power, and you have to only look at line 10 of the bill which states very clearly:

> The Board shall not implement, administer, or enforce any decision, rule, or vote on or after January 4, 2012.

This is a shameful day for this House. The rights of workers to collectively bargain were not only recognized by the National Labor Relations Act; they were recognized by the Vatican in the 1890s by Pope Leo XIII. They were recognized by the United Nations Human Rights Charter after World War II as a basic criterion of civilized society.

Today, when this law passes, America will go on record basically saying that workers who are seeking to have elections to form unions, to have workers who try to protest unlawful terminations, to workers who are trying to protest unlawful retaliation, you have no place to go. You are living in an undeveloped country right now in terms of your legal rights.

Shame on this House for bringing up a measure like this which strips the rights of people which common-law doctrine, reaching back beyond the birth of this Nation, has recognized for centuries.

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relations Act. Despite the rhetoric on the other side of the aisle, this important legislation will ensure the integrity of the National Labor Relations Board. The other side has talked about how this legislation would somehow throw this process into chaos. The truth is that it's the President's unconstitutional actions that have thrown this process into chaos.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia unanimously ruled that the President's so-called recess appointments were unconstitutional, calling into question approximately 600 decisions by the Board. All 600 of these actions are now ripe for legal challenge. By operating without legal authority, the Board has created more uncertainty for employers, unions, and workers in an already fragile economic climate. The President's actions are an indefensible overreach of power; and, unfortunately, they are part of a broader trend.

Time and again, this President has demonstrated a with-or-without Congress mentality in pursuit of his political agenda. This mentality shakes the foundational principles of checks and balances our Founding Fathers put forward in the Constitution. The Constitution is our ultimate law. No one is above it, not even the President.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will ensure the integrity of the National Labor Relations Board and will help eliminate uncertainty in the workforce. When the President begins to operate within the law, the NLRB's work will begin again. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

President Obama is relying on the same constitutional provision that President Reagan relied on when he appointed Alan Greenspan as head of the Federal Reserve, the same constitutional provision he relied upon when he appointed Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), someone who stood up against the assault on collective bargaining and the middle class.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, being a middle class American today often means being caught in the middle, caught in the middle of the partisan posturing in Washington. And the situation we are in here today is yet another example.

The Senate's filibuster of appointees to the National Labor Relations Board left the President with two options: make recess appointments or stop enforcement of the laws. Because the latter was not acceptable, the President appointed NLRB members in a recess appointment, a process used by several Presidents before him. Unfortunately, the D.C. Circuit Court invalidated those appointments, and the question is presently pending before the Supreme Court. Now, it's too bad we're not here working together to request expedited consideration by the Supreme Court, but instead we're considering a bill that essentially seeks to shut down the NLRB.

Freight workers in my home State of Oregon will feel the consequences. In September of 2008, Oak Harbor Freight Lines, in violation of the law, announced that they would stop making payments to employee pension funds following a work stoppage during contract negotiations. In May 2012, a unanimous panel at the NLRB, a panel of Republicans and Democrats, found the company to be in violation of multiple sections of the National Labor Relations Act and ordered the company to reimburse the trust for missed payments. The law before us today, if passed, will invalidate this decision, as well as many others; stop the enforcement of the National Labor Relations Act; allow unlawful activity to continue; and exact a toll on workers across the country.

The NLRB is the referee between management and labor, and it helps guarantee the fundamental rights of middle class workers to organize, to bargain for better wages, benefits, and workplace conditions. This bill eliminates the referee and does real harm to hardworking men and women in my district and across the country. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relations Act. This legislation provides much-needed clarity for employers, employees, and other stakeholders affected by the unconstitutional actions of the National Labor Relations Board.

The issue here is the Constitution. You're hearing from the other side of the aisle that this is about policy disagreements with the NLRB decisions or about how previous Presidents have done recess appointments similar to these. They're wrong on both accounts. They're attempting to reframe the debate and confuse the American people about what this really is about.

Previously, the Senate was not in session when previous Presidents made appointments, and decisions by their appointees were accepted as constitutional. In this case, the Senate was in a pro forma session. They were in session, and this has precedent that has been stated already here today. In 2007, Senator REID announced that the Senate would be coming in for pro forma sessions during the Thanksgiving holiday to prevent recess appointments. I

guess my friends on the other side of the aisle only want to follow the Constitution when there's a Republican in the White House. Appointments at that time in 2007 would have been unconstitutional, as these appointments are now.

The American people deserve a Board that will fairly and objectively administer the law without bias towards management or labor. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1120, the appropriate congressional response to help ensure certainty and fairness in America's workplaces.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House, I'm certain, wants to follow the Constitution. On our side, we think that the Constitution means the same thing whether George W. Bush is President or Barack Obama is President, and that Constitution vests the President with recess power appointments which were never challenged by the other side in the Bush administration.

At this time, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP), a long-time fighter on this committee for the rights of the middle class.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1120. What we are doing here this morning is simply more of the same. For the past 28 months, House Republicans have used their majority to engage in a relentless campaign to tear at the fabric of organized labor by voting to defund, abolish, or greatly curtail the powers of the NLRB more than 40 times. Let me repeat that: more than 40 times. None of the attempts to crush the authority of the NLRB have become law; nor will they ever become law. And yet House Republicans keep trying.

At the same time, more than 22 million people remain unemployed or underemployed in this country, sequestration cuts continue to devastate middle class families, and the most severe cuts are yet to come. Total payroll compensation as a share of gross domestic product is at its lowest point since the 1950s. House Democrats seek solutions to these problems, and yet House Republicans continue to waste our time on a bill that will never see the light of day in the United States Senate. And if this bill were to ever pass into law, its impact would be to hurt workers, not help them.

How many more times do we need to waste taxpayer dollars on political messaging bills like this, rather than pursue legislation that will actually help the middle class?

□ 1050

Ten more times, 20 more times?

Is this all we can expect to accomplish over the next year and a half?

Americans want Democrats and Republicans to work together. Let's end the political posturing. Let's get America back to work.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), a real leader on this issue.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, our Framers were visionaries. They had the foresight to not only establish constitutional principles and processes that address the challenges of their day, but that still sustain and guide this country 230-plus years later.

Now, I don't think there's any question that this particular government, this Federal Government, has gotten away from proven and time-tested processes required by our Constitution and has stretched constitutional authority to its limits.

We're operating under continuing resolutions. That seems to be normal today. We've submitted budgets that are now over 2 months late. And we have taken other steps, right here in these Halls, that have served to usurp the rights that belong to our States.

Doing so has left us vulnerable, Mr. Speaker, to rulings like the D.C. Court of Appeals ruling on February 8 that said that the President's recess appointments to the National Labor Relations Board were unconstitutional.

Now, like my friends on the other side of the aisle, and like you, Mr. Speaker, we have all raised our hand and said that we're going to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and you know the rest. We've all taken that oath.

The Noel Canning decision holds the President's recess appointments are in direct contradiction to what the Framers outlined in article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution. And, as a result of the ruling, each decision made by that Board since that time has been called into question.

Mr. Speaker, I, personally, don't have anything against the individuals who have been appointed to the NLRB. And it's irrelevant whether I agree or disagree with the Board's rulings.

My concerns are, and the concern of each and every Member of this House should be the fact that we continually push the limits of our Constitution, the checks and balances outlined in this sacred document.

At its best, this Court of Appeals ruling provides uncertainty, and the last thing that this country, this economy needs is uncertainty.

I recognize the weight of the decisions made on the interpretation of the Constitution. They are tough. It is no easy task. And that's why I don't think it's unreasonable to press the pause button on the decisions emanating from this Board until we get a final ruling. It is irresponsible, in my strong opinion, not to.

That's why I appreciate my friend from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) for authoring this legislation. I support it wholeheartedly and recommend its passage.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

With all due respect to the last speaker, this bill doesn't push the pause button. It pushes the erase button. It erases the rights of American workers to bargain collectively and organize.

At this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my friend and neighbor from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), a member of the committee, and someone who understands that there's a direct connection between economic growth and collective bargaining.

Mr. HOLT. I thank my friend and colleague from New Jersey.

Let's understand, the issue here is not about recess appointments or the Board quorum at a Federal agency or the Constitution. My Republican friends never raised this issue in hundreds of previous occurrences.

Instead, what's happening now, the majority is using this misguided bill as a platform to continue a coordinated attack on the National Labor Relations Board and on American workers.

H.R. 1120 is simply an attempt to effectively shut down the Board and deny all private sector employees their rights.

The NLRB is an independent agency which serves as the only avenue for private sector employees to bargain collectively, to file unfair labor complaints, to conduct union elections if desired.

The National Labor Relations Act stabilizes workplaces and ensures industrial peace. We must not continue these warrantless attacks on the only established avenue which brings employees to the bargaining table with their employers.

What H.R. 1120 would do is roll back the clock three-quarters of a century, to the days of brutality and humiliation, the days before the institution of the Wagner Act, the days in which workers and their families suffered indignities, strife, even bloodshed.

Having laws for orderly labor and management processes helps businesses. It helps industry. It helps citizens of all economic levels. It helps our economy.

I regret that the majority is wasting time that could be used to address the real problems facing Americans. At every town hall citizens ask me: What about jobs? What about economic growth?

But instead of helping workers raise their wages, improve workplace safety, ensure fair retirement, House Republicans continue their attack on the National Labor Relations Board and ignore the economic crisis facing American workers, and making the American Dream that much harder for Americans to achieve.

This is not about abstract worker rights. This is about a productive economy where workers and their employers can work together.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), the chair of the Workforce Protection Subcommittee.

Mr. WALBERG. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be in the battle for the middle class of Michigan's great Seventh District, as well as the middle class of the United States.

Today, Michigan's unemployment rate is nearly 9 percent, and the actions of this dysfunctional Board have only hindered Michigan's attempts to grow and develop a healthy economy and have more people able to climb to the middle class.

For our State to recover and thrive, we need Michigan to be open for business. What our employers need now, more than ever, is certainty. Unfortunately, this Board has done little to help foster their success.

In fact, the NLRB has been a chilling factor to economic success for employers and employees. In January 2012, President Obama attempted to make three unconstitutional recess appointments to the National Labor Relations Board. However, a year later, on January 25, 2013, they were found, indeed, to be unconstitutional by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

In that year, the Board made numerous decisions, oftentimes with significant consequences for job creators and for employees. They made it more difficult for employers to investigate employee complaints or misconduct and undermined employee rights to not engage in partisan political activities of their union bosses.

In spite of the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals, the Board has continued to issue rulings and decisions. I would urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation and help bring much-needed certainty and stability to America's workforce and increase in our needed middle class.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ), a Member who fought for these kind of rights before she got here as a litigator and has fought for them since.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1120, the Republican plan to shut down the NLRB. This plan is just the latest in a seemingly unending series of Republican attacks on working people.

Make no mistake: the real goal of this legislation is to attack workers' rights. This bill will make it harder for workers and employers to settle disputes. It will essentially end the National Labor Relations Board's ability to hear cases until the Senate confirms the President's NLRB nominees. And we all know that that deliberative body is often better at obstruction than getting the people's business done.

Instead of trying to shut down the NLRB, shouldn't my colleagues on the other side of the aisle be calling on the Senate to have an up-or-down vote on the President's nominees for the NLRB?

Allow me to separate fact from fiction. This bill is not about certainty. This bill is about making it harder for working people to have their voices and their cases heard.

This bill is not about making the NLRB function efficiently.

□ 1100

This bill is a partisan move to gut the NLRB's implementation of the law. After all, if you fire all the judges, there's nobody there to hear your case.

Once again, the Republican leadership has decided to waste time making political points at the expense of working class Americans. We should be working on legislation to grow jobs. The American people are sick of politics. They want Congress to work on creating jobs and economic certainty. What our Republican friends are giving the American people today is more of an assault on workers' rights.

This legislation doesn't do anything to help the 23 million Americans looking for good-paying jobs. Vote ''no'' on this turkey of a piece of legislation.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relations Act.

If you're sick of government, spend a couple of years here.

We talk about the American people. Please tell me that these debates have anything to do with getting people back to work. This is about a constitutional process that we're supposed to follow. This is about unconstitutional appointments to the National Labor Relations Board. That Board, by the way, protects employers, management, and labor—it's not just labor—so let's make sure we understand that.

As we come here and do this posturing, no wonder the American people are losing faith in the way this body works. If we're really concerned about getting people back to work, if we're really concerned about letting this Nation rise again, this is not a Republican issue or a Democrat issue. This is not a Board that's supposed to be made up of all Republicans or all Democrats, but it's supposed to be constitutionally appointed. My Lord, what are we talking about today? These are unconstitutional appointments.

You know what the certainty of this is? Here's the certainty. And this is a President that always talks about if you play by the rules, if you follow the rules and you work really hard in this country, you have a chance to make it. But the footnote is: unless you don't agree with me, I'll go ahead and do it the way I want to do it. Even though I'm a professor of constitutional law, put that aside. I know an end run on this.

Now, I would tell my colleagues, please, this is a process that we have to protect. This is not a political football to go back and forth with. My goodness. This is about fairness. Fairness is not a Republican issue or a Democrat issue. It's an American issue. It doesn't matter who struck John or what did past Presidents do. This has been found unconstitutional.

The only certainty of what's going on here are three things regarding the Board's current decisions: those decisions cannot be relied upon; every losing party will be justified in filing an appeal; and no prevailing party can be assured that they will ever benefit from any Board-ordered remedy.

How do you fix it?

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

Mr. KLINE. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Take it to the Senate; run it through the process it's supposed to run through; get them appointed the right way; and then to go forward. Isn't that the American way? I'm not talking about a Republican way. I'm not talking about a Democrat way. It's what's best for the country.

This political posturing is ridiculous. We know what the law is here; we know what the process is; we know what the Constitution says; and we're here today making it something else. This is not about class warfare. This is about denying the process.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

My friend talks about playing by the rules. President Obama followed the rules that President Reagan followed, President Bush followed, President Clinton followed, President George W. Bush followed. The other body has the ability to resolve this dispute by taking votes on the five nominees that are presently before the United States Senate.

I am pleased to yield 1 minute to a consistent voice for America's working families across the country, the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank my good friend.

I'm so glad my good friend talked about the question of fairness because I believe in fairness as well; and I ask my colleagues to enthusiastically, with great presence, to vote this legislation down because it is unfair because I believe in the working man and working woman and working families who desperately need a fair body that is in regular order, the NLRB, that allows companies, corporate America, to come to the table of reconciliation on issues like pay equity, of which my good friend ROSA DELAURO is a champion of and I'm joining her, on good issues like the quality of life in the workplace, the idea of income and negotiations on plants being shut down.

What my good friends want to do is deny the process to this President that Ronald Reagan used some 240 times, the hundreds of recess appointments in

the 1980s, to ensure that regular order occurred in this Nation on behalf of the working men and women of America. This is a direct stab at them. This is a direct affront to them. And I would ask my colleagues to vote against this and for the working men and women of America. This is a bad bill.

Mr. KLINE. I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to a member of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I'm struck by the mention of fairness from the gentlelady who just spoke. What is fair is the rule of law, and that's what this country was founded on. That is the ultimate fairness. And that's what this bill is fundamentally about—the core American value about respect for the rule of law.

Now, our President chose to violate the law by unconstitutionally appointing new members to the National Labor Relations Board in January of 2012. And while the President claimed he had this authority and while our friends are claiming he had this authority because the Senate was ''in recess,'' there was one problem: the Senate wasn't in recess. The Senate was actually in session.

Last year, in response to this, I led in a letter to our President, with 26 of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, protesting these appointments and asking the White House to obey the law so that we wouldn't have the uncertainty that we do now, so that we wouldn't have to have the argument that we're having now, unfortunately; but by making these appointments, the White House and the executive branch has essentially claimed the authority to determine when the Senate is unavailable to perform its constitutional duties.

The executive branch should not be deciding whether the Senate is unavailable to provide its advice and consent. Our Founding Fathers, who created a government marked by a separation of powers, would be shocked and dismayed by the utter disregard the President has shown to the Constitution of the United States by making these appointments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my colleagues on the other side who continually make this argument as though if they said it 20 times it actually makes it more true—it does not—the suggestion that President Obama's actions were similar to past Presidents is patently false. No President ever made recess appointments while the Senate was meeting regularly in pro forma session—until this current President.

If President Obama had followed the practice set by his predecessors, there wouldn't be a cloud of uncertainty hanging over the NLRB today. And this uncertainty, to the point made by my colleagues earlier, is hurting jobs; because when you have Commissioners who are appointed unconstitutionally, their rules are now unconstitutional. Businesses can't follow them. Unions can't follow them. Workers can't follow them. And when that's the case, what job creator is going to hire more people? And that's the real situation we find ourselves in here today, unfortunately.

Now the issue is pending before the United States Supreme Court. It's my hope that the Court will acknowledge that no one, including this President, Mr. Speaker, is above the law in this country, from the poorest of our citizens to himself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KLINE. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ROKITA. We can never afford to forget that.

For these reasons, I simply urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 1120 and to not listen to the nonsense that we're hearing from the other side. We believe in the worker. We believe in workers' rights. We believe in the rights of businesses. We believe in the rights of unions. We believe the President, above everyone else in this country, should follow the law.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the prior speaker's own words indicate the contradiction of his position. He said it is unconstitutional that these recess appointments took place. He then just said that the appeal of this matter is pending before the United States Supreme Court. Marbury v. Madison does not give the D.C. circuit the final say on constitutionality or the Supreme Court that authority.

I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to someone who has made a career here of fighting for the rights of working Americans and collective bargaining, the gentlelady from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

□ 1110

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in strong opposition to this ill-conceived bill. It aims to effectively shut down the National Labor Relations Board—another direct attack by this House majority on workers' rights.

As we have been debating, a D.C. court recently ruled that two of the Board's current appointments made during a recess within a congressional session are invalid, and therefore NLRB currently lacks a quorum. This ruling is at odds with three other court rulings on the same matter and, in fact, the court did not order the NLRB to stop performing its duties. Nevertheless, the majority is trying to use this one decision as a pretext to stop the Board from issuing any decisions or taking any other actions on behalf of workers. This is a transparent attempt to effectively shut down the NLRB.

What we need to do here is have the Senate take up the five pending nominations and act quickly so that we can have a functioning NLRB.

This one court decision is squarely at odds with longstanding practice. Presidents of both parties have routinely made recess appointments during intrasession recesses and without regard to when the vacancy first arose.

The Congressional Research Service has identified a total of 329 intrasession recess appointments made since 1980. All of these would presumably be invalid under this court's decision, and that includes four such NLRB recess appointments by President Reagan and four by the second President Bush. Tell me, were these eight appointments by President Reagan and President Bush also in violation of the Constitution? If so, then why is this one particular court decision considered the ''right'' one despite the fact that all other courts and past practices disagree with it?

The majority simply wants to prevent the NLRB from functioning so that workers who want to invoke their basic right to organize have no recourse. What recourse, for that matter, would employers have against actions by unions that violate labor laws, such as secondary boycotts or unlawful picketing? Under the terms of the National Labor Relations Act, its provisions can only be enforced through the NLRB. There is no provision in the act for private lawsuits.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlelady another 30 seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. Without the NLRB, we simply do not have a fair workplace that works for everyone.

This is another in an endless series of Republican attacks on the foundations of the American middle class. It aims to undermine worker protections and accelerate a race to the bottom.

Let the NLRB do its work. I urge my colleagues to stand up for workers and employers and oppose this bill.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota has 6½ minutes; the gentleman from New Jersey has 5½ minutes.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, we have another speaker reportedly en route from another committee, so I will reserve the balance of my time and give him a chance to get here.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I'm pleased to yield 1½ minutes to someone who has walked in the shoes of those collectively bargaining and organizing, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I oppose H.R. 1120. This is just a naked attempt to neuter the National Labor Relations Board. This is done in concert with the United States Senate, which refuses to confirm any nominees by the President to the NLRB, and in concert also with the right-wing ideologues on the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, who have gone against 150 years of practice by Democratic and

Republican Presidents alike in appointing through the recess appointment constitutional process.

Now we have the U.S. Congress, the House of Representatives, with this H.R. 1120, Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relations Act. This would straitjacket workplace fairness and hurt middle class workers. It would also create uncertainty, interfere with judicial proceedings still on appeal, and undermine the NLRB's core functions.

This is a bill that's anti-worker, it's obstructionist, and it represents the machinations of a Republican Party more interested in impeding the NLRB and blindly attacking this administration at every opportunity than finding solutions to unemployment.

This bill represents a party that has lost touch with middle class values, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my colleague that the speaker we're waiting for has not yet arrived. I'm not sure how many speakers are left on your side.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my friend and the Speaker that we have no more speakers at this time.

What I would propose, with the Speaker's discretion, is I'd like to speak for about 1 minute. Perhaps if your other speaker arrives, we could accommodate that person. If not, I would then close for our side and then the chairman defending the bill would close.

Mr. KLINE. I have no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The House deserves an accurate record of where this matter stands legally.

After the Senate refused to cast a vote on any of the President's nominees to the National Labor Relations Board, the President acted through the recess appointments clause that his predecessors have relied on far more often than he has. The D.C. Circuit ruled that those appointments were invalid. The case is presently under consideration under writ of certiorari to the United States Supreme Court, which either will or will not hear the appeal.

The majority is advancing a rather novel legal theory that a decision by one circuit court of appeals establishes with finality the constitutionality or lack of constitutionality of a provision. This is truly a novel theory. Marbury v. Madison makes it clear: only the United States Supreme Court has finality in these sort of matters. The President acted in good faith under a constitutional provision that others have followed before.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, our speaker has not yet arrived, so I will be ready to close after the gentleman from New Jersey.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank the Speaker and colleagues of both parties for the spirited nature of this debate. At its core, this debate and this bill is about the primacy and value of collective bargaining in our country.

There really are two different points of view on collective bargaining: one is that it's a nuisance; the other is that it's an engine of economic growth.

There are those who believe that the proper organization of our economy is that the bosses decide what happens, everyone else salutes, and that's what happens. This led us to situations where we had children working in sweatshops, people working 80 or 90 or 100 hours a week, and people being forced out and fired for all sorts of invalid and irrational reasons.

In our country's history, we're fortunate that there was a great movement of collective bargaining among the working people of this country. In the 1930s, those who preceded us here enshrined the rights of collective bargaining in various statutes. Since then, for nearly 90 years these statutes have worked to promote fairness, equity, and economic growth in our country.

Collective bargaining works—not just for those in a union, but for all those in the United States of America. This bill is a direct assault on collective bargaining. It is an assault that has seen its manifestation in other parts of the country—against public workers in Wisconsin, against all workers in Ohio.

Collective bargaining is one of the main engines of the development of America's middle class, and America's middle class is clearly the main reason for the development of the strongest economy on the face of the Earth. A vote against this bill is an affirmation of the value of collective bargaining. A vote for this bill is an erosion of that precious right that Americans have always enjoyed and should enjoy.

□ 1120

We have the opportunity to stand up for those who wash the dishes, patrol the streets, build our buildings, teach our children. We have the opportunity to stand up for the right of collective bargaining. I urge both my Republican and Democratic friends to stand up for America's middle class and vote ''no'' on this bill that paralyzes and assaults collective bargaining in our country.

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

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

I think it is important to remember why we are here today. More than a year ago, the President took an unprecedented step despite all of the discussion from the other side of the aisle. No other President made a recess appointment when the Senate was in session, in pro forma session, or any session. So despite how many times President Reagan or President George H.W. Bush or President George W. Bush made recess appointments, this was unprecedented.

Now, it's still an open question to be decided. The D.C. Court of Appeals made a ruling that the President's appointees to the National Labor Relations Board were unconstitutional. And it's going to be an ongoing debate, I'm sure, going forward for days and weeks, the sooner the better, to determine what it means under article I, section 5, clause 2 of the United States Constitution, where it says the Senate is vested with the power to ''determine the rules of its proceedings.'' The Senate determined that the rules of its proceeding said that the Senate was in session.

We heard mention today by a number of my colleagues that Senator REID had announced, when President Bush was in office, that the Senate was going to stay in pro forma session in order to keep the President from making recess appointments. That's an important debate going forward.

The problem is, as we stand here today, with a lot of discussion from the other side of the aisle, unfortunately some of which was questioning our motives, my motives, called action shameful, that's a shame. Because what we've got today is a Board that has been ruled unconstitutional by the D.C. court, which by the way is the court that reviews every single challenge to an NLRB ruling. You can't get relieved by a court in San Diego. If you don't like the ruling of the Board, you're going to appeal to the court that has already ruled that that Board is unconstitutional.

This is dysfunctional. This doesn't have anything to do with whether or not I, or anybody else, believe in collective bargaining rights. We have a Board that under the National Labor Relations Act is supposed to be an arbiter, a fair arbiter. It's the place where you go to get a determination; and the problem there is you can't go there to get a determination, or you get one that is immediately suspect and open to appeal to a court that has already said that they're unconstitutional.

We already have over 600 rulings by this Board since these appointments were made January a year ago. Every time this Board makes another decision, another ruling, it pours more uncertainty into an economy that is, frankly, still desperately struggling to come out.

We've heard accusations about, well, it's the Senate's fault, and I'm sort of inclined to always think that it's the Senate's fault when something doesn't happen. I just remind my colleagues that this is a bipartisan Senate problem.

In 2011, a Republican Board nominee languished in the Democrat-led Senate for a year—no hearing, no debate, no vote. So this is not a new circumstance.

There is an answer to this: the President of the United States can bring forward nominees that can be confirmed—that can be confirmed—and then we would have a constitutionally constituted Board to go forward and resolve the disputes that were brought up so many times by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. That's not what we have now. We have a dysfunctional Board that is worse than useless because they are making decisions which are entirely suspect.

Congress should not allow this situation to get worse. The Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relations Act is an appropriate response to a horrible situation. This ought not to be Republicans versus Democrats. This is a chance for us to say we have an intolerable situation. This Board needs to stop issuing decisions that are immediately suspect and challengeable to the very court that has ruled them unconstitutional.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 1120, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1120, the so-called Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relations Act.

House Republicans today are continuing their assault against workers' rights. The bill before us would retroactively invalidate National Labor Relations Board, NLRB, decisions made after January 2012 and prevent the board from making or enforcing new decisions until the Senate confirms a quorum of members.

There is an ongoing debate in the courts about the extent of the President's recess appointment powers, and there is no reason for Congress to interject itself now. Moreover, this misguided bill would hurt both workers and businesses by creating chaos. The NLRB protects workers rights to bargain collectively, but it also works to protect businesses by setting orderly standards for labor disputes.

We cannot afford to have both workers and employers face further uncertainty in resolving cases, which will negatively impact our economy. While our economy continues to recover, we should instead be supporting growth by providing stability to both workers and businesses.

Instead of attacking workers and curtailing their rights, I would hope Members would be willing to work together find common sense solutions to help working families. I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 1120.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is disappointing that House Resolution 1120, the so-called ''Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Relations Act'' would actually create greater uncertainty for labor unions and businesses and wreak havoc on the middle class. I do not understand the interest in scapegoating America's unions for the economic problems that beset us. It was not America's grocery clerks, nurses, teachers, postal workers, or electricians that nearly caused the meltdown of the economy. America's working men and women didn't engineer poor loans, systematically cheat consumers, and transform financial institutions into giant casinos. However, there are some in this Chamber who seem convinced that getting rid of labor unions will advance their agenda.

This bill essentially shuts down the Labor Relations Board, by refusing to allow them to issue decisions, enforce existing decisions, or move forward with rulemaking. It means that labor and business issues that are currently unclear will remain unclear. It increases the chance of a strike, because without the National Labor Relations Board to help mediate, workers will be more likely to strike to protest unfair working conditions.

Let's remember that it's not just union members who benefit from America's unions. Our entire society benefits from their efforts. It was organized labor that spearheaded efforts for a 40 hour work week, brought safety to the workplace, fought for environmental protection, and championed pay equality for women. It is not just rhetoric that unions brought you the weekend. Unions are among the few strong voices who continue to stand up for a strong livable wage for our workers.

It's important to be thoughtful about the best way to navigate labor-business relations. I'm all for fine tuning the system, but I am adamantly opposed to gutting rights and protection of workers. We must start by acknowledging the debt we owe to unions and to stop this wholesale assault. I will vote no on H.R. 1120, and I will be disappointed if I am not joined by more of my colleagues.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1120, the ironically and unfortunately-named ''Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relations Act.'' The National Labor Relations Board is a crucial federal agency, mediating disputes between workers and employers, upholding labor laws, and ensuring the integrity of union elections. This bill would undermine the NLRB's authority and lead to an unstable labor-management relationship for the foreseeable future.

Under H.R. 1120, countless labor cases would go unheard, decisions would be unenforceable, violations of workers' rights would go unpunished, and union elections could not be certified. All current unfair labor practice proceedings in the country could be brought to a standstill. Instead of removing uncertainty, this bill would in fact do just the opposite.

Not only would this bill hamstring the NLRB in fulfilling its duties, but it increases the chances of labor strikes. Without a functioning board, wronged workers would have nowhere to turn for the enforcement of their rights under the law. There would be no one to enforce reinstatement orders for workers who were wrongfully terminated, and businesses would lose a forum to address disputes. Without the guarantee of the NLRB's protections, workers will be more likely to strike to seek redress of grievances.

We are told this bill is necessary to enforce the decision in *Noel Canning* v. *NLRB*, which invalidated recent recess appointments to the Board. This partisan decision, which runs contrary to mountains of legal precedent, has already been appealed to the Supreme Court. I recall that we opened this Congress with a reading of the Constitution. I hope my colleagues have taken to heart the Separation of Powers enshrined therein, and will allow the judicial branch to work through this issue. Should the ultimate decision run contrary to the will of the House, I have no doubt we will be able to revisit the topic then.

If my colleagues across the aisle are truly interested in ensuring the integrity of the NLRB, they should urge their Senate colleagues to stop holding up these nominations and allow them an up or down vote.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this bill.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on yet another attack on workers' protections.

The National Labor Relations Board has provided stability between workers and employers for decades. And yes, it has helped ensure that workers have a voice. Yet, in just the past two years, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have tried numerous times to paralyze the operations of the board. Each time, they came up with a new angle. I appreciate their creativity. But the goal is the same: to put labor rights out of reach. This time, the majority has tried to say their bill will promote ''certainty''. But without a functioning Board, none of the labor rights in the landmark Wagner Act can be enforced. So it seems the only ''certainty'' we're providing is that there will be even more economic turmoil than we already have.

Whether its women's rights or workers' rights, bill after bill advanced by the majority is aimed at taking our country backwards. I know that not all my friends on the other side of the aisle agree with this bill. I appreciate that. It is unfortunate that some of my colleagues are seeking a return to the past, before we had protections for workers. But I hope that most will focus on the present, and get on with building a better workforce and a brighter future.

So I again urge my colleagues to stand with millions of middle-class American workers and vote ''no'' on this bill.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this attempt to strip worker protections in this country by shutting down the National Labor Relations Board.

The Majority argues that this bill somehow removes ''uncertainty'' in the economy. In reality, it does exactly the opposite. By removing all authority from the Board that enforces labor law, it creates unworkable deadlock. The NLRB orders union elections, certifies and decertifies unions after elections, and makes decisions on unfair labor practices when they are filed by employers or employees. Without a functional NLRB, there is no enforcement of workers' rights. And with no alternative means of resolving disputes, workers may resort to strikes.

The President has nominated two Republicans to fill the vacant seats on the NLRB and has renominated the Board members in dispute in the DC Circuit case. If the Majority is really interested in a functional Board, they should urge their colleagues in the Senate to vote on those nominations without delay. Today's bill will destabilize labor relations and I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1120, the Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relations Act. This legislation is anti-worker, anti-management, and rather than creating certainty, it would throw the world of labor relations into complete chaos by shutting down the final arbiter—the National Labor Relation Board. And it would do this all in the name of upholding a single decision that overturns decades of court precedent and executive practice upholding intra-session recess appointments as constitutional.

If H.R. 1120 becomes law, it would put us in a situation where employees and employers

would be denied recourse in the courts—a fundamental guarantee in our society. Final review of decisions would be all but impossible to obtain, effectively nullifying the consequences for unfair labor practices. The National Labor Relations Act, overseen and enforced by the National Labor Relations Board, protects working Americans' rights to form unions, bargain collectively for fair wages, and ensure they work in a safe environment. The National Labor Relations Board also protects employers, who have recourse before the Board in the same way employees do. Eliminating the Board helps only those who wish to violate labor laws without consequence. That is not a constituency this Congress should be representing.

H.R. 1120 does two things. First, it prevents the NLRB from operating, which is in and of itself a reason to oppose it—America's workers depend on a functioning Board. Second, H.R. 1120 legitimizes the obstructionism of the minority in the Senate, which led President Obama to make these recess appointments in the first place. It is responding to hostage taking by giving the hostage-takers everything they want and more. This creates a no-win situation where neither side has any incentive to compromise for the good of our country.

The Framers of the United States Constitution included the recess appointment clause in Article II of the Constitution to ensure that our government could function even if the Senate is unavailable to confirm the President's appointments. It is time that we honor their wisdom. That means that here in the House of Representatives, we vote down this wrong-headed bill; in the Senate, that means getting to work and voting on whether the Presidents' appointees are qualified or not.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this legislation and uphold over a half-a-century of precedent and practice, and ensure our working men and women are not denied justice by way of delay.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose H.R. 1120, the ''Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relations Act.''

This bill effectively prevents American employees from seeking remedies when their rights under the National Labor Relations Act, or NLRA, are violated.

The NLRA guarantees American workers in the private sector the right to act collectively to improve the conditions of their workplace. This applies for formal meetings with supervisors, as well as to employees who gather in the break room to discuss a new company policy or compare their paychecks.

The NLRA also protects workers when they act together to protest working conditions, such as leaving the building because the employer refuses to turn on the heat. Recently, these laws have been applied to protect employees who discussed their salaries with each other on Facebook. You don't need to be part of a union to be protected by these laws.

Under the NLRA, employees can go to the National Labor Relations Board (''NLRB'') with their workplace grievances.

The NLRB is also charged with conducting elections for labor union representation and with investigating and remedying unfair labor practices involving unions.

On January 25, 2013, in *Noel Canning v. NLRB,* 678 F.3d. _____, No. 12–1115 (D.C. Cir. 2013), a case challenging the constitutionality of certain appointments made to the NLRB by President Obama pursuant to his authority under Article II, Section 2, Clause 3, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia issued a ruling invalidating President Obama's appointments on the alleged ground that they violated the Recess Appointments Clause.

The D.C. Circuit's decision in Noel Canning rests upon its novel and controversial interpretation of the word ''the'' in Recess Appointments Clause, which states that ''The President shall have Power to fill up all Vacancies that may happen during the Recess of the Senate.''

The court held that the Recess Appointments Clause applies only to ''intersessional'' recesses, that is, only to the recess occurring between the first and second session of a Congress but not to ''intrasessional'' recesses, which are those occurring during either the first or second session.

The decision in Noel Canning is squarely at odds with that of every other circuit court that has considered this issue going back as far as 1880. Indeed, until the D.C. Circuit issued its bizarre ruling, this was thought to be a long settled issue, most recently affirmed by the Eleventh Circuit in 2004 in *Evans v. Stephens,* 387 F.3d 1220, 1226–27 (11th Cir. 2004), cert. denied, 125 S.Ct. 1640 (2005).

In Evans, the court upheld the intrasessional recess appointment of Judge William Pryor to the Eleventh Circuit made by President George W. Bush. The court rejected the same argument that was advanced by the petitioner in Noel Canning, stating:

> ''interpreting the phrase to prohibit the President from filling a vacancy that comes into being on the last day of a Session but to empower the President to fill a vacancy that arises immediately thereafter (on the first day of a recess) contradicts what we understand to be the purpose of the Recess Appointments Clause: to keep important offices filled and the government functioning.''

387 F.3d at 1226–27.

The Supreme Court has granted certiorari and will review the Noel Canning decision, and I expect the Court to reverse the judgment of the D.C. Circuit.

Mr. Speaker, the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service has estimated that had the decision in Noel Canning been the controlling precedent over the last the 30 years, it would have invalidated more than 325 appointments made by Presidents of both parties, including the following conservative icons: Jeanne Kirkpatrick, Alan Greenspan, and John Bolton.

In fact, of the 326 total intrasession recess appointments made over the past three decades, 76.7 percent, or 250, were made by Republican presidents: 72 from President Reagan; 37 from President George H. W. Bush; and 141 from President George W. Bush. In contrast, less than 1 in 4 appointments (79) were made by Democratic presidents: 53 from President Clinton; a mere 26 from President Obama.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1120, the bill before us, is a solution in search of a problem. Until and unless the Supreme Court affirms the Noel Canning decision, the NLRB remains empowered to administer the National Labors Relations Act and protect the rights of workers and management as it has since its inception in 1935.

The proponents of H.R. 1120 simply dislike the NLRB and are using this bill as an excuse to try the neuter the agency. Rather than preventing greater uncertainty, this ill-considered and unwise legislation would inject uncertainty in labor-management relations.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are not fooled. They understand this bill is nothing more than a thinly disguised attempt to weaken the ability of organized labor to protect the interest of working families. And I am proud to stand with the President and the following organizations in unyielding opposition to this legislation:

1. AFL–CIO
2. AFSCME
3. SEIU 3
4. International Brotherhood of Teamsters
5. International Association of Machinists
6. Airline Pilots Association International
7. Transportation Trades Department
8. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers
9. Building and Construction Trades Department
10. United Steelworkers

Mr. Speaker, I stand for fairness. I stand for justice. I stand with working families. I stand for certainty in labor-management relations. And that is why I stand in strong opposition to H.R. 1120, the misnamed ''Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relations Act.''

I urge my colleagues to vote me in voting against this assault on working families.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1120, the Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relations Act.

This bill's very title is fundamentally misleading. H.R. 1120 will, in fact, lead to more uncertainty in labor-management relations. The bill is part and parcel to the Republicans' ongoing war against working American men, women, and their families. Its purpose is nothing less than the wholesale abrogation of the right of workers to protect themselves from unfair labor practices.

H.R. 1120 will neuter the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) and give employers greater rein to intimidate workers who have the temerity to try to organize or protest unjust workplace practices. The bill will prevent the NLRB from certifying union elections, enforcing orders to comply with existing labor laws, and taking to trial employers accused of unfair labor practices.

Mr. Speaker, my father nearly lost his life because of his union activities. All he sought to do was make a better life for himself and his family. He lost his job and was sent west to die of tuberculosis, which very well could have happened if not for the Union Printers Home and the union of which he was a founding member. I will not stand idly by as my Republican colleagues seek to destroy his productive legacy. H.R. 1120 is another legislative expression of the contempt in which my Republican colleagues hold American working men and women and the unions they founded for their protection. I am grateful that this bill will never be taken up by the Senate, much less signed by the President. It saddens me, however, that Republicans continue their march at every opportunity to demolish the capacity of the federal government to protect the health and well-being of Americans not fortunate enough to have been born with silver spoons in their mouths.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this shameless excuse for a bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, as our economy continues to recover, Congress should avoid any action that would destabilize employer-employee relationships—something that we can all agree is essential for our Nation's economic success. In my home state of Michigan, we have seen the resurgence of the domestic auto industry in large part due to cooperation between labor and management and their shared desire to succeed.

With that example in mind, I cannot understand why House Republicans are supporting H.R. 1120, the so-called Preventing Greater Uncertainty in the Labor Management Relations Act, which would effectively shut down the National Labor Relations Board. Instead of assuring productive employer-worker relations, a vital part of which is giving workers a voice in the workplace, this bill would actually create more uncertainty by rendering inoperable the very agency that protects workers and businesses from unfair and illegal activity.

This country has labor laws for a reason—to protect workers from exploitation and ensure a working environment that benefits both labor and management. And we should not forget that these labor laws helped create the middle class, providing generations of Americans with good pay and quality benefits, safe workplaces, and job security.

If Congress wishes to take action regarding the National Labor Relations Board, I would recommend that action to be the swift Senate confirmation of President Obama's three candidates for the Board. As for H.R. 1120, I will oppose this partisan effort to shut down the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relations Act (H.R. 1120).

H.R. 1120 requires the NLRB to cease all activity that requires a quorum of Board members. This prohibits the Board from implementing, administering, or enforcing any decision finalized on or after January 4, 2012, that requires a quorum. This would essentially shut down the NLRB.

I understand the concerns regarding the Constitutionality of the appointments, but on February 13, 2013, President Obama asked the Senate to confirm the two recess appointments to the NLRB. Both sides have agreed the President is doing what is required of him by the Constitution.

The NLRB is an essential component of worker protections available to working men and women. The NLRB prevents and remedies unfair labor practices by employers and labor organizations. Elimination of the NLRB would leave millions of Americans without adequate protections.

I urge my colleagues to join my opposition to H.R. 1120 to protect the hardworking men and women in the United States.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1120, the Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor Management Relations Act. The 112th Congress was laden with baseless attacks against labor unions and middle class workers. Sadly, it appears that my Republican colleagues in Congress are working once again to make the 113th Congress just as partisan and divisive as the last.

H.R. 1120 is simply another attack on the rights of workers and their ability to form unions and bargain collectively. H.R. 1120 seeks to prevent the NLRB from carrying out its core responsibilities and will undermine the critical ability to protect Americans from abuse and exploitation by employers.

If enacted, H.R. 1120 would have devastating consequences for the millions of workers belonging to unions. The NLRB issues legally-binding decisions that protect workers who have been illegally fired, denied the right to collectively bargain with their employer, or have experienced any other violation of their legal rights. With the NLRB effectively disarmed, these workers will have no recourse if any labor law violations are committed against them.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans in Congress have repeatedly resorted to deceitful tactics to carry out their agenda. H.R. 1120 is no different, and is just one small part of a larger effort to dismantle the NLRB and weaken protections for workers to the benefit of businesses. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1120, and any other partisan pieces of legislation that also seek to undermine the rights of workers all across America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 146, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. BUSTOS. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Bustos moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 1120) to the Committee on Education and the Workforce with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 5. PROTECTING THE EMPLOYMENT AND ELECTION RIGHTS OF VETERANS AND THE AMERICAN WORKFORCE AGAINST OUTSOURCING, ABUSE BY FOREIGN FIRMS, UNSAFE WORKING CONDITIONS, AND DISCRIMINATION.

This Act shall not apply to any case or matter before the National Labor Relations Board involving any of the following:

(1) Any former members of the Armed Forces fired from a job in violation of the National Labor Relations Act or the processing of an election for representation for collective bargaining sought by any former member of the Armed Forces.

(2) Any attempt by a U.S. employer to outsource jobs or work overseas in violation of such Act.

(3) Any violation by an employer that is a foreign-owned firm against the rights of American workers under such Act.

(4) Workers seeking good faith bargaining under such Act to address issues related to health and safety, including hazardous working conditions involving underground mines, exposure to toxic chemicals, or explosions.

(5) Workers seeking good faith bargaining under such Act to address discrimination based on age, sex, disability, race, religion, or other personal characteristics.

(6) Any employer found to have violated child labor laws during the five-year period before the case or matter involving such employer comes before the Board.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not delay or kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will proceed immediately to final passage as amended.

This past November, Illinoisans and people across our country sent a strong, but simple, message to Congress, that the middle class needs to be a priority, not an afterthought.

The people I talk with back home are worn out by Washington putting politics before people. I was honored to take my oath of office in January with a mission to be part of the solution here in Congress.

Like so many other Members of the freshman class of this session of Congress, I ran for office to fight for the American worker and for a stronger middle class. I believed I could make a difference, and I still do.

The hardworking middle class people from my district in Illinois are counting on us to remember them as we deliberate in this Chamber. That begins with standing up against attempts to cut the legs out from beneath American workers, which is exactly what this bill does that's being presented today.

□ 1130

Mr. Speaker, without the support of organized labor, my family wouldn't be where we are today. My father-in-law, Joe, was born in a boxcar to immigrant parents from Mexico. With just an eighth grade education, he worked the line at John Deere Harvester Works in East Moline, Illinois. And because of organized labor, he earned an honest wage and benefits for his hard work. He was able to provide for his family and make sure his four children had a better life and more opportunities than he did.

Joe's youngest son is Gerry, my husband, who, with the help of organized labor, has helped lift our own family to success. I'm proud of my husband's nearly 30-year law enforcement career, and he is now the undersheriff of Rock Island County, where I live, and the commander of the Quad-City Bomb Squad.

I know my family story is not unique about how organized labor helped lift us and that so many American families share this same type of experience. Far too many people across this great Nation of ours are still struggling but are still hopeful that, if they work hard and play by the rules, they too can live the American Dream.

Unfortunately, the bill before us today tells American workers they're on their own. Instead of adding certainty and stability to our communities, this bill creates chaos and undermines decades of progress.

My amendment pleads for just a morsel of common sense. It provides a few simple but critical exceptions to the chaos that the bill otherwise promises. It protects workers who have risked their lives for our country on the battlefields abroad. These are heroes like Clarence Adams, who was among the first American marines to set foot in Iraq 10 years ago.

After Clarence returned home, he tried to exercise his right to organize at his workplace. The election was held, the union won, and then the union busting began. Clarence and 21 of his fellow workers were even fired at one point. He had one place to go, and that was to turn to the National Labor Relations Board.

Voting for this bill means stripping away those rights for Clarence and countless other brave veterans. My amendment would protect the rights of veterans to organize in the workplace.

As far too many hardworking families across our Nation feel each day, our economy is still healing.

I pledged to fight for the American worker, and that's a pledge I'm committed to keeping. The middle class is stronger because of organized labor.

If a company takes American jobs and outsources them overseas simply to avoid the formation of a union, that must not be allowed. My amendment would protect these jobs.

If a foreign company abuses our American workers' rights, we need a strong NLRB to stand up for them. My amendment does this.

If American workers face dangerous working conditions that could cost them their lives and they seek the right to organize for their own protection, we need the NLRB to function on their behalf.

If a person faces sexual harassment at the workplace or a worker faces racial discrimination, they should be allowed to join with their coworkers so they can address these issues. My amendment gives these workers a voice.

The NLRB was created to decide cases on a fair and an independent basis and has traditionally been made up of both Republican and Democrat Board members. It is there to fight for the rights of workers and the middle class against the worst abuses. They are depending on us.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote ''yes'' to put aside partisanship and begin focusing on the middle class and to remember all those people getting up early, working hard, and playing by the rules who deserve the same chance that my family has had to realize the American Dream.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, this is an interesting political stunt.

My friends on the other side had ample opportunity, both in committee markup and before the Rules Committee, to offer an amendment of this nature. They did not.

It does nothing to fix the problem that we're faced with today. Making an exception in statute that says a Board that has been ruled unconstitutional can act any way for some people and not for others, frankly, makes no sense.

I'll stand behind no one in my desire to protect our men and women in uniform, those who are serving and those who have served, but that's not what this motion to recommit is really about.

Our bill brings certainty and an impetus to our friends at the other side of the Capitol to move the President to fix a dysfunctional National Labor Relations Board that can address the very issues that my colleagues have brought up.

I urge defeat of the motion to recommit and support the underlying bill.

With that, 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.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 197, nays 229, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—197

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—229

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus

Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Barton
Castor (FL)
Garamendi
Maloney, Carolyn
McCaul
Ros-Lehtinen

□ 1200

Messrs. GOSAR, BRADY of Texas, and CHAFFETZ changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. FATTAH, DEFAZIO, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. LEE of California, and Messrs. RAHALL and HUFFMAN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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 219, noes 209, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

AYES—219

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—209

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—4

Barton
Castor (FL)
Maloney, Carolyn
Ros-Lehtinen

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1210

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 277, nays 131, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

YEAS—277

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clay
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Grayson
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Himes
Hinojosa
Horsford
Huffman
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lipinski
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)

McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thornberry
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Vela
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (IN)

NAYS—131

Amash
Andrews
Bass
Benishek
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Chu
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conyers
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crowley
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
Duckworth
Duffy
Edwards
Enyart
Fitzpatrick
Foxx
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibson
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lewis
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Markey
Matheson
McDermott
McGovern
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schock
Sires
Slaughter
Southerland
Stivers
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Owens

NOT VOTING—23

Barton
Bishop (NY)
Burgess
Camp
Castor (FL)
Coble
Crawford
Davis, Rodney
Duncan (TN)
Fincher
Garcia
Gibbs
Gohmert
Hanna
Higgins
Hultgren
Maloney, Carolyn
Quigley
Ros-Lehtinen
Smith (NE)
Watt
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 1217

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1220

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Virginia, the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

On Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes for the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

On Friday, no votes are expected.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business today.

In addition, we expect a robust debate next week on the importance of our Nation's cybersecurity. The House will consider a number of bipartisan bills to reduce the obstacles to voluntary information-sharing between the private sector and government, secure our Nation's infrastructure, better protect government systems, and combat foreign threats.

A number of committees will bring bills to the floor next week, Mr. Speaker, including the Intelligence, Oversight and Government Reform, and Science Committees. In the coming months, I expect to continue to address cybersecurity legislation from additional committees, including Homeland Security and Judiciary.

Of the bills coming to the floor, we will consider H.R. 624, the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act, under a rule. This important legislation is authored by Chairman MIKE ROGERS and cosponsored by Ranking Member DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. I want to share his view that the cybersecurity legislation is critically important legislation. I know that there are still continuing differences with reference to the protection of individual citizens' privacy on this legislation, but I also know, as the gentleman has indicated, the critical nature of providing access and exchange of information so that we can protect Americans, protect our country, and protect our intellectual property and commercial property. So I would hope and expect that we would be working together in a bipartisan way to make sure that we can reach consensus so that we can see a bill signed.

I want to say that I know that both you and I are pleased that Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER have been working so closely together in a bipartisan fashion to accomplish this objective.

Mr. Leader, I hope you've noticed that earlier this week I gave a speech with reference to Make It In America. In that speech, I want you to know, if you missed it, I mentioned the jobs bill. I made a little fun of the jobs bill, as you recall, when you put it on the floor, but we all voted for it because it was a good bill. We put together five or six bills that had bipartisan support as they passed the House and Senate.

□ 1230

We put them together, the President signed that bill, they were a step forward, they were part of our Make It In America agenda on our side and your jobs expansion, growth expansion on your side.

What I said in my speech on Make it in America, which refers to manufacturing in America, growing things in America, selling them here and around the world, and doing what Americans are hopeful that we are focused on, and that is creating jobs, in that speech, Mr. Leader, I said that we needed to focus on four particular priorities.

Number one, adopting and pursuing a national manufacturing strategy. As I'm sure you know, Mr. Leader, last Congress we passed the Lipinski bill, which came out of committee in a bipartisan fashion and passed this House in a bipartisan fashion. Unfortunately, it did not pass the Senate.

You and I both know that if you're going to win, if you're going to succeed, you're going to have to have a plan to do so. This speaks to the coming together of business, labor, entrepreneurs, investors, as well as government, in terms of the partnership that we can play in ensuring that we are making things in America and that goods around the world have on them ''Made in America.''

Secondly, we want to promote U.S. exports. You and I, Mr. Leader, have worked on that. We worked on that in a bipartisan fashion. This was another part of what we call Make It In America, the Export-Import Act. Your staff and my staff worked very diligently together to get that done, and we passed it in a bipartisan fashion.

The third part of the Make It In America agenda focus would be encouraging manufacturers to bring jobs home. I think we have, Mr. Leader, an excellent opportunity, given the context of where we find ourselves, where salaries are going up overseas, where it is more expensive now to ship goods back to the United States because of transportation costs, the largest market in the world.

And, fourthly, as the gentleman knows, while there have been some differences, the President has expressed, you've expressed, I've expressed, our need to expand our energy supply, and particularly as we see the natural gas technology advancing, that the United States of America is going to be one of the least expensive energy venues in the world and have one of the best supplies in the world, which perhaps no one would have predicted 20 years ago but is a fact, all of which ought to go to helping us reinvigorate, expand manufacturing, and create middle class jobs, paying good wages and providing good benefits.

Lastly, we want to ensure that we invest. And I notice the gentleman sent out a memo to your Members. I don't think we purloined a copy, but we did get a copy. You talked about investing and making sure that the quality of life and jobs were available for working Americans. We need to make sure that we invest, as you pointed out, as we believe strongly, in education and infrastructure and innovation, to make sure that we have the training necessary for people to be able to perform the jobs that are going to be required in the growing economy and the global marketplace.

I say all that, Mr. Leader, to suggest that I would like to sit down with you so that we can talk together about how we mutually can move forward on what, as I say, we call a Make It In America agenda, but a jobs agenda, a growing the American economy agenda. I know you've been focused on that, we're focused on that. I'm hopeful we can do that, I think it will be positive for our country, and I think Americans will feel good about it.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and really appreciate his remarks and willingness to sit down and see where we can find areas of agreement. Because as the gentleman and I have both expressed on this floor on many occasions, there is plenty of disagreement and no shortage of supply in this town of that.

On the bigger issues of the fiscal situation of the country, we still struggle, Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, on trying to come together. But I listened to the gentleman, and I know he's very committed, and has been to his agenda, Make It In America. As the gentleman knows, I gave a talk earlier this year at the American Enterprise Institute, which I spoke of an agenda of trying to make life work for more working people in this country.

There is a lot in common that we have in these two programs, if you will. Because we talk about the kinds of things that will help working families, that will help working people get a job again. The gentleman's intention in a national manufacturing strategy, I'm sure, is to increase job availability; make sure that we have more American jobs.

We also have a skills problem. We passed the SKILLS Act on the floor a couple of weeks ago. My hope is we can increase bipartisan support for things like that, because it was simply an attempt to respond to a GAO recommendation where there are 50 different job-training programs at the Federal level. Certainly we can do better than that. Certainly we can streamline and still protect the kinds of individuals that the statute asks us to, or requires protection of—the veterans, the folks who are on limited income that we can help put in place for employment. Because, after all, all of us believe that we are a society built on hard work, built on playing by the rules and getting ahead. So, I welcome the gentleman's commitment to those type of things.

He mentions the need for us to invest and to look to the future. In fact, I have not only a budget and a spending plan of the future, but a real mentality on this floor of how we can work together for all Americans. I have talked a lot about this in this making life work for people and for families. Really, the priority that we place in this country on medical research, on research and development, because it is the seed corn of the future.

While we are constrained by the current fiscal situation, it does bring to life setting priorities. We're not going to be able to fund everything, but certainly we can agree on trying to find medical cures, trying to understand how we can better discover therapies, treatments, so people can live longer and have a better quality of life. These are the kinds of things I look forward to working on with the gentleman as well, and I accept his invitation and look forward to being able to sit down.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that.

Following on his observation, clearly what he says is we need to focus on priorities. I think he's absolutely right on that. I think one of the sad things is we have passed a fiscal posture in this country presently that does not focus on priorities, unfortunately, and that's called sequester, which, in effect, looks across the board at cutting both the highest priorities and the lowest priorities in similar ways.

I would hope that we could obviate the sequester. I think it's bad for the country, I think it's bad for our future, I think it's bad for the growth in our economy. I would hope that we could also work on that.

And towards that end I would say, Mr. Leader, you have talked about, and, in fact, we passed legislation that was designed to encourage and to require the passage of a budget by the Senate. The Senate has now passed a budget, we have passed a budget, the President has now presented a budget, so that we have three alternatives on the table now.

I would hope that as soon as the Senate passes its bill to us, which I expect to be shortly, that we would go to conference in pursuance of an agreement which will give us a fiscally sustainable path for this country, give us confidence in this country that Congress can work, that the Nation's board of directors can work, in coming to a balanced compromise with respect to how we move forward with the finances of America. Now that we have, as I say, a Senate-passed budget, a House-passed budget, a budget presented by the President of the United States, obviously, there are things that each person in the country can disagree with and agree with presumably on each one of those budgets.

□ 1240

I would hope that we would be going to conference as soon as possible so that we could address this critically important objective.

I ask the gentleman if he has any information with respect to the intention to go to conference as soon as we receive the Senate bill, which, as I say, I think will be shortly.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, I, too, am glad that we have finally seen the Senate act and pass a budget. That is an accomplishment in and of itself. And the President also has finally proposed his budget. So the gentleman is right that we've got some things on the table that maybe we can start to discuss.

I know that Chairman RYAN and Chairman MURRAY are already in discussions about a path forward, and I look forward to the results of those discussions. And in concert with the gentleman's point earlier about setting priorities, it just seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the best way forward is to find areas where we agree and let's go make some progress on those things. Again, this town is full of division and disagreement, but there are things we have in common, in agreement in these three documents that I believe we can work on together.

Mr. HOYER. I would simply observe—and he knows this as well as I do—that there will be an agreement on things that he perhaps does not agree with and there will be things in the agreement that perhaps I will not agree with. The secret, in my view, of getting agreement is going to be to have a comprehensive agreement that accomplishes the objective of bringing our finances to a fiscally sustainable path that's credible and believed by not only the economy, by investors, by the American people, but also by the international community.

We've talked a lot about confidence, as I've indicated, in the past. You've talked a lot about confidence in the past. I think we all agree that our economy needs confidence to grow as robustly as we want it to create the kinds of jobs we want.

Toward that end, can the gentleman tell me what plans we have at this point in time for the debt limit extension? I know there's some discussion of bringing a bill to the floor which will deal with that issue. Can the gentleman perhaps elaborate on what the

plans are with respect to the debt limit that confronts us that will hit sometime around May 19?

And I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman has indicated, Mr. Speaker, the majority has committed itself to a budget that balances in 10 years. It is our desire that we can come to some agreement on how to do that. This is where the difficulty, again, comes in, where the President's proposal and budget raises a lot of new revenues. Some estimates have indicated it will create a trillion dollars in new taxes and won't ever balance.

So we've certainly got a gulf between us, but it is our intention to work together to avoid the situation of default; and we are and do intend to consider a bill that will ensure we meet our legal obligations and do not default on our debt, which I'm sure the gentleman agrees with me, Mr. Speaker, is the responsible thing to do.

Mr. HOYER. I certainly agree that defaulting on the debt is an extraordinarily irresponsible thing to do, and, in fact, we shouldn't do it. In fact, we shouldn't use it as a leverage point, in my view, to pretend that somehow going over the debt limit without extension is an acceptable political leverage point for either side.

Both sides have sort of blamed the other for the deficits as we've confronted these debt limits. We've never come close, except in August of 2011, to defaulting, which was the first time, as the gentleman knows, when we were downgraded by 1 point by S&P. That's an irresponsible policy. I agree with the gentleman.

Let me say that the advantage of a conference on this issue will be that transparently the American public will see the debate. The gentleman indicates a 10-year objective of balancing the budget without revenues. I personally believe that's impossible.

I've said on this floor that if there were no Democrats in the Congress of the United States, either in the Senate or the House, that, frankly, your side of the aisle could not pass either the appropriation bills or the revenue bills or tax cuts that are suggested in Mr. RYAN's budget, which would accomplish your objective. I think we'll never know that, which is, I think, a happy circumstance on your side that that will never be put to the test.

Having said that, I would hope that we could get to a place where we say the debt limit is not going to be subject to political maneuvering.

Furthermore, let me say that the bill that we've been hearing about—in The Wall Street Journal there was an article that appeared just yesterday, I think:

> Fitch Ratings, a credit-rating firm, said Tuesday it wasn't clear whether the Treasury legally could prioritize bond payments over other government obligations.

And it went on to say:

> If it did so, Fitch added, it was very likely the firm would downgrade its AAA rating of the U.S. debt.

In other words, even if we say we're going to pay the debts or, as some people have said, even if we say we're going to pay the Chinese first and not invest in those things such as basic biomedical research—to which the gentleman referred, and I share his view of that being a priority of our country—and cut those as we pay the Chinese or other creditor nations back for what we borrowed, that would not be in the best interest of the United States.

I would say that in both instances, either pretending that we're going to go over the debt limit and avoid it by simply paying the debt first and then cutting other things in some sort of order, neither of those policies is consistent, I think, with our responsibilities as Members of Congress.

I will tell you that we will do it on a bipartisan basis, Mr. Leader. I use a very simple example for my constituents. You go to Macy's. You take out your Macy's credit card and you buy $200 worth of goods. You go home. Next week, you and your wife are sitting around the table or you and your husband are sitting around the table, and you say, You know, we're really in debt too much. We're going to limit it to $100. So Macy's sends you the bill for 200 bucks. You send them back a check for $100 and say, Sorry, we have a debt limit of $100. Macy's writes you back and says, We're sorry, too. We're not going to give you any additional credit and we're going to sue you. That's our debt limit.

The debt limit, you and I both know, is not realistic. It's much more a political and demagoguing way of dealing with one another and dealing with the finances of this country.

I would hope that you and the Speaker—both of whom I know have said not extending the debt limit is not a viable or a responsible option. I would hope that we could make that clear, that we're not going to do that and, in a bipartisan way, extend it, and perhaps extend it early enough so that it doesn't become even an item of consideration by any of the rating agencies or the international community.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I would just respond to the gentlemen by saying this in terms of the family he talked about going to Macy's and making the charge of $200. I think most families would also think it's prudent to figure out how they're going to pay that bill before they go about incurring it, and that is the spirit in which I think the majority approaches the debt ceiling to say, How are we going to tell the people that we're going to pay off the debt that we've now gone ahead and incurred?

I think a little bit of forethought here, planning into the future how we are going to pay the bills, is the emphasis. I've always agreed, as the gentleman said, the debt ceiling is something that is necessary for the operations of government. We'll bring a bill forward that will ensure that we don't go into default. But I do think that we should be mindful of how we're going to tell the public we're going to go into the future and pay off these debts. Because, as the gentleman, who has many children and grandchildren, he doesn't want his kids, nor do I want mine, to be shouldering the debts and paying our bills.

□ 1250

We should be really committing ourselves not to just borrowing more, not to just taking more from taxpayer dollars, because we've done a lot of that this year already. When the gentleman talks about the need to proceed with revenues, we already have close to $650 billion of additional static revenues—taxes that are accounted for because of the fiscal cliff deal. So it's not that there are no revenues in the mix here.

Again, I look forward to working with the gentleman. I appreciate his commitment to longevity in this country, to sustaining economic growth or to at least restarting it again so we can sustain it, and look forward to joining him in that effort.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

The way to do that plan of how to amortize our debt and invest in the priorities of this country—education, innovation, infrastructure, other basic biomedical research to which the gentleman referred—is to have a budget. That's the plan that the gentleman refers to. The way to get to a budget is to go to conference and come to an agreement.

However, I will tell my friend what the problem we've had is: reaching compromise, and it's going to be necessary to compromise. As the gentleman observed and as I know, we have very substantial differences, but if the differences continue to create gridlock and no action, those children of which you spoke and I speak are going to suffer, so I would hope that we could move forward.

The President's budget, I will tell the gentleman and as he probably knows, has about an almost 3–1 ratio between cuts and additional revenues, which is essentially, approximately, what most on the bipartisan commission—some have been 2–1, some 2.5–1—have recommended. I know the gentleman disagrees with that ratio, but it is certainly the President's view, which I share, that he has made a very positive proposal whether you agree with it or not, and a number of your Members have observed that it's a useful document.

Given that context, hopefully, we can go to conference. Hopefully, we can come to agreement. Hopefully, we can see compromise reached, and hopefully put our country on the fiscally sustainable path that it needs to be.

I yield back the balance of my time.

MODIFYING THE REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE STOCK ACT

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (S. 716) to modify the requirements under the STOCK Act regarding online access to certain financial disclosure statements and related forms, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICE of South Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 716

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. MODIFICATIONS OF ONLINE ACCESS TO CERTAIN FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS AND RELATED FORMS.

(a) PUBLIC, ONLINE DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE FORMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except with respect to financial disclosure forms filed by officers and employees referred to in paragraph (2), section 8(a) and section 11(a) of the STOCK Act (5 U.S.C. App. 105 note) shall not be effective.

(2) EXEMPTED OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.—The officer and employees referred to in paragraph (1) are the following:

(A) The President.

(B) The Vice President.

(C) Any Member of Congress.

(D) Any candidate for Congress.

(E) Any officer occupying a position listed in section 5312 or section 5313 of title 5, United States Code, having been nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate to that position.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1 of the Act entitled ''An Act to change the effective date for the internet publication of certain information to prevent harm to the national security or endangering the military officers and civilian employees to whom the publication requirement applies, and for other purposes'' is repealed.

(b) ELECTRONIC FILING AND ONLINE AVAILABILITY.—

(1) FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND CANDIDATES.—Section 8(b) of the STOCK Act (5 U.S.C. App. 105 note) is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking '', OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE, AND CONGRESSIONAL STAFF'';

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''18 months after the date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''January 1, 2014'';

(ii) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

''(B) public access to—

''(i) financial disclosure reports filed by Members of Congress and candidates for Congress,

''(ii) reports filed by Members of Congress and candidates for Congress of a transaction disclosure required by section 103(l) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, and

''(iii) notices of extensions, amendments, and blind trusts, with respect to financial disclosure reports described in clauses (i) and (ii),

pursuant to title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 101 et seq.), through databases that are maintained on the official websites of the House of Representatives and the Senate.'';

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking the first two sentences; and

(ii) in the last sentence, by striking ''under this section'' and inserting ''under paragraph (1)(B)'';

(D) in paragraph (3), by striking ''under this subsection'' and inserting ''under paragraph (1)(B)'';

(E) in paragraph (4), by inserting ''be able to'' after ''shall''; and

(F) in paragraph (5), by striking ''under this subsection'' and inserting ''under paragraph (1)(B)''.

(2) FOR EXECUTIVE BRANCH OFFICIALS.—Section 11(b) of the STOCK Act (5 U.S.C. App. 105 note) is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''EMPLOYEES'' and inserting ''OFFICIALS'' ;

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''18 months after the date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''January 1, 2014'';

(ii) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

''(B) public access to—

''(i) financial disclosure reports filed by the President, the Vice President, and any officer occupying a position listed in section 5312 or section 5313 of title 5, United States Code, having been nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate to that position,

''(ii) reports filed by any individual described in clause (i) of a transaction disclosure required by section 103(l) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, and

''(iii) notices of extensions, amendments, and blind trusts, with respect to financial disclosure reports described in clauses (i) and (ii),

pursuant to title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 101 et seq.), through databases that are maintained on the official website of the Office of Government Ethics.'';

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking the first two sentences; and

(ii) in the last sentence, by striking ''under this section'' and inserting ''under paragraph (1)(B)'';

(D) in paragraph (3), by striking ''under this subsection'' and inserting ''under paragraph (1)(B)'';

(E) in paragraph (4), by inserting ''be able to'' after ''shall''; and

(F) in paragraph (5), by striking ''under this subsection'' and inserting ''under paragraph (1)(B)''.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 15, 2013

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

RESTORING THE HEALTHY MANAGEMENT OF OUR NATIONAL FORESTS

(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, over a century ago, the Federal Government pledged to actively manage our forests when Congress created the National Forest System. This management includes activities such as prescribed fires and thinning—and, yes, timber harvesting is a core part of this duty. A portion of the revenues reaped from the forests would go to the counties containing National Forest lands in order to supplant the lost local tax revenues. Unfortunately, the Federal Government has failed to uphold this commitment.

One example is revealed when you compare the harvests of adjacent lands. In the Fifth District of Pennsylvania, the Collins Pine Company currently owns 120,000 acres in the Allegheny Plateau, an area adjacent to the Allegheny National Forest, which totals 493,000 acres of forest land. Collins Pine sustainably harvests the same amount of timber as the entire Allegheny National Forest on less than a quarter of the acreage. This lack of adequate forest management has deprived rural counties of revenue needed to fund critical local projects such as schools and infrastructure projects.

Mr. Speaker, we must restore the active and healthy management of our national forests in order to provide a stable revenue stream for rural schools and counties and to help build back these robust local economies.

PRESERVING THE LINCOLN TRAIN STATION IN GETTYSBURG

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

Mr. PERRY. To help commemorate the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg and the Gettysburg Address, I have introduced legislation, H.R. 1513, to preserve the historic Lincoln Train Station in Gettysburg.

President Abraham Lincoln arrived at the Lincoln Train Station on November 18, 1863, prior to delivering the Gettysburg Address the following day. Listed on the National Register of Historic Places, the Lincoln Train Station also served as a hospital during the Battle of Gettysburg, transporting wounded soldiers after the battle.

The National Park Service plans to utilize this station as a downtown Gettysburg information center. The intent of this legislation is to preserve this historic site without using any hard-earned tax dollars. The legislation also expands the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include 45 acres of donated land along Plum Run in Cumberland Township. This legislation specifically forbids the use of eminent domain for the acquisition of either property and will not utilize any Federal funds.

I applaud the efforts of the Gettysburg Foundation and the Gettysburg National Military Park to increase public understanding of the heritage and lasting significance of Gettysburg and Gettysburg's place within the context of the American Civil War.

IN HONOR OF THE 236TH BIRTHDAY OF HENRY CLAY

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of what would be the 236th birthday of Henry Clay, who once represented the same district which I am honored to serve today.

As one of Kentucky's most celebrated statesmen, Henry Clay proved that an unwavering dedication to principle and a practical commitment to compromise are not incompatible values. As the ''Great Compromiser'' himself demonstrated, they are instead the tools of statesmanship. Henry Clay was focused on saving the country, and he resolved to enact substantial solutions, not short-term fixes that merely pushed the problems onto the backs of future generations.

As we consider how to deal with the almost $17 trillion national debt and as a proud graduate of Henry Clay High School, I call on my colleagues in Congress to remember Henry Clay's resolve because now is a time to come together in the spirit of statesmanship in order to cut spending and balance our budget for the sake of future generations.

SAVE AMERICA COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION ACT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Throughout the week, we have been hearing from souls who have asked us to have mercy on them and to pass comprehensive immigration reform. Thousands came to petition the government. There were mothers and fathers and children, and I am listening to their cries, as America has listened and as the Statue of Liberty often said: to bring you those who were in need but wanted to serve this Nation.

Today, I introduced Save America Comprehensive Immigration Act, H.R. 1525, to have earned access to citizenship, family reunification, border security, supporting our Border Patrol agents, and a number of items that will bring us together. I hope that we can move this legislation forward.

Let me quickly say that 50 of us signed a letter this week to stop the filibuster on sensible gun legislation. Thank goodness the other body now will move forward to answer the cries of other Americans who have been the victims of gun violence. It is certainly in keeping with the Second Amendment that we have the opportunity to have universal background checks, to rid ourselves of assault weapons and multiple rounds that have killed many in the various mass killings, and to have the ability to help those who have mental health needs.

We can do this as Americans and as Members of Congress. I ask that we move forward and respond to the American people.

□ 1300

HONORING WILLIAM BOOTH GARDNER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 15, last month, William Booth Gardner passed away in his home in Tacoma, Washington, after courageously battling the ravages of Parkinson's disease for about 20 years. Born in 1936, he was 76 years old.

Booth Gardner will be remembered for many things. He will be remembered as Washington State's 19th Governor, having served from 1985 to 1993. He voluntarily retired after two terms, with sky-high job approval ratings, and was subsequently appointed as ambassador to GATT, now known as the World Trade Organization, by his good friend, President Bill Clinton.

He will be remembered as a person of means—some would say considerable means—who began his lifelong pattern of ''pay it forward'' by volunteering to work with children in the inner city while he was still in college. He even coached Jimi Hendrix in football.

He will be remembered for turning around a scandal-ridden Pierce County government as its first elected county executive and bringing it into the 20th century.

He will be remembered for his impish sense of humor. At the end of the long campaign for the aforementioned county executive position, so familiar was he with his opponent's speech that he delivered it, verbatim, at the last campaign appearance. It was the only time his opponent was left both figuratively and literally speechless.

Booth Gardner will be remembered for leading Washington State through a stunning era of progress. He was a national leader in civil rights. He appointed our State's first African American to the United States Supreme Court. He signed an executive order banning discrimination against gays and lesbians in the State workforce way back in 1995, way before it was the popular thing to do. And at the time he said, The only thing I care about is if they are competent to do the job.

He pushed forward a trainload of environmental protections. For example, he signed an order protecting wetlands, knowing their importance to ensuring clean water, while most of the rest of us were still thinking about wetlands as kind of like large mud puddles.

He was a national education leader. He chaired the Education Commission of the States and fought for standards before that was popular. He expanded choice for students and restored a then-deteriorating higher education funding system.

He leveraged his very considerable private sector experience to be a great manager of State government, implementing—again, before it was popular—commonsense ideas like a rainy-day fund and life-cycle capital budgeting.

But Governor Gardner really shined in health care. When he chaired the National Governors Association, he triggered the national debate on health care and for improving access for low-income families and containing costs for all of us.

Booth Gardner will also be remembered for the Academy Award-nominated documentary that bore his name, Booth Gardner's Last Campaign. It eloquently told the story of his successful advocacy in our State of the Death with Dignity initiative, which was overwhelmingly approved by the voters.

I'm often asked about how and when I first met Booth. It was 40 years ago this year. I was a 20-year-old very lowly clerk in the Washington State House of Representatives. I took paperwork over to the chair of the Senate Education Committee. And to my great surprise, then-State Senator Booth Gardner invited me into his office, never having met me, and simply said, Sit down and tell me about yourself, DENNY. Little did I know that day that, many years later, I would have the unbelievable honor to serve as his chief of staff.

Booth Gardner will be remembered for many things; but mostly I think he will be remembered for governing when government actually worked, and it was due in no small part to his steadfast commitment to civility, respectfulness, and collaboration.

For my own part, I will remember him as boss, mentor, and the truest and dearest of friends.

I now yield to my very good friend, the gentleman from the Seventh Congressional District of Washington State, Dr. MCDERMOTT.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Thank you very much, DENNY.

Although it makes me sad for the reason we are speaking here today, I am honored to say a few words about my friend, Governor Booth Gardner.

A lot of people will remember us as adversaries, and that's true for a brief time. We ran against each other for Governor in 1984, and I lost. Now, it might come as a surprise to you, but I didn't particularly like losing. And so after the election, I went off to a place I had up in the San Juan Islands to lick my wounds on Lopez Island. It's exactly there where Booth found me a few days later. He called and said, I'm going to be up in the area. I have a place over on Shaw Island, and I'll come over and see you. And so he drove his boat over and we met.

I had a 40-acre farm, and we walked around the property four times, talking about our visions, about the State, about the election, about the campaign, and where we wanted the State

to go, because Booth and I both loved the State of Washington. By the time we landed on my front doorstep, we'd solved all of Washington's problems.

Booth had a unique characteristic which I think DENNY alluded to, and that is we had a Senator in the State by the name of Warren Magnuson who used to say you can get a lot of things done if you don't care who gets the credit for them. Booth really did believe that.

I'd been working on a basic health plan for the working poor in the State for a number of years before he got to be Governor, and I hadn't been able to get it through the Republican Governor and the Republicans in the legislature. It was my passion project: giving the poor who fell outside of Medicaid but were working an opportunity to buy into the health care system in some way. It was one of those gaps between what the Federal Government did and what the private insurers and the employers were doing, and there were lots of people who were working full time but couldn't get health care.

So we put together this program. He told me that day when we were talking around that he would do everything he could to get it passed, and he kept his word—also unusual in politicians. He put everything he had into it. And when it was finished, he signed it in the middle of my district in a little clinic called Country Doctor in the middle of the city on Capitol Hill.

That bill has helped the working poor of Washington all over the State get medical care and is one of the first public options. It's so good for the State of Washington that Senator CANTWELL took it and put it into the Affordable Care Act. It's now in the blueprint for the safety net that we are developing in this session of Congress.

So Booth lived on beyond his days. His ideas, his willingness to make something happen, carried into the future, and he never walked around telling anybody about it, just did it. That walk with me, a couple of rivals, was really the beginning of it all.

It wasn't only health care. I was the Ways and Means chairman in the Senate, so I had a lot to do with how the budget got put together. But it doesn't matter if you're the Ways and Means chairman or not, if the Governor won't sign it, you can't get it passed. He and I had lots of talks.

He was willing to sign a bill that created the largest settlement for women workers in this country under equal pay for equal work. He signed it after a lawsuit that the State had lost, and I convinced him that we ought to settle the case and let women move ahead in the workplace, and Booth said, Good idea.

□ 1310

Finding a partner like Booth, one who's willing to get past politics and jump in the deep end with you on some issues that weren't exactly sort of centrist—sometimes he took some real risks—is not a very common thing in politics. But with Booth it was common. The best interests of the State always came first.

Although, occasionally I would go over to his office to find him and they would say, well, he's gone. Well, where is he? Well, he's gone up to coach his girls soccer team in Tacoma.

He had all kinds of interests and all kinds of concerns about kids, and he was willing to put everything he had into it, both in the office and out of the office.

Now, some of his most important work, in my view, and what shows his real character and why I feel bad today, is that when he left the Governor's mansion, he was in apparently good shape, as far as we knew; went off to Geneva to work for the GATT trade organization, and while he was over there, the diagnosis was made of Parkinsonism.

Parkinsonism is a very, very difficult disease to cope with. Your mind is active, everything is active; your body just won't cooperate. And Booth had this disease and struggled with it for 20 years, as you've heard.

Now, death is a frightening thing for all of us to think about. None of us want to think about death. It's not something that's usual table conversation or much of a conversation out here on the floor. But Booth was willing to look at it straight on, and he was willing to talk about it in a way that few other people were.

He wanted to talk about what people's options were; and he saw the suffering, he was going through it himself, and felt that everyone should have the right to choose how they want to end their life. In a final directive, when you go into the hospital, you tell them whether you want them to resuscitate you or not. All of that, he looked at all of that.

And the one thing that was obvious to him was that there comes a time when there is no hope, and there is no question when it's going to happen; and people ought to have the right to make their own decision at that point. It's called death with dignity.

Now, he took that issue on. Here's a man who's struggling with a debilitating disease of his own, no political advantage whatsoever in doing it, none. But he came and spent his time. He was sick; it was hard for him to get up and talk. Sometimes he could only talk a few sentences and then someone else would have to take the podium because he was unable to continue.

There weren't any donors watching. There was no election to be prepared for. It wasn't even an issue that affected him directly, because the requirement of the law was that you had to have two doctors say that you had only 6 months to live, and with Parkinsonism, it's not possible for any physician to say that. So it wasn't something he was doing for himself. It was because he thought it was right for the people of the State of Washington.

You rarely find someone with that ability to get out of their own self-interest. He just believed in it. He believed that it was best for the people of Washington, and he wasn't going to let his sickness or anything else stop him from getting it done, and it passed by about a 54 percent majority.

Booth was a great man. They say people are—they pass twice, once when they die, and once when people stop telling stories about him. The stories will never stop about Booth. I could stand up here and tell them for a long time.

But he was a great man. He was a good Governor, he was a good father, he was a good husband, and he was my partner and my friend, and I'll miss him very much.

Rest in peace, Booth.

I yield now to DOC HASTINGS, from Pasco, Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank my other colleague from Washington (Mr. HECK) for having this Special Order.

I didn't know Governor Gardner that well. We come from different political parties. That's one reason why you don't probably build a close association. But also my last 2 years in the legislature was his first 2 years as Governor, so I don't have the special relationship that Mr. HECK and Mr. MCDERMOTT had with him.

But the one characteristic that I did realize with him has been talked about a great deal by my colleagues, and that is that he was a very friendly guy. When Mr. HECK was on the floor just a moment ago saying, as a clerk, you know, he'd call him into his office and treated him like an equal. And I found that characteristic the same in my 2 years when I was in the legislature with Mr. HECK, or with Governor Gardner, even when we were the minority party at that time.

But probably the story that I remember best on a personal note dealt with my daughter. In the Washington Legislature, and I assume other legislatures are the same way, when sine die comes, it is done at precisely the same time. And the doors of the House Chamber are open, the doors of the Senate Chamber are open, and the joint rules require that the gavel drop at the same time. So, you know, it has to be organized and so forth.

And my oldest daughter happened to be a page on that sine die. It was going to be my last sine die, as a matter of fact. So I told her, why don't you go behind the House podium, and you can see how that works. And so she kind of snuck behind there and managed to get that view.

And then after sine die, typically, in the Washington Legislature there are a number of get-togethers. The Governor's Office happens to be on the floor right below the Senate Chamber, and parties are going on and so forth.

So my daughter changed because we were going to drive home, and she put

on a sweatshirt. And the sweatshirt was a remembrance of her going to the State volleyball finals. And so she had a bunch of names, all of her classmates wrote their names on there.

So we walked down to the Governor's Office, and he looked at her and grabbed her and, you know, wanted to know what all the names were, what happened, did they win the championship, I mean, all this sort of stuff, just, I guess, so typical of the type of individual that Governor Gardner was.

So I can't talk about the policies that my previous colleagues spoke about, but I can tell about that one particular issue. And it just turns out that my daughter is here in town this weekend with her three daughters, and we were talking about that last night. And she says, yeah, you know, I do remember that, where he kind of put his arm around me and made me feel very welcome.

So he was a Governor that was forward-looking. I know he's thought about very, very well. My part of the State is a whole lot different than the other part of the State politically; but there's no question that, at least in his second term, he did very, very well in my part of the State. I didn't necessarily like that, but that's part of politics.

So he will be missed; and the editorials around the State that spoke of him, I think, were very true. But just from a standpoint of personality, that's my association with him. And he certainly will be missed.

With that, I'd like to yield to one of the newest colleagues from the State of Washington, the gentleman from the Sixth District, Mr. KILMER.

Mr. KILMER. Thank you. And thank you to all of my colleagues from Washington State who spoke before me. I'm batting clean-up and have the unique position of having neither served with Booth Gardner nor having run against him.

But I actually met him when I was a kid. There's no doubt that Booth Gardner's legacy of accomplishments is impressive, and I could stand here and list them off, both from his role as Governor and for his involvement on trade issues at the Federal level.

But I think it says more about the kind of man Booth Gardner was when we don't just talk about what he accomplished, but we talk about what kind of man he was. As someone who met him as a kid, I was just very much struck by the fact that he was exceedingly civil and very, very kind and seemed to have interest in every person he represented.

Regardless of one's race or religion or orientation or gender or economic status, he seemed to care about every person he represented, including a little kid in Port Angeles, Washington, where I was born and raised.

I met Booth for the first time when I was a kid and he was a candidate and my mom was involved on his campaign.

□ 1320

I was struck by the fact that he seemed to be spending an inordinate amount of time talking to me, even though I wasn't old enough to vote. I met him again in his last year in office. As a high school senior, I received a scholarship to go off to college; and Booth, as Governor of our State at the time, was hosting a luncheon to honor all the scholarship recipients. And I remember he came over to talk to my mom and me and say hello. In that very brief interaction, I was just struck by the extent to which he seemed to care about my mom and about how much he cared about me. As an 18-year-old, I just thought it was really cool that a Governor expressed that level of interest.

Over the years, I'd run into him at political events or often at education-oriented events or events in Pierce County, where he was our first county executive. And our interactions always started in the exact same way. He'd start by saying, How's your mom? Many years later, just this last year when I decided to run for Congress, I was very touched that he came to my kickoff in Tacoma. Parkinson's, by that point, meant that he could not walk, and he struggled very deeply to express himself. I went over to thank him for coming. I kneeled down and thanked him, and I could tell he was struggling to say something. It struck me I knew he was going to ask, How's your mom? I thanked him for that, and I told him she was doing just fine.

The other thing I'll say about Booth and his legacy is the legacy he lives behind of his family. His grandson, Jack, actually interned with our campaign. He's an extraordinary young man who spoke very eloquently at the memorial service that was held in honor of Governor Gardner.

So you can look at his legacy of accomplishments when it comes to education or protecting our environment or extending health care services to folks who need it or his work to improve our economy or improve civil rights, or you can look at his extraordinary business legacy as someone who is a leader in our business community. But for me, his legacy is as a guy who truly cared about others. That's how I will remember Booth Gardner.

Today, I will tell all who are listening that my mom is doing well, but she misses Booth Gardner; I miss Booth Gardner; and the people of Washington State miss Booth Gardner.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. A lot has been going on this week and certainly worthy of discussion here at the end of the week. One of the important topics that has been discussed at both the Senate end and the House end is the issue of immigration—legal immigration and illegal immigration.

Back when my friend STEVE KING and I were meeting with people from the British Government about their handling of immigration, they were offended by the term that STEVE and I were using of ''illegal immigration.'' We were told that that's not appropriate in England. I asked what words they use, and I was told the appropriate terminology is ''irregular migrant.'' I was concerned that sounded too much like some kind of body function. I hated to use that term. Anyway, when people immigrate into a country illegally, it's illegal immigration. And it is a problem.

Anyone that goes down to the end of this Hall just outside these two doors here and heads onto the Senate floor, immediately what is seen above the President of the Senate's chair are the words ''e pluribus unum,'' Latin meaning out of many, one. I have heard a colleague before say it means out of one, many. But we all get mixed up at times. But e pluribus unum means out of many, one.

For those of us that attended public schools when and where I did, we were taught that it was immigration and the process of out of many people becoming one people, becoming Americans, is what made us strong. And the terminology for much of this country's history was that we were a ''melting pot.'' I believed it then, I believe it now, and I believe that that has been one of the great strengths that has made this country the greatest country in the history of mankind—greater than Solomon's Israel—with more liberties, more conveniences, more input into the government and into the way the government works.

My friends on this side of the aisle and everybody I know of agrees we want immigration to continue. Our country allows more immigrants into this country than any other country in the world. No other country comes close to allowing the number of people to immigrate into this country, to come with visas into this country. Nobody comes close. We are an extraordinarily generous country. And for those who have wondered about whether they should be proud of our country in the past, one of the greatest pieces of evidence would probably be the fact that people all over the world, those who hate us, those who admire us—at least a billion, maybe 1.5 billion in estimates have been made—want to come to America. There's no other country in the world that so many people would like to come to and enjoy the freedoms we have.

Unfortunately, there are many who want to come to this country to destroy the freedoms we have because they look at our country and they say, No, unless you have something like sharia law or a country in which you

have a powerful, benevolent dictator, be it religious leader or be it a benevolent secular dictator, they think we would not be nearly so decadent. I prefer our government—a government, as Lincoln said, that, under God, was of the people, by the people, and for the people. There's never been one like us.

Now, I have heard a guy call into the show of my friend, Sean Hannity, and he knew just enough history to be dangerous. He talked about our history being founded on the proposition e pluribus unum—out of many, one. He said there was never anything about God in our beginnings. This young man apparently showed his ignorance and the weakness of teachers in whatever school he grew up in. Because the fact is e pluribus unum was never our national motto, as this person thought.

From the beginning, from the 1700s, it was part of the Great Seal. The Great Seal had two sides—and still does. It's still the Great Seal of America. And on one side we have the eagle. I like the way the eagle has differed over the years. I like the way it is now better than the skinny little eagle that was there back in the 1700s. But the eagle has a ribbon through his beak and on that ribbon has always been the Latin phrase e pluribus unum—out of many, one. That's on one side of the Great Seal.

On the other side of the Great Seal is a pyramid. And that pyramid represents one of the greatest works of man. And there was a reason. Because if you read the Founders' writings, read their journals, read their letters, they believed they had within their grasp what philosophers like John Locke, Montesquieu, and so many philosophers had only dreamed about—that we might be able to govern ourselves.

□ 1330

They viewed it as a little experiment in democracy. They believed that if we did it right, that nations around the world would want to follow our example. So it was important. They recognized that this was a great achievement of man if it was done properly.

If you look on the back of a dollar bill, a one-dollar bill—if anybody still has one, Mr. Speaker—you note one side with the eagle and the e pluribus unum on the ribbon through the beak. In fact, the shield up here above the House floor doesn't have the ribbon through the beak—it's beneath the eagle—but it has those words there.

But on the other side, seeing the pyramid—you know, here's a great, well-done work of man. Above that pyramid is a triangle, and in that triangle is an eye. There is a glow around that eye to represent the all-seeing eye of God looking at the work of man. Above that is a Latin phrase that's above one of the exits down at the Senate, the Latin words ''annuit coeptis.'' Taken together, it means He, God, has smiled on our undertaking.

Beneath the pyramid are the Latin words ''novus ordo seclorum,'' meaning new order of things, new order of the ages—not new world order, as some tried to say. But the way the Founders looked at it, if we did this right, if we governed ourselves effectively and created the most free Nation in the history of the world, by the grace of God, God would smile on our undertaking and it would be a new order of things because of the other nations that may follow our example. And it is good.

I don't try to push my religious beliefs on anyone else, but it is a part of who I am. As a matter of fact, I believe it was 36, at least—most of the signers of the Declaration of Independence weren't just Christians, they were ordained Christian ministers. It's hard to imagine if over half of the Congress now, as the Continental Congress was in those days, was of made of ordained Christian ministers—and I'm not advocating that at all, I'm just historically making the note. That's where we came from. That's who was inspired to start this little experiment in democracy, not just Christians, but ordained Christian ministers. They knew if they did it right, this place would be blessed, and it would be a source of blessing for the world.

They did like the idea ''out of many, come one nation.'' That has continued today, as most of us strongly support the idea of allowing more immigration into this country than in any other country in the world. Mexico doesn't allow near the freedom for immigrants that the United States of America does. So at times it goes down a little tough to be criticized by the leaders in Mexico who demand more rights for immigrants into the United States than they would ever consider affording United States citizens who are going into Mexico. But it's true around the world.

Now, I'm told that some students are taught that we're not really a melting pot; we're more of a tossed salad, where people retain their individual natures and don't really become one people so much, we just retain individuality. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you, having studied history and continuing to study history, that is a recipe for the end of a nation. People need to come together as one people.

I find from data—and my Hispanic friends, some of them have pointed out—that actually in the Hispanic community a vast majority support the idea of having English as the official language. One of my dear friends in Tyler, whose parents immigrated from Mexico, started one of the most successful restaurant businesses there, and my friend has just branched off and started another restaurant, he said that his parents were adamant: you will speak only English in our home. Now, to be sure, his parents spoke Spanish between themselves, but his father told him: you can be anything in this country, but if you're going to be everything you can possibly be, you have to speak good English, and in doing so, you can be anything. He was right. Gus has been a city councilman, a county commissioner, he is a leader in the community—a good guy, a friend.

That's why it breaks my heart when I hear people—and it's normally of the liberal political persuasion—who say, no, no, no, we need to educate Hispanic immigrants in Spanish. Because when you study what happens in those cases, you are compelling children who could end up being President, if they're native-born Americans, President of the United States. They could be President of the country. But when you teach them in Spanish rather than English, you are relegating them to be manual laborers when they could be president of the company, not working out in the field for the company.

So that's what conservatives believe in. We want everyone to have the sky as the limit for what can be achieved. We even want, at the White House right now, we would prefer that women be compensated on an even par with men, which is not happening right now. We want everyone to be treated with equal opportunity, not to be treated equally, but with equal opportunity. Because when you take away the incentive to work hard and do well and achieve, you again are compelling a country down a path that leads to the dust bin of history.

I've related this numerous times, but in the Soviet Union, when I was an exchange student there one summer and visiting a collective farm, communist farm, a collective, socialist farm—a progressive farm, if you would prefer that, as some of my friends prefer not to be called socialists, but prefer to be called progressives—it was a progressive farm, where everyone was treated equally and everyone was paid the same number of rubles.

I was shocked, having worked on farms and ranches around east Texas growing up, because I had learned, heck, if you're going to work out like that—and back then, if you were lucky enough to get to drive a tractor instead of walking through the field hauling hay or working with cattle or horses, we didn't have cabins over the tractors. We thought it was pretty terrific if you got to drive the tractor instead of walk along and working. But here I was at this progressive farm—socialist farm, communist farm, whatever you want to call it—and most of the farmers were sitting in the shade. I had a couple of years of Russian at Texas A&M, and I spoke my best Russian at the time and asked the question, here was mid-morning, When do you work out in the field? I looked out in the field; I couldn't tell what they were working and what they hadn't. It didn't seem to be a whole lot of difference.

I couldn't really tell what they were even growing out there. It looked kind of greenish brown; none of it looked too good. This was the middle of the summer. I knew from my work that you want to start early and try to finish by three or four at the latest before

the sun gets its hottest, and here they were in the middle of this shady area, not working; didn't look like they'd worked all morning.

The people there laughed, and I thought, oops, maybe I didn't say it properly in Russian. And one of the guys responded for the group: I make the same number of rubles if I'm here in the shade or if I'm out there in the hot sun. And he said: So I'm here.

□ 1340

And there, in a nutshell, is why a progressive farm will not ever really work. Because when you give people the same amount of money to work and sweat and produce as you pay them to sit in the shade and not do anything but laugh and joke and cut up and have fun and eat snacks, then I don't care how dedicated you are, at some point you'll quit working out in the hot sun and you'll sit in the shade and no one will have food to eat. That's why socialists or progressive societies always fail.

So how does a free enterprise system fail? Free enterprise systems always fail when they become so progressive, so socialist, that they begin to reward completely the same amount for working as they do for doing nothing.

This administration has been at the head of destroying the welfare reform that was done in 1995–1996. And, yes, I'm pleased President Clinton takes credit for it now. He certainly didn't at the time. He fought the Republican majority over it over and over. He vetoed it. And when finally there were enough votes to override the veto, President Clinton signed it, and now he takes credit for it. But it was welfare reform.

And what you learn from that, if you go back and do the studies—and I was surprised, knowing the liberal bent of Harvard, to be at Harvard for a seminar and have a dean have charts that said, since the Great Society legislation started in the sixties, here is a chart of single mothers' income when adjusted for inflation; and the graph showed a flat line when adjusted for inflation. Single mothers, since the sixties when the Great Society and all the giveaway programs began, the welfare system, the welfare state began here in America, single moms flatlined. When adjusted for inflation, they never improved their situation, on average. Some did, but, on average, it was flatlined.

And then he said, since welfare reform where people were required to work who could work, here is what has happened to single mothers' income. That was since people were required to work who couldn't work. And then adjusted for inflation, there was a huge rise for those 10 years in the income for single moms.

Well, now, I know the people that passed the Great Society welfare legislation in the sixties, they wanted to help. I know they did. I know friends on the other side of the aisle, they want to help single moms. They want to help anybody who needs help.

But there is a question of how much do you help when you incentivize people to never reach their God-given potential, and how much do you help when you incentivize working and producing and becoming productive and participating in society; who helps more? I know the intentions are equal on both sides, but who actually helps more?

And it's never been more graphic than when you look at the income for single moms after welfare reform and for the 30 years before welfare reform. And now this administration has taken the best thing that Newt Gingrich did as he led to a Republican majority and led in balancing the budget, but even better, he helped single moms more than anything that any Democrat had done for the 30 years preceding that majority by elevating their income and beginning to have them feel some self-worth because they could do jobs and they had value and they had worth that they did not feel when they were flatlined and just taking the doles that the government provided.

The Romans learned the hard way: you provide bread and circuses, and eventually you kill off incentive. Once Caesar decided, gee, this is not good for the people not to work when they can work; let's cut off the bread and circuses, and he did. And there was so much massive rioting, like we've seen in Greece, like we've seen in other places in Europe that are broke.

Once you have degraded as a society to the point that more people have been convinced to sit back and just accept what the government gave them instead of using their God-given potential, then you are not likely going to ever get back to your greatest days again; you're done. It's just a matter of how long until you hit the dustbin of history.

The reason I'm still in Congress, the reason I've continued to run, is because I've still got hope. I've still got hope we can preserve, perpetuate for more generations the greatest gift that any group of people have ever been given as a secular nation, and that is the gift of this country, a country that saw its Founders coming over, Pilgrims. Right down the hall in the rotunda, there is the great painting, that massive painting, of the Pilgrims having a prayer meeting, praying for the land that they would come to.

That famous prayer meeting that they had on board the Speedwell—they had two ships, the Speedwell and the Mayflower. A lot of people don't know that. But that prayer meeting was in Holland, before they left from Holland to go to England, and then from England come to America. Some think it may have been a bit like Gideon's army being whittled down to just the strongest among them.

But the Speedwell, when they got ready to leave from England to come to America, began to take on water, so they had to cut their group. The Mayflower was smaller than the Speedwell. They had to cut their group down in size and get the hardiest and the most likely to be able to plant that settlement in America where Christians could have prayer meetings, where they could say what they believe, where they could say without fear of retribution that I believe marriage is between a man and a woman. They could say all of the things they had been taught in the Bible, all of those things they believed as Christians, and have a land where Christians would not be persecuted. Other groups came as Christians seeking that land that God would allow them to live in without persecution.

Now, Jesus said, ''You will suffer for My sake.'' I didn't suffer for Jesus' sake growing up as a Christian, because people who were Christians didn't suffer. But now we're persecuted. And now if you point out that Jesus sanctioned marriage, he intended a marriage between a man and a woman, if you point out that in Genesis God ordained marriage, he saw a man alone and said, that's not good, so I will give you a helpmate, a wife, you start talking about those things, then as a Christian you're about the only person, the only group in America that it's politically correct to actually persecute and condemn and discriminate against and say, as my friend, Rick Santorum, was told, Gee, oh, you believe what's been the history of great societies for thousands of years that a marriage is between a man and a woman. Because biologically by nature, even if you don't believe in God, by nature, that's how a species continues is by marriage between a man and a woman. And now we're persecuted for that.

We're persecuted because we say, you know, I believe a baby is a life deserving protection. ''Well, that's some Christian nonsense. You ought to be a criminal. You ought to be put behind bars, don't try to protect.'' And all the while where some of those folks are saying we need to protect the most innocent among us, is there any more innocent being in the world than a child ready to be born? They've done nothing wrong. They just want to live.

□ 1350

We want immigration. We need immigration in this country. I want Hispanics coming to America. I want people coming from any nation where they want to come together and become one people and be part of that e pluribus unum. But I also want them not to tear down my history and act as if it never was true. Or act as if when you look to the west and you see the Washington Monument, that when that was finished over 100 years ago, after the whole nation was contributing and they finally brought it to a conclusion and finished it off, they capped it with a capstone and on that capstone there's writing on three of the four sides of that capstone that's made out of what

was an extremely valuable and rare metal back at the time called aluminum. But on the side facing the Capitol, by design, they wanted two Latin words, ''laus Deo,'' meaning praise be to God.

Don't tell me that that's not the case. Don't tell me that's there by mistake. Because over a hundred years ago and back to the days of John Adams and his son John Quincy Adams, and Abraham Lincoln, or going back to George Washington when he resigned from the military and his prayer was that we would be following the divine author of our blessed religion, without an humble imitation in these things we can never hope to be a happy nation.

I understand things have changed, but don't tell me that is not our history. It is. Don't tell me those words are not up there. They are. And even though the Park Service for a time took the capstone that tourists could see and turned it to where you couldn't see ''laus Deo,'' it doesn't hide the fact that up there on the top of the Washington Monument, those words are there.

And why are they facing the Capitol? It's certainly not because we can look out from the Capitol and read ''praise be to God'' in Latin on the top of the Washington Monument. No, it's because they knew that would be the highest point man had constructed in our Capital City, and they wanted to ensure as the first rays of God's sun illuminated anything in this town, it would be the words, praise be to God. That's why it's there.

As a Christian, I'm supposed to turn the other cheek. I'm not always good at it, but that is what I'm supposed to try to do. But as a part of the government, we have an obligation to protect this country, to provide for the common defense, to make sure that whether enemies are foreign or domestic that we protect what has been entrusted to us as servants to protect, and that's not happening sufficiently right now, because there are people coming into this country that want to destroy what we have. They want to bring us down before a monarch that they want to set in place. There are some who simply want to come for benefits.

I'm so grateful that most of the people that come want to come to enjoy the freedoms and to get a job, and I'm so thankful we have so many immigrants, first generation immigrants, who come wanting to work. They are of an incredibly immense help to this country still being productive, especially after 50 million abortions. We're needing people to help. But I want them to have a chance to be president of their company and, if they're born here, to be President of the country. We need to be one people, and we need to have people come legally. Since we're allowing more immigrants to come in legally than any other country in the world, why not make sure the people that are coming are going to be helpful to America and not hurt America and not end this great experiment in democracy? That's part of our job.

And then we have this article from Friday, April 12, 2013. This is from radio WOAI:

> The debate in Washington on immigration reform has had no political impact, but the debate is having a major impact on south Texas.
>
> Officials say the number of people entering the U.S. illegally is way up and, tragically, the number of undocumented immigrants who have been found dead in the unforgiving Texas brush country is way up and is on path this year to best last year's record for the number of people found dead in the ranch country.

So why are more people dying in the harsh brush country of Texas?

The article goes on:

> Linda Vickers, who owns a branch in Brooks County which is ground zero for the immigration debate, pins the blame directly on talk of ''amnesty'' and a ''path to citizenship'' for people who entered the United States illegally.
>
> She recalls one man being arrested on her ranch not long ago.
>
> ''The Border Patrol agent was loading one man up, and he told the officer in Spanish, 'Obama's gonna let me go.' ''
>
> Border Patrol agents report that immigrants are crossing the border and in some cases surrendering while asking, ''Where do I go for my amnesty?''
>
> ''When you have amnesty waving in the wind, you're going to get an increase,'' Vickers says. ''And when you get an increase, especially with this heat, you're going to get an increase in deaths.''
>
> She says the current increase in illegal immigrant entries began last summer, at almost exactly the same time as President Obama unilaterally announced plans to no longer deport young people who came to the U.S. as children with their illegal immigrant parents.
>
> ''Washington is directly responsible for these deaths,'' she said.
>
> Brooks County routinely has the largest number of illegal immigrant deaths each year because smugglers come up U.S. 281 from the Rio Grande Valley but kick their human cargo out of the truck before reaching the Border Patrol checkpoint in Falfurrias.
>
> ''If that individual, illegal immigrant, can't keep up, they are left behind,'' she said. ''And you are going to die out in this heat if you can't find water.''

I know none of my friends on this side of the aisle want people to die like that. I know that. I deeply care about so many, just as the Democrats do. As a Christian, I'm supposed to love all people. I don't want them to die in the Texas brush country. And if the administration or people in Congress promising amnesty is luring people out as so many are indicating in that area who appear to have firsthand knowledge, then we should not be luring them to their deaths.

We need to talk about one thing right now: let's have a secured border, so when the report came out 2 or 3 weeks ago that there were over 500 people that entered illegally at one place and that not even 180 or so were actually picked up or seen by cameras by the Border Patrol, and fewer than that were picked up, and there were over 30 people bringing drugs into this Nation that would poison American children, American people, then we're not ready to talk about resolving the issue of the people who are here. Because until the border is secured—not closed, I don't want it closed, we need it open for people to come in legally—but until it's secured so we can control who comes in, we should not be talking about a pathway to anything but deportation.

□ 1400

Let's secure the border, and then people will be amazed at how fast we have an agreement on what to do about the people who have come into this country illegally.

I've got a lot of restaurants and hotels and people who have businesses who say, I need those immigrants to keep my business open.

Fine. Let's secure the border, and then we can work this out. We surely can—we absolutely can—but until that's done, we're luring people to their deaths. We're learning what one article says—and this is from townhall.com—that border crossings are up two to three times what they were because of all this talk.

Then there's the talk that the President has given about how we're not going to be able to secure our border because of the sequester. We're not going to cut golf trips, and we're not going to cut any of these other things, but by golly, we're not going to protect the border unless you give us amnesty for the people who are here. Well, let's secure the border. Oh, no. We're going to hold that hostage. We're not going to do our job that we took an oath to do until you grant amnesty to the people who are here.

People who are here in this Congress need to understand what it does to those who did everything lawfully to come into this country, who have followed every part of the law. It is absolutely demoralizing to most of those people to have the talk of amnesty of people who didn't follow the law as they did. Once we have a secured border—not held hostage, but just do the job that the oath was taken to do. Once that's done, let's talk about a pathway to a green card or a pathway to being here as a permanent legal resident. A pathway to citizenship needs to have people who believe in the rule of law because, if that is not the case, we will become like the nations those people left because they couldn't find jobs. They didn't have adequate freedom. There was graft and corruption because they did not believe in the rule of law as a nation, so they had to leave that nation and come to our Nation.

So don't destroy a Nation that, for the most part, believes in the rule of law and in following the law—and that includes me and other Members of Congress. We need to show respect for those who follow the law and for those who say, It's Christian to help all immigrants. Well, it's Christian to help all people and to love all people just as Christ did, but as a government we

need to make sure this country is going to be here, and we cannot do that unless we make sure that people here—immigrants who have come in, people who are Native Americans, those who are here in America—are protected against all enemies who may come in and want to destroy us. That's part of our job.

I want to make a point about gun control since cloture was voted on down the hall. I've not always been terribly complimentary of our friend Senator MCCONNELL down the hall, but he made some very, very important points that people need to understand about what is being proposed for gun control. Under what has been proposed in the Senate for gun control—and I'm quoting from Senator MCCONNELL—he has it right:

''An uncle giving his nephew a hunting rifle for Christmas.'' That's someone who, under the law being pushed in the Senate, will be a criminal. Someone else who would be a criminal under the law being pushed in the Senate is ''a niece giving her aunt—'' he says ''aunt,'' but it could be her grandmother even ''—a handgun for protection.'' Another criminal under the Senate proposal would be ''a cousin loaning another cousin his hunting rifle if the loan occurs just 1 day before the beginning of hunting season.'' Another criminal under the proposal would be ''one neighbor loaning another a firearm so his wife can protect herself while the husband is away.''

Senator MCCONNELL said, ''The people I am describing are not criminals—they are neighbors, friends and family—and the scenarios,'' he says, ''I am describing are not fanciful. They happen countless times in this country.'' As he says, ''The Schumer bill would outlaw these transfers, and it would make people like these, criminals.''

Any time a bill is rushed to the floor before people have a chance to read it, examine it, amend it, discuss it, it's not going to be good for the American people in all things.

Thomas Jefferson was not part of the Constitutional Convention. He was part of the Continental Congress. In fact, he did most of the drafting of the Declaration of Independence, but he wasn't there for the drafting of the Constitution, itself. He wrote this letter after the Constitution was promulgated—an incredible document.

He said:

> If I could add one thing to the Constitution, it would be a requirement that every law had to be on file for 1 year minimum so everyone could read it, everyone could make comments on it. You'd have plenty of chances to think of amendments that might make it better and a stronger, more effective law.

Have it on file for a year. That may not have been such a bad idea if it had been included. As incredibly and, I believe, divinely inspired as the Constitution was, so many of the Founders said they got their inspiration for provisions in the Constitution from the Old Testament, but as fantastic as it was, it was written down by men who make mistakes.

This Congress better not put into law a gun control bill or an immigration bill or any other important bill that has not had adequate scrutiny because, if that happens, Americans will suffer just as surely as they are beginning to as ObamaCare is being implemented around the country and as people are being turned away from treatment, though they were promised: if you like your doctor, you can keep him; if you like your health insurance, you can keep it. Now they've found that was completely untrue—and JOE WILSON was right. It's not true what was said about the Affordable Care Act. People have lost their doctors, and they've lost their insurance. That will continue to occur, and we're going to destroy the best health care in the history of man.

There are doctors, medical historians, who have indicated that they think it was just after the turn of 1900—maybe 1910 or so—when for the first time in human history a person had a better chance of getting well after seeing a doctor than he did of getting worse after seeing a doctor. You get your mind around that. For thousands of years of the existence of man, where we have recorded history of man, think about that: only in the last hundred years have you had a better chance of getting well after seeing a doctor than of getting worse. You think about how far we've come. Now we're radically going to change health care so people can't get the treatment they once did? We needed to reform health care—it needed reform—but it didn't need a government takeover, and it still doesn't. The reason for that is that life is important. Life has value.

I'm going to read a story—I won't read the whole thing—that was in the New York Daily News from Thursday, April 11.

□ 1420

> Ashley Baldwin said she saw the puppies moving on five occasions after their spines were snipped.
>
> The doctor is charged in the deaths of these puppies and in the death of the mother. The gruesome testimony at the ''House of Horrors'' trial of Dr. Kermit Gosnell continued on Thursday, with two former employees describing scenes that strained the imagination.
>
> Ashley Baldwin, who began working at the cash-only clinic in west Philadelphia when she was just 15, said that she routinely assisted Gosnell with these procedures, on five different occasions, saw puppies moving following the procedure.
>
> In one case Baldwin, who is now 22 and a dog owner, testified that she witnessed a puppy ''screeching'' after the procedure.
>
> She said, ''They looked like regular puppies.''
>
> When asked about a particular puppy described in court as ''puppy A,'' who the prosecution contends was nearing its birth date, Baldwin recalled how large the unborn puppy was following the procedure.
>
> ''The chest was moving,'' she testified Thursday.
>
> Gosnell trained his employees to cut the necks of the puppies to sever their spinal cords, both Baldwin and Lynda Williams, another former employee, testified on Wednesday.
>
> Williams testified that she saw her former boss snip the necks of more than 30 puppies.
>
> John McMahon, Gosnell's attorney, has argued that his client did not kill any puppies by snipping their spines and that they were already in the death throes because of the drugs he had given the mother dog.
>
> Gosnell is charged with first-degree murder in the deaths of seven puppies, as well as murder in the death of the mother undergoing its procedure.

Now, the reason the mainstream media has not reported this story and continues to refuse to report this story about little innocent puppies having their necks cut and killed after they're born alive is because they are not puppies; they're human beings. They're boys and girls, and it doesn't fit the agenda of the mainstream media to report on little boys and little girls whose spinal cords are cut by a doctor. They would be sure to report if these were puppies, but they're not; they're little boys and girls.

And as a father who held our first very premature child in my hands and heard her gasping for air, heard her efforts to live, and knowing that we did all we could to help her live and that she's 29 years old, I can't imagine anyone thinking not only is it not a big deal but it is not worth reporting when a doctor snips the neck of someone's little child.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

WOMEN'S PAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADEL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 30 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rushed to get to the floor before the gavel went down this afternoon because this is the week which marks when women had to work as long as men work in order to get the pay that is equivalent to the pay of men during the 12 months of 2012. Notice what month we are in. This is April. So we're talking about four-plus months beyond the 12 months that a man had to work in order to have the same salary—it takes a woman 16 months plus.

But it was not that alone, Mr. Speaker. There are figures I discovered in doing some research. And, of course, there is the pressure, I think, all of us should feel if Congress has anything to add to this discussion that would move what appears to be a ''no-forward'' position for women's pay in the workforce in at least the last 10 years. There are pending before the Congress at least two bills. There is a petition, a discharge petition, that is already up to compel the House to vote on the Paycheck Fairness Act. That act has not moved forward in the House, although it has been filed for a number of

years. But I believe the most recent data would compel everyone to believe if there is anything this House can do, this is the time to do it.

I looked at what progress women have made since I chaired the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) beginning in the late 1970s, with never a thought that I'd be a Member of the House of Representatives. I've looked at the decade of the 1980s. That's about the time I left the EEOC, and what I found then was steady, yes, incremental, but steady progress; moving, for example, from 60.2 percent in 1980 to 69.9 percent, so that means about 10 percentage points movement in 10 years.

But then I looked at the years beginning in 1990 until today, and it appears to be taking women twice as long to move the distance during this latter 20-year period than it took during the 10-year period beginning in 1980. That ought to make all of us stop and wonder what is at work.

If we look at 1990, when we looked like we were solidly into the 70s, that is women making 70 percent, the exact figure was 71.6 percent of what men earned, that figure gradually went up. You get to 2000, from 1990, and women have gone only from essentially about 70 percent, exactly 71.6 percent, to 73.7 percent. The rate is what has slowed, but even more seriously, 77 appears to be the unlucky number for women's pay in our country because women have been at 77 percent, sometimes 77 percent and a little more, but basically 77 percent of what a man earns since 2005.

□ 1420

What that means is no progress whatsoever.

Incremental progress was never enough, particularly when you consider that more women today work than men. But the slow pace of growth, compared to many past years, is unacceptable.

What is the reason for this?

The most recent data shows an actual widening of the gap between men and women in wages. For example, in 2012, women who worked full-time—now we're talking about full-time workers—earned 80.9 percent, almost 81 percent, of what men earned. That was in terms of weekly pay. But that was a drop of more than two percentage points from the year before, 82.2 percent.

Now, these are full-time women's earnings at a time when women considerably outrank men in the number who graduate from college, for example.

The annual earning look even worse, because that's where the 77 percent figure comes in, where women lagged even further behind if you look annually, and there you get 77 percent of what men earned annually. That becomes a figure that we almost know by heart. That's a figure that we ought to know for only one year.

If you want to see what that means in dollars and cents, a woman who works full-time averaged $691 a week in 2012. That was less than she had earned in 2011.

Now, men's earnings in that same week were $854. That's compared to $691 for a woman. What is most important is not the difference in the men's and women's pay, but that men had a small gain over what they had earned in 2011, whereas women were going in the opposite direction.

As we looked at why this would occur, I looked further into where are the jobs. Why not look at the job growth; perhaps we're not seeing growth in women's occupations.

And one of the great problems, of course, with women's pay is that, although they are graduation from college, women are still employed largely in stereotypic women's jobs. And these jobs have been women's for so long that they are labeled as women's jobs, and they have acquired a wage of their own that reflects discrimination against women.

Job growth, if we look at it during the last year, has been in retail, in catering, and in minimum-wage jobs. That, in and of itself, of course, may tell us why women's wages have not been growing at the rate we would like.

Women are preparing themselves in other fields; but very often, when we talk about women's wages, we are not talking about the average woman. And since that average woman's wage is essential for family earnings today, we've got to look at who we're talking about.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is so modest that it doesn't even pretend to go at this entire problem, but it is the kind of bill that you would think we would have a bipartisan majority for. The Paycheck Fairness Act, which we're trying to get out of the House, simply updates the Equal Pay Act, which it was my honor to enforce as chair of the EEOC.

The so-called EPA, or Equal Pay Act, was the first of the Civil Rights Acts, and it guarantees equal pay for equal work, the kind of guarantee that, if you asked every 100 Americans if they were for equal pay for equal work, you would find 99.9 percent of them would say they were, and any falling off of that, whatever it would be would be because they didn't understand the question.

But we are talking about a bill that was passed more than, well, now, 50 years ago, and you can imagine that it does not fully meet today's economy. The modest changes involved, to allow class actions, for example, are to ensure that a woman could discuss her wages without being fired.

Today, if you discuss your wages openly, there's nothing to protect you against being let go. You can see secrecy in wages is part and parcel of the problem.

Women's wages, of course, have suffered, particularly in this recession, also because a disproportionate number of public jobs have not come back, as we see teachers being laid off, for example. We see social workers being laid off. And you're going to see more of that because of the sequester.

The sequester is going to be handed down in programs to states and cities, and it means that the programs that were available are not going to be readily available, and you will begin to see these women's jobs suffer even more.

I am very concerned that we have been looking at what progress women have been making, without noting that they have been making no progress, and that is the problem I see.

I don't pretend that any one statute will make that progress occur. I do understand that there is a set of related phenomena involved here, but I do not believe we can leave on the table our responsibility for moving to do what we can, as women become not only equal in the workforce, but often the majority.

It is men who are opting out of the workforce, and some of them can opt out because they have pensions. Some of them are opting out because they go on disability from having worked. Women seem not to be opting out, but opting in.

The Paycheck Fairness Act gives some muscle to the old Equal Pay Act. In some ways, it's fallen into a certain amount of disuse because it doesn't meet all that is needed today. It's still, of course, an important statute; but it remains a statute that, like any of our civil rights statutes, needs to be looked at often to see in what ways it can be improved.

In addition to the Paycheck Fairness Act, with Senator HARKIN I have sponsored the Fair Pay Act. That act differs from the very important Paycheck Fairness Act because it seeks to get at a rudimentary problem in the workforce, and that is that women are captured in women's occupations that, by their very nature, have built-in discrimination.

For example, two-thirds of white women and three-quarters of African American women work in just three areas of the economy: clerical, service, and factory jobs.

□ 1430

It will take a more aggressive strategy to break through the old, even ancient habits of the workplace that have been there since women began to work. We have steered women into women's jobs. The Fair Pay Act looks at jobs which are comparable but are not paid comparably and would require that they be paid in that way. There may not be a huge number of such jobs, but the States have often found such jobs and sometimes have made them comparable in pay. Often at the urging of trade unions, studies that have made it clear that you can make comparable pay adjustments where you can prove that the reason that jobs which are different but comparable and are not paid the same is because of discrimination—and that's what'd a woman would have

to show—women's wages can, in fact, make up for the disparity over a period of time, as a number of States have done, simply by spreading change in pay over a period of time until the goal of equal pay is reached.

It is one thing to mark this week as a week where women are still at 77 percent; it's quite another to make clear that that 77 percent is a figure we've been stuck on now, with absolutely no movement, for more than 10 years. The Paycheck Fairness Act, moving it with a discharge petition, as we're trying to do, to at least force a vote on it, would make people think about the figures I have just discussed; because if they think about them, I think most Members would want to do something about them.

We are not preparing women for the inevitable retirement that will come without pensions and with too little pay. The more their pay begins to reflect the pay of what is often their mate's, who graduated from high school or college at about the same time, with comparable skills, the greater will be women's security as they age and will reduce the call on taxpayers to take care of them.

It was with great pride that I chaired the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in the late 1970s and saw some progress that began to be made in the seventies and eighties. There's no reason for the slowdown that women have been stuck on at 77 percent even before the recession. It is not the Great Recession that has set women back; it is the failure in legislation and it is the failure in the workplace, itself, to treat women's pay as the equivalent of the pay of men.

I hope women will not be discouraged as they now are finishing high school and college in greater numbers and at a greater rate than their male counterparts. We can only hope they will not be discouraged when they see that their pay does not, in fact, equal what their education forecasts.

During this week when we noted that it took women 16-plus months to earn what a man earned in 12 months, I ask that we look behind these numbers and put a face on them. Because the face is the woman who lives next door; the face is your wife; the face is your daughter who is going to come out of college now loaded, as most of them are today, with their education having been secured through loans. They want to maximize the time, effort, energy, and ambition that goes into pursuing education, regardless of gender, so that they can begin to move at least incrementally again.

Women have been more than aware that their own progress has come slowly. They are not content to make no progress. But, if we look at the last 12 years, essentially, what we see is no progress. I'm not sure what kind of a goal to put on progress that should be made. I can only look at the decade when some considerable progress was made and when 10 percentage points of progress was made over 10 years, to say if we could do that once, we surely should be able to do it again. A place to begin would be to sign the discharge petition so that the Paycheck Fairness Act could be brought to the floor. It needs 218 signatures. It currently has 192 cosponsors. There may be more by this point.

We have to focus on taking action. Individual women, perhaps, will be taking such action in their own workplaces. The whole notion of lean in—that is, to go in and ask for the pay that you're entitled to—is a step that I would, of course, advise. But I recognize that an endemic problem in women's progress across the board calls for more than individual action.

As we mark, as we usually do in April, the time in months it has taken for women to achieve what men have achieved in far less time—and this time 4 months more to earn what a man earned in 12 months—I hope that that figure, at a time when women's pay is stuck at 77 percent or so as it has been for 10 or 12 years now, that we will be inclined to use this week not to commemorate, not even to just recognize, but to be activated to move women whose incomes are vital not only to their own families, but to our country. If we do that, then by the time we reach this point perhaps next April, we will have a different story to tell.

I am pleased to yield back the remainder of my time.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 716. An act to modify the requirements under the STOCK Act regarding online access to certain financial disclosure statements and related forms.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 15, 2013, at noon for morning-hour debate.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Robert B. Aderholt, Rodney Alexander, Justin Amash, Mark E. Amodei, Robert E. Andrews, Michele Bachmann, Spencer Bachus, Ron Barber, Lou Barletta, Garland ''Andy'' Barr, John Barrow, Joe Barton, Karen Bass, Joyce Beatty, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Kerry L. Bentivolio, Ami Bera, Gus M. Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner, Suzanne Bonamici, Jo Bonner, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Bruce L. Braley, Jim Bridenstine, Mo Brooks, Susan W. Brooks, Paul C. Broun, Corrine Brown, Julia Brownley, Vern Buchanan, Larry Bucshon, Michael C. Burgess, Cheri Bustos, G. K. Butterfield, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, John Campbell, Eric Cantor, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Tony Cárdenas, John C. Carney, Jr., André Carson, John R. Carter, Matt Cartwright, Bill Cassidy, Kathy Castor, Joaquin Castro, Steve Chabot, Jason Chaffetz, Donna M. Christensen, Judy Chu, David N. Cicilline, Yvette D. Clarke, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Howard Coble, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, Chris Collins, Doug Collins, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. Connolly, John Conyers, Jr., Paul Cook, Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Tom Cotton, Joe Courtney, Kevin Cramer, Eric A. ''Rick'' Crawford, Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Steve Daines, Danny K. Davis, Rodney Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, John K. Delaney, Rosa L. DeLauro, Suzan K. DelBene, Jeff Denham, Charles W. Dent, Ron DeSantis, Scott DesJarlais, Theodore E. Deutch, Mario Diaz-Balart, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Michael F. Doyle, Tammy Duckworth, Sean P. Duffy, Jeff Duncan, John J. Duncan, Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Renee L. Ellmers, Jo Ann Emerson*, Eliot L. Engel, William L. Enyart, Anna G. Eshoo, Elizabeth H. Esty, Eni F. H. Faleomavaega, Blake Farenthold, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Stephen Lee Fincher, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Charles J. ''Chuck'' Fleischmann, John Fleming, Bill Flores, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Bill Foster, Virginia Foxx, Lois Frankel, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Tulsi Gabbard, Pete P. Gallego, John Garamendi, Joe Garcia, Cory Gardner, Scott Garrett, Jim Gerlach, Bob Gibbs, Christopher P. Gibson, Phil Gingrey, Louie Gohmert, Bob Goodlatte, Paul A. Gosar, Trey Gowdy, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Alan Grayson, Al Green, Gene Green, Tim Griffin, H. Morgan Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Michael G. Grimm, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutierrez, Janice Hahn, Ralph M. Hall, Colleen W. Hanabusa, Richard L. Hanna, Gregg Harper, Andy Harris, Vicky Hartzler, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Denny Heck, Joseph J. Heck, Jeb Hensarling, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Brian Higgins, James A. Himes, Rubén Hinojosa, George Holding, Rush Holt, Michael M. Honda, Steven A. Horsford, Steny H. Hoyer, Richard Hudson, Tim Huelskamp, Jared Huffman, Bill Huizenga, Randy Hultgren, Duncan Hunter, Robert Hurt, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Sheila Jackson Lee, Hakeem S. Jeffries, Lynn Jenkins, Bill Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, David P. Joyce, Marcy Kaptur, William R. Keating, Mike Kelly, Robin L. Kelly, Joseph P. Kennedy III, Daniel T. Kildee, Derek Kilmer, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Jack Kingston, Adam Kinzinger, Ann Kirkpatrick, John Kline, Ann M. Kuster, Raúl R. Labrador, Doug LaMalfa, Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, James R. Langevin, James Lankford, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Robert E. Latta, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, John Lewis, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Billy Long, Alan S. Lowenthal, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Luján, Michelle Lujan Grisham, Cynthia M. Lummis, Stephen F. Lynch, Daniel B. Maffei, Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean Patrick Maloney, Kenny Marchant, Tom Marino, Edward J. Markey, Thomas Massie, Jim Matheson, Doris O. Matsui, Carolyn McCarthy, Kevin McCarthy,

Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty McCollum, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, Mike McIntyre, Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon, David B. McKinley, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNerney, Mark Meadows, Patrick Meehan, Gregory W. Meeks, Grace Meng, Luke Messer, John L. Mica, Michael H. Michaud, Candice S. Miller, Gary G. Miller, George Miller, Jeff Miller, Gwen Moore, James P. Moran, Markwayne Mullin, Mick Mulvaney, Patrick Murphy, Tim Murphy, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Gloria Negrete McLeod, Randy Neugebauer, Kristi L. Noem, Richard M. Nolan, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Richard B. Nugent, Devin Nunes, Alan Nunnelee, Pete Olson, Beto O'Rourke, William L. Owens, Steven M. Palazzo, Frank Pallone, Jr., Bill Pascrell, Jr., Ed Pastor, Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Jr., Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Ed Perlmutter, Scott Perry, Gary C. Peters, Scott H. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Robert Pittenger, Joseph R. Pitts, Mark Pocan, Ted Poe, Jared Polis, Mike Pompeo, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Mike Quigley, Trey Radel, Nick J. Rahall II, Charles B. Rangel, Tom Reed, David G. Reichert, James B. Renacci, Reid J. Ribble, Tom Rice, Cedric L. Richmond, E. Scott Rigell, Martha Roby, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Todd Rokita, Thomas J. Rooney, Peter J. Roskam, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Dennis A. Ross, Keith J. Rothfus, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, Raul Ruiz, Jon Runyan, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Matt Salmon, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Bradley S. Schneider, Aaron Schock, Kurt Schrader, Allyson Y. Schwartz, David Schweikert, Austin Scott, David Scott, Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Terri A. Sewell, Carol Shea-Porter, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Kyrsten Sinema, Albio Sires, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Lamar Smith, Steve Southerland II, Jackie Speier, Chris Stewart, Steve Stivers, Steve Stockman, Marlin A. Stutzman, Eric Swalwell, Mark Takano, Lee Terry, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Scott R. Tipton, Dina Titus, Paul Tonko, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Fred Upton, David G. Valadao, Chris Van Hollen, Juan Vargas, Marc A. Veasey, Filemon Vela, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Ann Wagner, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, Jackie Walorski, Timothy J. Walz, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Melvin L. Watt, Henry A. Waxman, Randy K. Weber, Sr., Daniel Webster, Peter Welch, Brad R. Wenstrup, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Ed Whitfield, Roger Williams, Frederica S. Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Frank R. Wolf, Steve Womack, Rob Woodall, John A. Yarmuth, Kevin Yoder, Ted S. Yoho, C. W. Bill Young, Don Young, Todd C. Young

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1059. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — World Trade Center Health Program Eligibility Requirements for Shanksville, Pennsylvania and Pentagon Responders [Docket No.: CDC-2013-0002; NIOSH-261] (RIN: 0920-AA48) received March 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1060. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Establishment of the Multi-State Plan Program for the Affordable Insurance Exchanges (RIN: 3206-AM47) received April 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1061. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-017, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1062. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-036, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1063. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-005, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1064. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-038, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1065. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-031, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1066. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-040, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1067. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-045, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1068. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-002, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1069. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-004, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1070. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-041, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1071. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-009, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1072. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-003, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1073. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-047, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1074. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-032, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1075. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-022, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1076. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-011, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1077. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-037, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1078. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-050, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1079. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-016, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1080. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-027, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1081. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-051, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1082. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-055, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1083. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-019, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1084. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department

of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-046, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1085. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-043, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1086. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-023, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1087. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-012, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1088. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-044, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1089. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Excepted Service-Appointment of Persons With Intellectual Disabilities, Severe Physical Disabilities, and Psychiatric Disabilities (RIN: 3206-AM07) received April 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1090. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Wage Methodology for the Temporary Non-Agricultural Employment H-2B Program; Delay of Effective Date (RIN: 1205-AB61) received March 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1091. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Scammon Bay, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0121; Airspace Docket No.: 12-AAL-2] received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1092. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0239; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-087-AD] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1093. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Multiple Restricted Areas; Eglin AFB, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0178; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASO-1] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1094. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Wilbur, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0768; Airspace Docket No. 12-ANM-22] received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1095. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to Class B Airspace; Atlanta, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1237; Airspace Docket No. 08-AWA-5] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1096. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Morrisville, VT [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0835; Airspace Docket No. 12-ANE-15] received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1097. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Unalakleet, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0322; Airspace Docket No. 12-AAL-3] received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1098. A letter from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of 30-Day Residency Requirement for Per Diem Payments (RIN: 2900-AO36) received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 882. A bill to prohibit the awarding of a contract or grant in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold unless the prospective contractor or grantee certifies in writing to the agency awarding the contract or grant that the contractor or grantee has no seriously delinquent tax debts, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–35). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 1162. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to make improvements in the Government Accountability Office (Rept. 113–36). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 1246. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to provide that the District of Columbia Treasurer or one of the Deputy Chief Financial Officers of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia may perform the functions and duties of the Office in an acting capacity if there is a vacancy in the Office (Rept. 113–37). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 249. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that persons having seriously delinquent tax debts shall be ineligible for Federal employment (Rept. 113–38 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on House Administration discharged from further consideration. H.R. 249 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 1520. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to allow civilian employees of the Department of Defense to delay furloughs until returning from a deployment in support of accounting and recovery efforts by the Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1521. A bill to provide for a five-year extension of the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of medical disability examinations by contract physicians; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. GIBBS):

H.R. 1522. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for the expansion of manufacturing in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. POLIS, Mr. AMASH, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 1523. A bill to amend Controlled Substances Act to provide for a new rule regarding the application of the Act to marihuana, and for other purposes; 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. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HOYER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CROWLEY, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 1524. A bill to require 85 percent domestic content in green technologies purchased by Federal agencies or by States with Federal funds and in property eligible for the renewable energy production or investment tax credits; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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 Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 1525. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to comprehensively reform immigration law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, 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. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS,

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. DAINES, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H.R. 1526. A bill to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest System land, to provide a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, 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. RANGEL (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. POLIS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. KIND, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 1527. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction allowed for student loan interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. YOHO, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 1528. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to allow a veterinarian to transport and dispense controlled substances in the usual course of veterinary practice outside of the registered location; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. CASTRO of Texas (for himself and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 1529. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to exempt certain State-provided loan programs from being subject to preferred lender arrangement requirements; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. BERA of California, and Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD):

H.R. 1530. A bill to ensure that individuals who are in an authorized job training program or completing work for a degree or certificate remain eligible for regular unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CHU, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FARR, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1531. A bill to require that health plans provide coverage for a minimum hospital stay for mastectomies, lumpectomies, and lymph node dissection for the treatment of breast cancer and coverage for secondary consultations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, 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. FOSTER (for himself and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 1532. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a program to populate downloadable tax forms with taxpayer return information; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 1533. A bill to establish an Office of Public Advocate within the Department of Justice to provide services and guidance to citizens in dealing with concerns involving the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 1534. A bill to amend section 70107 of title 46, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the port security grant program through 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. HAHN (for herself and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 1535. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to conduct a study and report to Congress on gaps in port security in the United States and a plan to address them; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 1536. A bill to establish the Office of Agriculture Inspection within the Department of Homeland Security, which shall be headed by the Assistant Commissioner for Agriculture Inspection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. JEFFRIES (for himself, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 1537. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide that individuals in prison shall, for the purposes of a decennial census, be attributed to the last place of residence before incarceration; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. PETERS of Michigan):

H.R. 1538. A bill to provide incentives to encourage financial institutions and small businesses to provide continuing financial education to customers, borrowers, and employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial 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. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. GRIMM):

H.R. 1539. A bill to provide for certain tunnel life safety and rehabilitation projects for Amtrak; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. BERA of California):

H.R. 1540. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning, and construction of the South Sacramento County Agriculture and Habitat Lands Water Recycling Project in Sacramento County, California; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. STUTZMAN):

H.R. 1541. A bill to establish limitations, for fiscal years 2013, 2014, and 2015 on the total amount in awards or other discretionary monetary payments which may be paid to any Federal employee; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. HIGGINS):

H.R. 1542. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish weapons of mass destruction intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 1543. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to exempt certain elderly persons from demonstrating an understanding of the English language and the history, principles, and form of government of the United States as a requirement for naturalization, and to permit certain other elderly persons to take the history and government examination in a language of their choice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 1544. A bill to promote transportation-oriented development and encourage dedicated revenue sources for urban and regional rail corridor development; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 1545. A bill to amend the definition of State in certain Federal agricultural laws to include the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 1546. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage a law enforcement presence in our schools by allowing full-time, off-duty law enforcement officials an exclusion from income for wages received for performing services in an elementary or

secondary school as a substitute teacher; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 1547. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend the basis for the denial of retirement credit, for service as a Member of Congress, to include conviction of any felony under Federal or State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, 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. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1548. A bill to facilitate the development of energy on Indian lands by reducing Federal regulations that impede tribal development of Indian lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.J. Res. 38. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SALMON, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. BONNER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. ISSA):

H. Res. 153. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2009 violates article I, section 7, clause 1 of the United States Constitution because it was a ''Bill for raising Revenue'' that did not originate in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERA of California (for himself and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H. Res. 154. A resolution expressing support for designation of April 15, 2013, through April 21, 2013, as National Minority Cancer Awareness Week; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RUSH:

H. Res. 155. A resolution expressing the necessity for the members of the House of Representatives to use refer the term ''undocumented'' instead of the term ''illegal'' when referring to foreign nationals which are working in the United States without proper documentation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself and Mr. GRIMM):

H. Res. 156. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representative that the Transportation Security Administration should delay implementation of changes to the Prohibited Items List that do not enhance the protection of passengers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H. Res. 157. A resolution honoring the Sikh community's celebration of Vaisakhi; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. HAHN (for herself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SIRES, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H. Res. 158. A resolution recognizing the importance of ports to the economy and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H. Res. 159. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of April 14, 2013, through April 20, 2013, as National Osteopathic Medicine Week; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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. LYNCH:

H.R. 1520.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1521.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 1522.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 1523.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to, among other things, regulate Commerce among the several States.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 1524.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 1525.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 4 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 1526.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

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. RANGEL:

H.R. 1527.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article XVI of the Constitution—Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes . . .

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 1528.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 1529.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1530.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 18

Congress has the authority, ''To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the forgoing Pawers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.''

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1531.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 1532.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 1533.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 1534.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 1535.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 1536.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 1537.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1538.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1539.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

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 this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 1540.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 1541.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 1542.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 1543.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, sec. 8, cl. 4 (''To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization''), and cl. 18 (''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 of Officer thereof.'')

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 1544.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3, of Section 8, of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 1545.

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.

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

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. TIBERI:

H.R. 1546.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill makes changes to existing law relating to Article 1, Section 8 which provides that, ''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; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;'' and Article 1, Section 7 which provides that, ''All bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.''

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 1547.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 6, Clause 1, of the U.S. Constitution: ''The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States.''

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1548.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

article 1 section 8 clause 3.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 38.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the U.S. Constitution, which grants Congress the authority to propose Constitutional amendments.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 12: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 38: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. ELLMERS, and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 60: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 62: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 176: Mr. CASSIDY and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 301: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 309: Mr. YODER, Mr. BARTON, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 324: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 335: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 337: Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 351: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 366: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 377: Mr. VELA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 382: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 436: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 452: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 460: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 474: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 499: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 503: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 515: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 521: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 567: Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 574: Mr. HIMES and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 578: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 582: Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 627: Mr. COTTON and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 628: Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 647: Mr. KLINE and Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 659: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 666: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 686: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 693: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 698: Mr. BURGESS and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 701: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 702: MR. DEFAZIO, MR. CARSON OF INDIANA, MS. MCCOLLUM, AND MR. BEN RAY LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO.

H.R. 718: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 719: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 721: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 724: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KIND, Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia and Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 731: Mr. HOLDING and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 761: Mr. ROSS, Mr. KLINE, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 763: Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 769: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 786: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 791: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 792: Mr. OWENS and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 807: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RADEL, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 809: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 822: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. COSTA, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 831: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 850: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ISSA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 864: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 874: Mr. HIGGINS and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 888: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 904: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 913: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 915: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 924: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 925: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. VELA, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 926: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 938: Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. MENG, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 951: Mr. HOLT and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 961: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN and Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 962: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1000: Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1014: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1026: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1038: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 1072: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 1078: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 1096: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1097: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 1099: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1122: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 1126: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 1151: Mr. COBLE, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. TITUS, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 1171: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1175: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1186: Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 1213: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 1214: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1219: Mrs. ROBY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 1252: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1286: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1290: Mr. COBLE and Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 1303: Mr. LATTA, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. ELLMERS, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1311: Mr. COBLE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 1312: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1313: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1327: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1334: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1340: Mr. MORAN and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1341: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 1343: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1354: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. HANABUSA, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1358: Mr. PETERS of California, Ms . Edwards, Mr. VEASEY, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1406: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HARPER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. YODER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. DAINES, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 1417: Mr. OLSON and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1427: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1428: Mr. POSEY, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. TIERNEY, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1433: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1448: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1461: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1462: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1478: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 1485: Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 1494: Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 1497: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 1510: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 1513: Mr. DENT.

H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. MEADOWS.

H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. LUCAS.

H. Con. Res. 28: Mrs. BEATTY.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BARBER, Mr. BARTON, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOK, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DENT, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. FOXX, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRIMM, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MICA, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROKITA, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. CRAWFORD, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. GARCIA.

H. Res. 30: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H. Res. 36: Mr. COTTON, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. PALAZZO, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H. Res. 90: Mr. NOLAN and Mrs. LOWEY.

H. Res. 104: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H. Res. 108: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H. Res. 129: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H. Res. 130: Mr. STOCKMAN and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN.

H. Res. 132: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. FARR, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HORSFORD, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. RUIZ, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H. Res. 134: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. PETERS of California, and Mr. TIBERI.

H. Res. 147: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 1, April 11, 2013, by Ms. ROSA DELAURO on H.R. 377, was signed by the following Members: Rosa L. DeLauro, Daniel T. Kildee, Ann Kirkpatrick, Terri A. Sewell, Cheri Bustos, Paul Tonko, Juan Vargas, Jackie Speier, Sheila Jackson Lee, John A. Yarmuth, Gerald E. Connolly, James P. Moran, Albio Sires, Janice Halm, Lois Frankel, Donald M. Payne Jr., Robert E. Andrews, Gwen Moore, Marcia L. Fudge, Karen Bass, Timothy J. Walz, Doris O. Matsui, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry A. Waxman, Corrine Brown, Zoe Lofgren, Dina Titus, Mike Quigley, Jim Cooper, Lois Capps, Colleen W. Hanabusa, Barbara Lee, Joaquin Castro, Nydia M. Velázquez, Scott H. Peters, Suzan K. DelBene, Julia Brownley, Sean Patrick Maloney, Danny K. Davis, Mark Pocan, Jerrold Nadler, Eric Swalwell, Steven A. Horsford, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, John F. Tierney, Suzanne Bonamici, James P. McGovern, Eliot L. Engel, William R. Keating, Gregory W. Meeks, Allyson Y. Schwartz, Chris Van Hollen, Michelle Lujan Grisham, Joseph P. Kennedy III, Lucille Roybal-Allard, John B. Larson, John P. Sarbanes, Linda T. Sánchez, Judy Chu, Rúben Hinojosa, Carolyn McCarthy, Sanford D. Bishop Jr., Ben Ray Lujan, Niki Tsongas, Denny Heck, Carolyn B. Maloney, G. K. Butterfield, Charles B. Rangel, John C. Carney Jr., David Scott, Ann M. Kuster, Matt Cartwright, Elizabeth H. Esty, Joseph Crowley, Rick Larsen, Carol Shea-Porter, Earl Blumenauer, Derek Kilmer, Alan S. Lowenthal, Al Green, Joe Courtney, Mark Takano, Tulsi Gabbard, Theodore E. Deutch, John Garamendi, Robin L. Kelly, Ed Perlmutter, Hakeem S. Jeffries, Yvette D. Clarke, Brian Higgins, James R. Langevin, Anna G. Eshoo, James E. Clyburn, David N. Cicilline, David Loebsack, Wm. Lacy Clay, Nancy Pelosi, Jared Polis, Stephen F. Lynch, Tammy Duckworth, Grace F. Napolitano, John Lewis, Cedric L. Richmond, Steny H. Hoyer, Richard M. Nolan, Robert A. Brady, Michael F. Doyle, Timothy H. Bishop, Loretta Sanchez, Michael H. Michaud, Rául M. Grijalva, Kyrsten Sinema, Jerry McNerney, Bill Pascrell Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Mike Thompson, Grace Meng, Jared Huffman, George Miller, William L. Enyart, Ron Barber, Joe Garcia, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Joyce Beatty, Lloyd Doggett, Frank Pallone Jr., Tim Ryan, William L. Owens, Susan A. Davis, Henry Cuellar, Chaka Fattah, Daniel B. Maffei, Jim McDermott, Brad Sherman, Bobby L. Rush, John D. Dingell, Michael E. Capuano, and Bruce L. Braley.