United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 7, 2013 No. 63

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 7, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable REID J. RIBBLE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

WHAT WOULD REAGAN DO ABOUT ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, what would President Ronald Reagan do about illegal immigration?

Mr. Speaker, let me share verbatim with you parts of a 2006 editorial by Ronald Reagan's Attorney General, Edwin Meese, that is instructive:

What would Ronald Reagan do? I can't tell you how many times I have been asked that question, on virtually every issue imaginable.

Immigration is one area where Reagan's principles can guide us, and the lessons are instructive.

President Reagan set out to correct the loss of control at our borders. Border security and enforcement of immigration laws would be greatly strengthened, in particular through sanctions against employers who hired illegal immigrants. If jobs were the attraction for illegal immigrants, then cutting off that option was crucial.

He also agreed with the legislation in adjusting the status of immigrants, even if they had entered illegally, who were law-abiding long-term residents, many of whom had children in the United States.

Illegal immigrants who could establish that they had resided in America continuously for 5 years would be granted temporary resident status, which could be upgraded to permanent residency after another 18 months and, after another 5 years, to citizenship. It wasn't automatic. They had to pay application fees, learn to speak English, understand American civics, pass a medical exam and register for military Selective Service. Those with convictions for a felony or three misdemeanors were ineligible.

The lesson from the 1986 experience is that such an amnesty did not solve the problem. There was extensive document fraud, and the number of people applying for amnesty far exceeded projections. And there was a failure of political will to enforce new laws against employers. After a brief slowdown, illegal immigration returned to high levels and continued unabated, forming the nucleus of today's large population of illegal aliens.

So here we are, having much the same debate and being offered much the same deal.

What would President Reagan do? For one thing, he would not repeat the mistakes of the past, including those of his own administration. He knew that secure borders are vital and would now insist on meeting that priority first. He would seek to strengthen the enforcement of existing immigration laws. He would employ new tools like biometric technology for identification and cameras, sensors and satellites to monitor the border that make enforcement and verification less onerous and more effective.

One idea President Reagan had at the time that we might also try improving on is to create a pilot program that would allow genuinely temporary workers to come to the United States, a reasonable program consistent with security and open to the needs and dynamics of our market economy.

And what about those already here? Today it seems to me that the fair policy, one that will not encourage further illegal immigration, is to give those here illegally the opportunity to correct their status by returning to their country of origin and getting in line with everyone else. This, along with serious enforcement and control of the illegal inflow at the border, a combination of incentives and disincentives, will significantly reduce over time our population of illegal immigrants.

Lastly, we should remember Reagan's commitment to the idea that America must remain open and welcoming to those yearning for freedom. As a Nation based on ideas, Ronald Reagan believed that there was something unique about America and that anyone, from anywhere, could become an American. That means that while we seek to meet the challenge of illegal immigration, we must keep open the door of opportunity by preserving and enhancing our heritage of legal immigration, assuring that those who choose to come here permanently become Americans. In the end, it was his principled policy—and it should be ours—to ''humanely regain control of our borders and thereby preserve the value of one of the most sacred possessions of our people: American citizenship.''

According to Reagan Attorney General Ed Meese, President Ronald Reagan would learn from history and not repeat the 1986 amnesty mistake that created today's illegal alien problem, the very same amnesty that today's President and so many Senators and Congressmen demand.

President Reagan would insist that those who are here illegally must repent and atone for their illegal conduct by returning to their country of origin and getting in line with everyone else.

Mr. Speaker, America's most cherished right is American citizenship. Foreigners whose first action on American soil is illegal conduct are not deserving of that cherished right.

SEQUESTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to call on Congress to replace the dangerous and irrational sequester with a big and balanced deficit solution.

Ten weeks after the dysfunction of this Congress led to the sequester taking effect, our economy and the most vulnerable in our society are continuing to experience its effects. On a macro level, the sequester has added to the uncertainty businesses and markets were already facing, making it even more difficult to plan for the future and discouraging private sector investment and development that creates jobs.

Just this past Wednesday, the Federal Reserve issued a statement that ''fiscal policy is restraining economic growth.''

But the ill-effects of the Republican sequester policy have been most devastating to those who are in the greatest need and rely on Federal assistance. 70,000 children who will be 3 once and 4 once will be kicked out of Head Start. $115 million in subsidies that help low-income parents access child care while they work will be eliminated. Over half a billion dollars is being taken away from children and family service programs. Because of the sequester, our most vulnerable children are at risk of losing their shot at the American Dream.

It's not only our youngest citizens who are being hurt by sequestration. Low-income seniors will see 4 million fewer Meals on Wheels deliveries this year, putting at risk seniors who are sick and homebound.

The National Institutes of Health will have to reduce life-saving medical research, and 600,000 women, infants, and children could be dropped from the U.S. Department of Agriculture's nutrition program. What an extraordinarily perverse version of ''women and children first''—an admonition to save first, not abandon first.

Congress, Mr. Speaker, must act to replace this stupid sequester. I tell people that sequester starts with ''s,'' which stands for stupid. Congress needs to replace it with a big, balanced agreement that every bipartisan commission that has looked at our fiscal challenge has recommended. Restoring financial discipline sets America on a fiscally sustainable path and enables us to invest in education, innovation, and infrastructure that will grow our economy, create jobs and keep millions out of poverty and lift millions of others from poverty.

□ 1010

In order for that to happen, of course, Mr. Speaker, I think you should appoint budget conferees so that negotiations on such a rational solution can begin in earnest.

Sadly, it's becoming increasingly clear that Republicans are in no hurry to complete the work on a budget as a result of the draconian, unrealistic, and damaging spending levels they set forth under the sequester. Simply put, they cannot implement the budget they adopted, neither through the appropriations process nor through the Ways and Means Committee.

Sequestration, of course, was meant to be so unacceptable that we surely would not allow it to come into effect. But it has. It has because it reflects the spending levels Republicans have long sought.

Now, when I say that, some Republicans say, oh, well, the sequester was the President's idea. Not only is the President opposed to sequester, Democrats in the Senate and Democrats in the House are opposed. Most Republicans—that is to say, 229 Republicans—voted for H.R. 2560, Cut, Cap, and Balance. And what this bill that 229 Republicans voted for—and, by the way, 181 Democrats voted against—was to say that we set numbers. If we don't meet them, what do we have? A sequester.

Sequester was their policy; the across-the-board, irrational cutting of the highest priority and the lowest priority the same was their policy that they voted for, an unfortunate policy because it is so irrational and so harmful. Now they won't say how we can get there, of course, because it just isn't possible without gutting some of the most important programs that have a positive impact on our communities. The Republican Appropriations chairman, my friend, Mr. ROGERS from Kentucky, said, on April 25:

> There will be some who are shocked. I don't think people yet understand how severe the numbers will be.

That's the Republican chairman, my friend, with whom I served for many years on that committee, HAL ROGERS from Kentucky. ''How severe the numbers will be.'' They're the numbers that were in the Ryan budget; they're the numbers that will be affected by sequester.

Republicans are setting up, in my view, a dangerous game of hide-and-seek in which they will hide what sequester levels actually mean and try to mitigate the ones they believe will have political backlash, very frankly, as we did just about 12 days ago regarding the FAA.

They know they can't achieve cuts their caucus can agree on and that the American people would support. And they seek, in my view, to blame the President and Democrats for what has been a wrong-standing Republican policy which I referenced in their Cut, Cap, and Balance legislation for which 229 of them voted for on July 19, 2011.

To do so, Republicans proposed shifting the defense portion of the sequester—''to do so,'' meaning to get to the numbers that they proposed—by shifting the defense portion of the sequester on to domestic programs. In other words, the cuts that would normally be across the board, their solution is to simply shift them to some of the programs that I mentioned earlier in terms of Head Start, Meals on Wheels, and other programs that are so necessary to make sure that some of the least of ours are taken care of.

Of course, this is a breaking of the agreement reached in the Budget Control Act of 2011. We all know the likely outcome of these partisan games, Mr. Speaker. House Republicans will once again be divided, as they were a week before we left, and prevent the adoption of a budget that includes a balanced approach.

Now, balanced approach, I won't like all of it. My friend, Mr. JONES, won't like all of it. None of us will like all of it because it will be balanced and we'll have to take the good with the bad. But what it will be is an effort and a reality of getting America on a fiscally sustainable, credible path. Democrats are ready to make tough choices necessary to reach a compromise, and both sides have a responsibility—my side, their side. Very frankly, we ought to be one side, the American side. Both sides have a responsibility to work together to meet our challenges in a sensible way, not a senseless, irrational way, which is what the sequester does, but in a smart way, worthy of our role as the American people's representatives.

OUT OF AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, like most Members of Congress, I was home last week and did two or three different civic clubs. Everywhere I went, when I said it's time to get our troops out of Afghanistan, save lives of our American soldiers, and save money, I would get applause.

Also, in the last couple of weeks, my office has sent out a survey, and 17,000 people of the Third District responded, and 70 percent of the 17,000 said the same thing: Why are we still in Afghanistan spending money we do not have and having our young men and women to give their life for a failed policy known as Afghanistan?

Mr. Speaker, a week ago, I was watching NBC News and Brian Williams broke the story that the CIA admitted that for the last 10 years, each month for the last 10 years they've been carrying cash money to Karzai—cash money. And they said that the best they could do was to estimate that this would be tens of millions of dollars. Poor Uncle Sam. I don't know how he can afford to continue to spend money of the taxpayers that we can't even account for so we can borrow more money from China to uphold Karzai, who's a corrupt leader to begin with.

I wonder where the outrage is in Congress? I have friends on both sides of the aisles that I think the world of and respect very greatly, but why isn't there more outrage by Congress on the money being spent and, more importantly, the lives of those lost?

Last Saturday, Mr. Speaker, an AP article said seven Americans were killed in Afghanistan. Seven Americans were killed. God help the families. Yet we in Congress just sit here and continue to think that Afghanistan is not our problem, it's just somewhere out there, and we'll find the millions and billions of dollars to send over there with no accountability.

Mr. Speaker, I'm on the Armed Services Committee, and I have written a letter to the chairman of the Oversight Subcommittee and asked her to hold hearings and bring in the inspectors general who've been looking into how the waste, fraud, and abuse abounds in Afghanistan. They can't even account for half the money we've spent over in Afghanistan. We've already spent over $700 billion in Afghanistan, and half of it we can't even account for.

I don't blame the American people for being frustrated. I really do not. I'm frustrated, too. And I would hope we can find more members of the Republican Party and the Democratic Party to join together in these budget bills coming up this summer and start bringing our troops out of Afghanistan.

I bring this photograph, Mr. Speaker, that has our marines carrying a flag-draped coffin. I try to do this down in the district, and I do it here on the floor because I'm afraid too many times the American people, unless they've got a family member in Afghanistan, probably, with all of the problems that the American people are faced with, and certainly we are here in Congress, don't think a whole lot about the war. But when you hear about the CIA sending cash money for 10 years, millions and millions and millions of dollars to Karzai so that he can take care of the warlords over in Afghanistan and give a little bit of money to the Taliban so they can buy weapons to kill Americans, then I don't know and I sometimes just am frustrated. Where is the outrage in Congress?

Just a couple more points, Mr. Speaker, before I relinquish my time. I hope that the leadership of the House, led by Speaker BOEHNER and Minority Leader PELOSI, I hope they will join us, Democrat and Republican, in trying to bring an end to this failed policy in Afghanistan. It is a failed policy. We're not going to change one thing. They've already acknowledged, Mr. Speaker, that we are fighting the Taliban, and most of the Taliban are Pashtuns, the largest tribe in Afghanistan. They will eventually be the leaders, and Mr. Karzai will not even be in Afghanistan. He'll probably be in Switzerland counting his money that Uncle Sam has sent to him. Taxpayer, taxpayer, it is wrong that you're having to pay that bill in Afghanistan.

Families who've lost loved ones and families who have kids losing their legs and their lives, it's not fair to you, either.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask God to continue to bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God to continue to bless the families who've given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. I'll ask God to please bless the House and Senate, that we will do what is right in the eyes of God for his people. I'll ask God to bless President Obama, that he will do what is right in the eyes of God for his people. And as I yield back, God, please, God, please, God, please, continue to bless America.

□ 1020

THE TIME HAS COME TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT SEXUAL ASSAULT IN OUR MILITARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, next to me is a mug shot. It's a mug shot of someone who's been charged with sexual assault. This is a mug shot of Jeffrey Krusinski.

Jeffrey Krusinski is a lieutenant colonel in the Air Force. His job is to work at the Pentagon as the chief officer of the Sexual Assault and Prevention Office within the Air Force. This man is charged with the responsibility of preventing and reporting sexual assault in the military, in the Air Force. And just this last weekend, he was charged with sexually assaulting a woman in a parking lot.

The best and the brightest the Air Force has to offer to run this office, and he's a sexual predator? Is that what we're talking about?

This is an indictment of the SAPRO office that is supposed to be the solution for military rape and assault. It's an indictment of our procedures. It's an indictment of everything we have done on this issue.

And Congress is as culpable as the military in not addressing it, because we've known about this issue for 25 years. And we are big on holding hearings and beating our chests and saying, This has got to stop. And the big brass comes up to the Hill, and they say all the right words. They say, We have a zero tolerance. And then our chief prevention officer is charged with a sexual assault.

But it doesn't end there. The bad news doesn't end there.

The military just released today it's Sexual Assault and Prevention Office report on how many sexual assaults took place in the military last year. And guess what? The numbers have gone up by 30 percent, from 19,000 sexual assaults and rapes in the military, based on the last year's figures, to the most recent year's figures of 26,000 rapes and sexual assaults in the military.

For all the money we've been throwing at this issue, for all the prevention and all the rehabilitation and all of the training, the numbers keep going up. And now, this most recent report also suggests that one-third of the women serving in the military reported that they were sexually harassed last year.

This is an institution of military good discipline, good order?

It is time for us to roll up our sleeves and do something real about this. We have got to stop just kind of nibbling around the edges in an effort to try and fix a broken system.

121 Members have joined me as coauthors of legislation that would take the reporting of sexual assault out of the chain of command, keep it in the military, but place it in a separate office staffed by persons who are experts in investigations, experts in prosecuting these crimes.

And until we do something like this, the numbers of sexual assaults will continue to rise in the military. The number of unrestricted reports will not rise as fast as the number of restricted reports.

And why do we have restricted reports? Why would we say to any member of the military, Yes, report this, but we will keep it quiet, we will sweep it under the rug?

This, my friends, is time for us to do something. It is time for us to say that we are not going to tolerate another scandal. We're not going to tolerate a scandal on Lackland Air Force Base, where there were 59 victims and 32 military training instructors who were implicated. We're not going to tolerate that in Aviano, Italy. We had a major general who overturned the decision by five military members of a jury who court-martialed a lieutenant colonel and found him guilty, and yet the major general overturned the decision and decided to reinstate this individual.

The time, my friends, has come to do something.

ADDRESSING THE DEBT LIMIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, amidst all the controversies gripping the Congress, certainly we should at least all be able to agree that the full faith and credit of the United States, the very trust that the public has when it loans money to the government, should not hang in the balance every time there's a fiscal debate in Washington.

This week, the House is expected to consider H.R. 807, to allow a temporary exception to the debt limit solely to assure that the full and prompt payment of principal and interest is made on the debt in the event of an impasse in Washington.

Now, that should make perfect sense. As a practical matter, a family that's depending on its credit cards to pay its bills had better make sure to pay the credit card bills first.

The executive branch already has considerable powers to protect the Nation's credit, but the administration hasn't always acknowledged it. The 14th Amendment to the Constitution

places the validity of the public debt beyond question.

The Government Accountability Office has consistently held that the Treasury Secretary already has ''the authority to choose the order in which to pay obligations of the United States'' in order to protect the Nation's credit. This authority is inherent in the 1789 act that established the Treasury Department and entrusted it with the management of the revenue and the support of the public credit.

Even with record deficits, our revenues are roughly 10 times greater than our public debt service, so there's no excuse for a debt default. And yet, when an impasse over the debt limit loomed 2 years ago, then-Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner insisted that his only option was to default on the Nation's credit.

Now, whether this was a crude attempt to hold the Nation's credit hostage to political demands for higher spending or whether it was the sincere misunderstanding of his powers and responsibilities is really immaterial.

In the future, this measure would order the Treasury Secretary to promptly and fully pay all principal and interest due on the national debt, even providing a temporary exemption from the debt limit in order to do so.

Now, most States have provisions in their laws or constitutions guaranteeing their debt. Last year in testimony to the Senate, Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke praised these State provisions for maintaining confidence in State and municipal markets, and he told the House Budget Committee that a similar measure at the Federal level would help protect the Nation's credit.

Is this a tacit suggestion that we shouldn't meet our other obligations? Well, does anyone suggest that all the States that have had similar provisions in their constitutions and statutes for hundreds of years have ever used them as an excuse not to pay their other bills? Of course not. On the contrary, providing clear and unambiguous mandates to protect their credit first, they actually support and maintain their ability to pay all of their other obligations.

For a Congress that's borrowing nearly 40 cents on every dollar that it spends, the importance of this provision should be obvious. With the Nation carrying a total debt that exceeds its entire economy, it is imperative that credit markets be absolutely certain that the risk of an American default is nonexistent. Without this confidence, rising interest rates could rapidly consume vital government programs and make a mockery of the even modest budget savings wrought by the sequester.

Opponents charge that protecting the public credit above all other expenditures would subordinate many other essential obligations, like payments to troops or children's nutrition, but they forget the public credit is what makes it possible to meet every other obligation of the government.

A prolonged impasse over the debt limit is something that is much to be avoided.

□ 1030

Postponing payment of any of the government's bills would be dangerous and unprecedented. Although existing revenues could support critical government responsibilities for a while, distress to other Federal employees and contractors would be severe, would rapidly compound, and would eventually threaten core governmental functions.

Yet there is a worse fiscal outcome, and that is a failure to honor the Nation's debt obligations. We should remember that if the full faith and credit of the United States is ever compromised, all programs are jeopardized.

We must recognize that today our country is divided over fiscal policy and that bitter fiscal disputes in Congress are likely to continue for some time. Financial markets ought to be confident that their Treasury bonds are safe regardless of what political storms are raging in Washington.

TRIBUTE TO MR. JOSEPH CARTER CORBIN, FOUNDER OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT PINE BLUFF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Mr. Joseph Carter Corbin, founder of the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff.

As a proud graduate of Arkansas Mechanical and Normal College, now the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, I am pleased to have the opportunity to participate in the dedication of a headstone on the grave site of our founder and first president, Professor Joseph Carter Corbin.

The Bible says, ''Where there is no vision, the people perish;'' and all of us who revere and appreciate the history of the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff owe a debt of gratitude to our fellow alumna, Ms. Gladys Turner Finney, who thought of the idea, did the research, and communicated with other alumni across the country and brought the idea to fruition. The final resting place of Joseph Carter was recently discovered in an unmarked grave in Forest Home Cemetery in Forest Park, Illinois, which I represent as a Member of Congress.

Professor Corbin died January 9, 1911, in Pine Bluff, Arkansas. He was interred at the Waldheim Cemetery in Forest Park near his wife, Mary Jane Corbin, and two sons, John W. Corbin and William H. Corbin. The cemetery, known at that time as Waldheim German Cemetery, is located at 863 South Des Plaines Avenue in Forest Park, Illinois.

Mr. Corbin was born in Chillicothe, Ohio, on March 26, 1833, to free parents, William and Susan Corbin. He entered Ohio University at Athens, Ohio, in 1850, when he was 17, after having been home-schooled. He earned a bachelor's degree in art. He also earned two master's degrees from Ohio University in 1856 and 1889.

He later moved to Little Rock, Arkansas, joined the Republican Party, and became a leader. He quickly rose and became secretary of the State convention and was elected State Superintendent of Public Instruction, where he laid the groundwork for the establishment of the Branch Normal College. It finally started, and he became its founder and principal for 27 years, from 1875 to 1902.

A leader in the public education movement in Arkansas, Professor Corbin became the principal of Merrill High School in 1902. He and fellow educator, R.C. Childress, founded Teachers of Negro Youth in Arkansas, which became the first State colored teachers association. Professor Corbin was its first president.

Compared with educators Booker T. Washington and Horace Mann, Professor Corbin was thought to be one of the most highly educated individuals of his time as a scholarly graduate of Ohio University. During his tenure at Branch Normal, he worked tirelessly to maintain an adequate physical plant and academic program. The student population grew from 7 students to 241 students by 1894, when Arkansas graduated its first African American student.

As beneficiaries of his work, we hold Professor Corbin and his legacy in high esteem. An institution which started with 7 students is now the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff offering master's degrees, bachelor's degrees, and doctorate degrees. We owe Joseph Carter Corbin, our first president and the founder of a now great institution, a debt of gratitude and thank him for his work.

PASS A RESPONSIBLE FARM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the importance of getting a farm bill done this year. Growing up on a farm in South Dakota, I know how volatile the agriculture industry certainly is. Our producers will invest in seed; they will fertilize the land; and they will put it in the ground in the spring, oftentimes in unfavorable weather, in the hope that that fall they will come back and be able to pick something up and have something to show for it in the fall. The crops that are grown provide food not just for South Dakota, but for our Nation and for our world.

South Dakotans understand that our weather can be extreme and it can be unpredictable. It can also vary a lot from year to year. We have certainly seen that situation this year. Look at

what we have witnessed lately. We have gone from extreme droughts in the Midwest to now blizzards in April. For agriculture producers, these extremes are more than an inconvenience. Whether it is an extended drought that dries out crops or a blizzard that endangers a herd of cattle, weather disasters can mean the difference between a family operation that is able to make it through another year or a family operation that ends forever.

When faced with weather-related disasters, I know that it is essential for our farmers and ranchers to have immediate assistance to keep their operations running. We have a national security interest in being able to produce our own food in this country. The instance we depend on another country to feed our people is the instance that we completely let them control us and our future. A farm bill not only provides a safety net for us, it keeps us safe. We need to keep our farmers on the land in good times and in bad times.

Budgeting for these programs through the farm bill process is much more responsible than doing what has been done in the past, such as passing large, ad hoc disaster assistance packages, which is what Congress often ends up doing year after year if these programs are not in place and are not funded. Often these disaster programs could be spent at a deficit level rather than responsibly being budgeted for.

One of the situations we don't talk about very often is how the dynamics have changed in the farming industry. It is simply not possible for farmers and ranchers to continue to operate without having access to credit. The only way they have access to credit a lot of times is because of dependence on crop insurance and somewhat of a farm safety net.

Next week, the House Agriculture Committee plans to mark up the farm bill. We need this House to act. We need them to get a farm bill done, one that will support both rural and urban America. We cannot accept another extension this year. We must pass a long-term bill to give certainty to our producers and to guarantee our Nation's food supply.

MATTIE RIPKOWSKI—TEXAS MOTHER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Sunday is Mother's Day where we honor our Nation's mothers. My mom is still alive. I got to know my grandmothers, both of them, until they died in their nineties, and my three daughters all have children.

But I want to talk about a mother that most Americans probably have never ever heard of. Her name was Mattie Ripkowski. Let me tell you a little bit about her and her family.

She was a first-generation American-born Polish immigrant. Back in the 1800s, the Polish community came into Texas through the Port of Galveston. They settled there while Texas was an independent country. In fact, some Poles fought at the Battle of San Jacinto where Texas won its independence from Mexico in 1836.

□ 1040

Mattie Olbrich was born in 1896 in Texas. At the age of 17, she married Stash Ripkowski—both newlyweds—another small-town guy from New Waverly, Texas. They started raising a family, Mattie and Stash. And after several years, this was their family. Yes, Mattie Ripkowski had 16 children—4 daughters and 12 sons. They were all born by natural childbirth with a midwife, except one. This whole family lived in southeast Texas on a small, 200-acre farm near Dayton, Texas.

Mattie—the mother, the wife—made sure that during the Depression all the kids never went hungry. She taught them the basics of life: true grit, a work ethic, a belief in the Almighty. They worked hard, everything from picking cotton to tending to animals to hauling corn. And every child was expected to do their work on the farm, which was self-sufficient.

When two of the Ripkowski boys got to be in high school, they were excellent football players. And you know, Mr. Speaker, Texas is known for its football teams all the way back to the 1800s. Two of them were so good that the local high school football coach, who knew that they had to work on the farm, had the school hire two farmers to take the sons' place and work the farm. Then the two high school football stars could play for Dayton High School. Dayton is a small Texas town that loves football. The 5,500 people there that go to Friday night football, the stadium seats more than the entire town population.

But anyway, back to the Ripkowskis. They never missed a meal. In fact, Mattie was so adamant about family that they all ate together three times a day. Now, can you imagine preparing a table three times a day for 18 people—16 of them kids and 12 of them sons?

As the Depression ended, World War II came. And as World War II came, Mattie, having taught her kids service to America, all 12 of her sons joined the United States military. They served in all branches of the military. They served either in World War II or Korea, or both.

Every night, Mattie would write one of them a letter. She would say the Rosary every night for all 12. She would pray for all of her sons. Miraculously, all 12 of her sons who went to war for America came back. There has never been another family with that many sons from the same parents who joined the United States military. She instilled in them those important values of country, God, and family. The Ripkowski family is quite a remarkable clan of Texans.

Mrs. Ripkowski—Mattie, as they called her—her kids grew up to all marry. She knew all of their spouses and many of her grandchildren and great-grandchildren. The fruits of Mattie Ripkowski's labor produced honest, hardworking, God-fearing patriots.

One test of motherhood, Mr. Speaker, is how a mother's kids turn out. Well, Mattie passed the test 16 times with her 16 children. They all turned out to be wonderful people. In fact, six of them are still alive. I had the opportunity recently at a dedication where we honored a Vietnam veteran who received the Medal of Honor by naming a post office for him. Some of her kids came to that ceremony. The youngest, Anna Lee Campbell, who is now 80, and I talked about her family, about Mattie, about growing up with this remarkable woman. And she showed me numerous photographs of their family.

I was also there with one of the sons, Mike, who talked about their family, Polish immigrants, and how they have all turned out to be successful and how they fought for America. Before the conversation was over with Mike I asked him, ''What did you call your mother all those many years?'' He said, ''Well, of course I called her mama, and I also called her ma'am.'' No kidding.

Remarkable lady, Mattie Ripkowski. We honor her and all of America's mothers this Sunday for their lives and dedication to motherhood.

And that's just the way it is.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 44 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Once again we come to You to ask wisdom, patience, peace, and understanding for the Members of this people's House.

We ask discernment for the Members, that they might judge anew their adherence to principle, conviction, and commitment, lest they slide uncharitably toward an inability to listen to one another and work cooperatively to solve the important issues of our day.

Give them the generosity of heart and the courage of true leadership to work toward a common solution which might call for sacrifice on both sides. We pray that their work results not in a Nation comprised of winners and losers, but where our citizens know in their hearts that we Americans are all winners.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BENISHEK 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

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING SERGEANT 1ST CLASS JAMES PRIESTAP

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

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce that the circle drive of the Oscar G. Johnson Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Iron Mountain, Michigan, will be named after local son and Iraq War veteran, Sergeant 1st Class James Priestap.

Sergeant Priestap graduated from North Dickinson High School in 1985 before attending Ferris State University and Northern Michigan University and joining the U.S. Navy as a rescue swimmer. Sergeant Priestap also served as a police officer at the Oscar G. Johnson VA Medical Center, where I worked as a physician. While bravely defending his Nation in Iraq, Sergeant Priestap was killed in action on Thanksgiving Day 2006.

The entire Dickinson community came together to memorialize Sergeant Priestap at the VA facility where he guarded our veterans, and I am honored today to have helped him fight for this distinction over the past 2 years.

This memorial represents a small but important gesture of gratitude, not only for Sergeant Priestap's sacrifice but for his lifelong pursuit of selfless service to others. I'm very pleased that all visitors to the world-class VA hospital in Iron Mountain will soon be able to remember a true hero from northern Michigan who laid down his life so that others could live in freedom.

NATIONAL TEACHER APPRECIATION DAY

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today on National Teacher Appreciation Day with an oft-forgotten remedy to our economic downturn: investments in early childhood education.

Successful nations invest in three things: infrastructure, research, and education. To compete in the global market, we need to have the most highly skilled workforce in the world. And to develop that workforce, we have to start at the beginning with early childhood education.

Research from Stanford shows that rich students perform better than middle- and low-income students. Quite simply, they enter kindergarten more prepared thanks to high quality preschool. Nobel Laureate economist James Heckman found a 7 to 10 percent annual return on investment in effective preschool.

Every child deserves a chance to succeed in school and throughout their lives. Providing early childhood education can give them that chance, and the entire Nation will be better off for it.

MONTANA VOTES AGAINST AN ONLINE SALES TAX

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

Mr. DAINES. Madam Speaker, today I rise in strong opposition to the Marketplace Fairness Act. This is a bill that mandates small businesses to collect sales tax on behalf of other cities and States when selling products over the Internet.

This bill would fundamentally change how online purchases are taxed and would impose yet another burden on Montana's small businesses. You see, back home in Montana, we don't have a Statewide sales tax. In fact, we often say that ''You know you're a native Montanan if you've voted against a sales tax twice.''

But under this legislation, which the Senate passed last night, Montana's small businesses would be forced to collect sales tax for up to 9,600 cities and States—none of which would go to Montana. The added costs and the burden of more paperwork and more regulations would severely undermine many small businesses in our State.

As a fifth-generation Montanan who supports our State's no sales tax policy, I strongly oppose this legislation, and I will fight to stop it should it reach the House floor.

URBAN AREA SECURITY INITIATIVE

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, the success of Boston law enforcement in responding to the marathon bombing is due to the skill and coordination of their law enforcement community.

Boston's law enforcement agencies also have the benefit of membership in the Urban Area Security Initiative, or UASI, program. The security program was created to develop capabilities to prevent and respond to attacks just like this one in our most vulnerable cities.

Unfortunately, funding shortfalls in recent years have cut the number of cities included in this program from 64 to 32. The Buffalo-Niagara region which I represent was among the eliminated regions.

Madam Speaker, the eliminated cities are still vulnerable, and, in fact, it was recently revealed that a Canadian terror plot may have targeted the border in Niagara Falls.

The Federal Government made an investment in these communities, and a sudden exclusion from this security program threatens to render that investment wasted. The increased security and response capabilities that have been developed must be preserved, and we have an obligation to restore eligibility to these excluded communities.

CONGRATULATING ANGELO STATE UNIVERSITY RAMS AND RAMBELLES

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the historic achievement of the Angelo State University men's and women's track and field teams. On May 4, 2013, the Rams and the Rambelles won the Lone Star Conference Outdoor Track and Field titles.

This marks the first time in school history that both the men's and women's teams have won their conference

title in the same year, the fifth consecutive year for the Rambelles and the first for the Rams since 1992. The Rams won their title in dramatic west Texas fashion, defeating their rivals West Texas A&M in the final race.

Coach James Reid, his staff, and these young men and women worked tirelessly this year to have earned their place in ASU history. They bring great pride to their school, the city of San Angelo, and west Texas. I encourage them to savor their victories, and I wish them great success as they defend their titles next year.

Again, I congratulate the Angelo State Rams and Rambelles for their Lone Star Conference Outdoor Track and Field titles. Go Rams!

RIGHT TO WORK FOR LESS ACT

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, for generations we have fought to improve conditions for working American families: the minimum wage, anti-discrimination rules, and the 40-hour workweek. These changes were all passed by Congress to make it a little bit easier for Americans to make a decent living under decent working conditions.

Now the Republicans want to roll back some of these basic protections, starting with the 40-hour workweek. The bill we are debating this week—which should be called the Right to Work for Less Act—is designed to let employers avoid paying overtime and could force workers to take comp time instead. But the comp time could only be used when it suits the employer.

There is no question we need to improve workplace rules, like equal pay for equal work or guaranteed paid sick leave or a higher minimum wage. But rolling back the clock to do away with the 40-hour workweek is a step backwards, and it is a lousy deal for American workers.

□ 1210

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today to voice my support for H.R. 1406, the Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013.

Working families all across America face difficult choices every day over how to balance their responsibilities at work with their duties to their families at home.

Government employees have always had the option to convert accrued overtime into time off from work. However, private sector employees do not have this option. Today's rigid and archaic wage-and-hour laws force these employees to take vacation days or simply not work when confronted with sick children, responsibilities to aging patients, or even seemingly mundane, yet time-consuming, tasks like running errands.

H.R. 1406 would provide private employees that same flexibility that government workers enjoy while protecting both the rights of workers and their employers.

I ask my colleagues to support working families and vote in favor of this legislation.

SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE MILITARY

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, last night, reports circulated that the Air Force official who is in charge of its sexual assault prevention program at the Pentagon was arrested for sexually assaulting a woman in a parking lot. Although we are still waiting for a full investigation to be conducted, if true, this type of conduct is absolutely unacceptable, especially from the individual who's in the leadership position to prevent this.

When one joins the U.S. military, he or she is expected to have the highest level of character and respect. Mr. Krusinski was not only a leader, but he was responsible for enforcing sexual assault prevention.

I have worked for many years in Congress on this issue. Fundamental changes are needed in order to combat this. It's up to the military and to the Congress to ensure that victims will be respected and protected and that offenders will be punished. It's absolutely necessary that this problem of leadership and climate in the military be addressed immediately. If not, the health and strength of this Nation's military will deteriorate.

SENATE IMMIGRATION BILL COSTS $6.3 TRILLION

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, a new study by The Heritage Foundation warns that the Senate immigration bill would cost $6.3 trillion. That's because over their lifetime, illegal immigrants given amnesty would receive $9.4 trillion in government benefits while paying only $3.1 trillion in taxes. Government benefits include Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, food stamps, and health care. That means each taxpayer would be forced to pay $40,000 just to cover some of the costs of the immigration bill.

The immigration bill costs too much, has no deadline to secure the border, and hurts American workers. We should put the interests of American taxpayers and American workers first.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO AMEAL MOORE

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to former Riverside City Councilman Ameal Moore.

Born and raised in the South, Ameal experienced ''separate but equal'' and injustice firsthand. In 1965, his brother Oneal, a Louisiana sheriff, was murdered by the racist vigilante group the Night Riders—a tragedy that in some ways fueled Ameal's activism and desire to create safer communities.

A veteran, Ameal served in the United States Air Force for 8 years. After being honorably discharged, he settled with his family in Riverside, where he worked for the United States Postal Service for over 30 years, eventually becoming the assistant postmaster.

Never one to sit idly by, Ameal was always involved in local organizations. He was the president of Riverside's NAACP chapter and served on the Greater Riverside Urban League. Later, he decided to run for public office and was elected to the Riverside City Council in 1994, becoming one of the first African American city council members in our city's history. During his tenure, Ameal showed unparalleled passion toward improving our community.

Riverside is lucky to have had such a remarkable and dedicated public servant like Ameal Moore. I am incredibly proud that Ameal came to Riverside and that our city is where he fulfilled his dreams. He will be missed.

MONEY FOR NOTHING

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

Mr. MESSER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight more wasteful government spending.

The Washington Post recently reported that the Federal Government will spend at least $890,000 on service fees for more than 13,000 empty bank accounts this year. Let me say that again. Our Federal Government will spend $890,000 servicing 13,000 empty bank accounts with a balance of zero.

The President's OMB thinks that's good news because the number of these so-called zero balance accounts has decreased by 50 percent over the past several years. I think we can do better. We must close these empty bank accounts and put the money sitting in the inactive ones to good use, like reducing the deficit. I plan to introduce legislation soon that will do just that.

Madam Speaker, President Reagan once noted how only in Washington

does it make sense for the agency responsible for everything outside to be called the Department of the Interior. I would add that only in Washington is it good news when the government spends $1 million on nothing.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, sequestration—we must repeal the sequester now.

Americans have lived under these budget cuts for over 2 months, and one thing is clear: sequestration is hurting Americans; it is hurting constituents in your district and in mine, damaging the American economy and killing American jobs. We must totally repeal sequestration now. Democrats are prepared to vote for full repeal.

Madam Speaker, a piecemeal approach to reversing these cuts is simply the wrong way forward. We should not be in the business of picking winners and losers when it comes to restoring funding, like when we reversed the cuts to TSA because the delays created made front-page news. Our actions should not be driven by who makes the most noise, but rather what is best for the country and the American people.

Lifesaving medical research funded by NIH has taken a $1.6 billion hit. Are we to think that research for cures to cancer, HIV/AIDS, and diabetes are less important than how quickly we move through airport lines?

Madam Speaker, we need to send a clear message to the American people that we will not stand for arbitrary cuts. We must fully repeal sequestration now.

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 1406, the piece of legislation that we will be debating today, the Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013. I am proud of the work that my friend Congresswoman MARTHA ROBY has done on this important bill. This legislation makes life easier for American families by giving them an additional tool to balance the demands of their family and workplace life.

As the father of boys, I know it takes a lot of time to help not only raise them, but to prepare them for their future. But I also had a job in the private sector; and I know that there are times when people in the private sector need the flexibility to do like I did, to take their boys to a Boy Scout campout or a wrestling tournament.

Currently, public sector workers have the flexibility to convert their overtime into comp time off. Labor unions include similar provisions in collective bargaining agreements with their employees. America's private sector workers deserve the same option that union workers have.

I look forward to supporting this legislation on the floor and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

□ 1220

ARBITRATION FAIRNESS ACT

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, today I introduce H.R. 1844, the Arbitration Fairness Act. Forced arbitration agreements stack the deck against working people and have been of concern to me ever since I've come to Congress. These agreements are pervasive and they adversely affect countless Americans every year.

Too many Americans are forced to give up their rights to have a trial by jury when it comes to these consumer agreements that they sign with these megabusinesses. My bill would remedy this by prohibiting any predispute agreement that requires arbitration for claims involving employees, consumers, civil rights, and antitrust.

We must protect our constitutional right to a fair trial by a jury of one's peers. I will continue to champion this bill until it is signed into law, and I urge my colleagues to support the Arbitration Fairness Act.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, as we approach the summer months, we get closer to the dreaded date of 2014 when ObamaCare is launched. We still face major uncertainty to how this massive takeover of health care is actually going to work. In fact, the administration is not even certain of that.

Families and small businesses in my district have great concern over what's going to happen. In fact, when I talk to small business owners, many of them say they're going to have to stop providing health care and put these folks into these exchanges because they need the money to stay competitive. It's going to be something that they can find savings; and, again, in these uncertain times, they're not sure exactly what they're going to do.

When you look at what the President said that ''if you like your health care, you can keep your health care,'' well, in fact, in my district, there's going to be 44,000 seniors that are going to lose Medicare Advantage because of ObamaCare.

Taxes will go up. Taxes will go up on businesses and families. Individuals are already seeing their premiums increased.

And the President has done nothing to provide certainty, as I said. The administration isn't even sure how this is going to play out. And I believe, ladies and gentlemen, that this is going to end up in a train wreck. This is going to end up in something that is going to hurt the economy and hurt health care.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN FURLOUGHS

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

Mr. MAFFEI. Madam Speaker, last weekend, I had the honor to visit the men and women of the 174th Attack Wing at Hancock Air National Guard Base in Syracuse, New York.

The 174th is tasked with training airmen and supporting missions around the globe, including supporting combat missions in Afghanistan. It also supports homeland defense and aids during domestic emergencies, such as Hurricane Sandy. It does this 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

I was thoroughly impressed with the professionalism of Colonel Greg Semmel and the officers and airmen under his command. But I also saw firsthand how sequestration is affecting our military and its ability to execute its mission, a mission that the Congress of the United States authorized.

Approximately 280 that work for the 174th are subject to furlough, forcing the unit to operate missions in a theater of war shorthanded. Many of these men and women are in the National Guard and work full time in uniform. They are members of our Armed Forces on military missions and yet subject to sequestration.

This Congress should be ashamed that soldiers are sequestered in a time of war. I urge this body to find a way to prevent these furloughs so that the 174th and the rest of our military can complete the mission and protect our national security. We cannot wait another week. We must do it this week. We must give our soldiers and sailors and airmen the support that they need.

GUN VIOLENCE

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, it has been more than 20 weeks since the tragic shooting at Sandy Hook school; yet Congress has still been unable to pass a comprehensive legislative piece to curb gun violence in this country. While an overwhelming majority of Americans support expanding background checks, Senate Republicans last month blocked an important measure that would have expanded background checks to many types of private firearm sales.

I came here from the mental health field. Every day that the Republicans in Congress choose to block critical measures to reduce gun violence, we will prevent having a safe community,

because with the background check, many innocent sick people will be stopped. We cannot afford to continue to lose lives and have families severely impacted by senseless violence at the hands of criminals with deadly firearms.

Madam Speaker, we owe it to the American people to respond immediately to this violence.

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT II

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

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, leave it to Washington to leave a severely outdated government regulation on the books where it can continue to be a thorn in the side of hardworking Americans all across the country.

Under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938—yes, 1938, 3 years before our country entered World War II—American workers in the private sector are not allowed to choose to be paid for overtime with extra time off instead of extra wages.

There's no denying that our workforce has changed since 1938. Nowadays, 59 percent of American families have two parents that work, and 8.5 million workers are single parents. When you're balancing work and family, time can be just as valuable as money.

The Working Families Flexibility Act, which House Republicans have introduced, will amend the 1938 law to give more American workers the choice to be paid in extra time off. It's your time and you deserve it.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, this institution is commonly referred to as the people's House. We have an obligation to address issues that impact all Americans.

The sequestration cuts began as a slow burn but have increasingly caused pain for people all across this country. Now, this House somehow found the courage to rescue air travelers from the sequestration battlefield, but we left other Americans behind:

We left Head Start children behind; we left expectant mothers behind; we left seniors who rely on the Meals on Wheels program behind; we left public housing residents behind; we left the long-term unemployed behind.

We have an obligation to address issues that confront all Americans. That's why I support H.R. 900, a one-sentence bill that would repeal the sequester.

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I wanted to take this 60-second moment to stand here in front of the House and talk a little bit about the Working Families Flexibility Act. I am someone that as a Member of Congress, in a previous life, has run both a State agency where they could do this, where actually employees at my State level had the options of how they managed their compensation, whether they wanted to take it in time or actually in dollars.

But yet the arrogance, the continuing arrogance of Washington, it's good enough for our public employees, but it's not good enough for the businesses around the country. I've got to give MARTHA ROBY credit. Thank you for bringing this bill before us. Hopefully, we're going to step up and say, if we really want economic choice for the American people, we'll pass this bill.

□ 1230

HONORING THE STUDENTS OF ELM PLACE MIDDLE SCHOOL'S PROBLEM SOLVERS

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, my district is home to Highland Park's Elm Place Middle School. The sixth, seventh, and eighth graders who make up the Problem Solvers team recently won their division at the Illinois Future Problem Solvers Bowl, and they will compete in the international competition in June.

The Future Problem Solving Program encourages young students to think critically and creatively in order to develop a vision for the future and to become leaders. In my view, these Elm Place students have achieved all three.

Their project, Tefkiir, connected them with a girls school in Jordan, and they began to exchange books and educational materials. Quickly, the students realized how much they all have in common—how much more binds us than separates us. The Elm Place students are moving on to the International Problem Solving Bowl, but they don't want to go without their partners, without their friends in Jordan. So the team raised money in our community to pay for the airfare. These students, a half a world apart, started this project together, and that's how they will finish it.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to use my time today to honor the students of Elm Place Middle School's Problem Solvers.

TIME FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO FACE SEQUESTER

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, the Federal budget is approximately $3.6 trillion; $2.4 trillion is what we call ''mandatory spending.'' That's Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and interest payments on the debt. Approximately $1.2 trillion is the discretionary budget, and we sit here and moan about $85 billion in sequester. Businesses have had the sequester over the past 3 to 4 years. Not-for-profits have had the sequester for the past 3 or 4 years. It's about time that the Federal Government sequestered also.

I want to thank the President for addressing the mandatory-spending program. With his chained CPI address on Social Security, he recognizes the fact that, if we want to stop sequestration from occurring, mandatory programs have to be reformed.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. VARGAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in favor of comprehensive immigration reform, especially one that respects the heroic work and heroic lives of our military.

We've now heard from many military personnel who have said that what they fear most is that their spouses are going to be unfortunately and dastardly taken from them and deported. We heard from a young marine over at the Russell Building who is going off to Afghanistan for his third tour of duty. He said that he is not afraid of dying. He says, ''That's what marines do—we fight and we die.'' His only fear is that, when he is gone, they may deport his wife back to Mexico, and then he doesn't know what he can do to help her or their two children.

So we have to change the law. The law is not fair. How can the law possibly be fair when our military men and women are under this kind of threat? I stand here today to say that we have to have comprehensive immigration reform, especially one that respects our military.

30TH ANNUAL NATIONAL TRAVEL AND TOURISM WEEK

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

Ms. TITUS. I rise today in recognition of National Travel and Tourism Week, and I will be introducing a resolution to that effect later today.

Travel and tourism make up the lifeblood of our economy in southern Nevada: 383,000 southern Nevada jobs are supported by the tourism industry, accounting for 47 percent of southern Nevada's labor force and generating $45 billion in economic activity.

Men and women are employed in the convention, entertainment, gaming, and related service industries. Their

hard work, ingenuity, and dedication make Las Vegas one of the world's premier travel destinations for business and pleasure. Last year, nearly 40 million visitors came to Las Vegas. In addition, we hosted over 21,000 conventions and meetings, which brought in some 5 million national and international tourists, most of whom spent considerable time in District One. Furthermore, 43 percent of these visitors traveled through McCarran Airport, which is the Nation's sixth busiest airport, also located in District One.

So for the sake of southern Nevada's economy and our national future, we must make real investments in our country's infrastructure in order to increase the efficiency and reliability of travel and to encourage greater tourism to the United States and to Las Vegas.

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

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

Ms. FOXX. It is hard to raise a family and earn a living at the same time. The reality is that every hour you spend working to provide for your family is an hour you can't spend with your family.

For nearly 30 years, Federal, State, and local government employees have been able to choose paid time off, or comp time, instead of cash wages as compensation for working overtime hours. Unfortunately, Federal law prohibits employees in the private sector from having the same option. It's time to put an end to this double standard. Private sector employees deserve the same flexibility.

That is why Republicans have introduced H.R. 1406, the Working Families Flexibility Act; and that bill deserves our support. We will vote shortly on the rule for that and tomorrow on the bill. Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for fairness for the private sector.

U.S. AIR FORCE CAPTAIN REID NISHIZUKA, A HERO

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

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize one of Hawaii's heroes, U.S. Air Force Captain Reid Nishizuka of Kailua, Hawaii.

On April 27, 30-year-old Captain Nishizuka died as a result of an MC–12 aircraft crash near Kandahar Airfield in Afghanistan. Captain Nishizuka put his life on the line in the service of our Nation, and he made the ultimate sacrifice. I am deeply saddened by this loss for his family, for Hawaii, and for our country. My thoughts and prayers are with the Nishizukas.

Captain Nishizuka always knew he wanted to serve. He had been on track to join the Air Force since high school when he was a member of the Kailua JROTC and when he later went on to the Notre Dame ROTC, where he studied aeronautical engineering. As his family and friends have said, Captain Nishizuka always loved flying, brought joy to everyone around him, and even inspired his brother Chad to join the Air Force, too.

As we do our work here in the people's House, let us always remember the selfless example set by Captain Nishizuka and by so many other heroes, and let us do our very best to honor their immeasurable sacrifice.

HONORING OAKLAND PARK STUDENTS ON WHITE HOUSE SCIENCE FAIR

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Today, I rise to say congratulations to the student inventors at Northeast High School in Oakland Park, Florida.

They were recently recognized for designing and creating a bicycle that serves as an emergency water sanitation system. After a natural disaster, the bicycle can be transported to the scene to filter contaminated water for E. coli and other pathogens. It can be assembled and taken apart in less than 1 hour, and it can produce enough water to hydrate 20 to 30 people for a 15-hour period.

These students first got the idea from unsanitary conditions in Haiti, and they have devoted countless hours to bringing this to life, and they even received a $10,000 grant from MIT. Their work ethic, creativity, and dedication to making this world a better place is an inspiration to all of us.

So, again, congratulations to the student inventors of Northeast High School in Broward County, Florida; and my best wishes to all of them in the future.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HARTZLER) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

MAY 7, 2013.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 7, 2013 at 9:30 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 743

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

Karen L. Haas.

□ 1240

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1406, WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT OF 2013

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 198 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 198

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1406) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Gibson of New York or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. House Resolution 198 provides for a structured rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1406, the Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013.

Madam Speaker, it's hard to raise a family and earn a living at the same time. The reality is that every hour you spend working to provide for your family is an hour you can't spend with your family, seeing your children off the first day of school, taking them to a doctor's appointment, or attending parent-teacher conferences. As a mother who worked while my daughter was growing up, I understand the firsthand

struggles of working parents. That is why my colleagues and I have introduced H.R. 1406, the Working Families Flexibility Act.

This commonsense legislation will allow private sector workers to choose paid time off instead of cash wages as compensation for working overtime, which is the same privilege that Federal, State, and local government employees have been able to choose for over 30 years.

The Working Families Flexibility Act is pro-family, pro-worker legislation that gives workers the flexibility to spend time with family, attend parent-teacher conferences, care for aging parents, or attend to other family needs that may arise.

If an employer and an employee agree on comp time, then the paid time off must be granted at time-and-a-half for each hour of overtime worked. Labor unions support flexible overtime compensation for their own members, and this benefit is already included in many public sector union collective bargaining agreements.

The flexible approach offered by this bill has worked for public sector employees since 1985. If the policy works for our public service employees, it will work for our private sector employees, as well. Fair is fair, Madam Speaker.

The bill maintains protections for workers to ensure that this new flexibility is not abused by making the decision to receive comp time completely voluntary and allows an employee to change his or her mind if he or she initially chooses comp time but later decides to receive cash wages for overtime. All existing protections in the Fair Labor Standards Act remain in effect under this legislation, and it is up to the employee when he or she decides to use accrued comp time. Additionally, an employee cannot be intimidated, coerced, or otherwise forced to accept comp time in lieu of cash wages for overtime.

The legislation also maintains all existing enforcement remedies for employees if an employer fails to uphold the agreement, and employers must provide 30 days' notice to employees if comp time will no longer be offered.

H.R. 1406 provides proper protection and flexibility for employees and will help American workers better balance the needs of family and the workplace. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, which should be called the More Work, Less Pay bill.

As my colleagues know, last week Majority Leader CANTOR outlined his party's agenda for the month of May. The words he used to describe it was as a ''full legislative agenda,'' yet here we are only debating this bill on the floor of the House and I think finishing the business of the House around 1:30 p.m. today with plenty of time for Members of Congress to play golf, to go to the beach, whatever they want to do. This is hardly a full legislative agenda.

Let me add, Madam Speaker, that this bill is about overtime. Under this current legislative agenda, Congress wouldn't even come close to qualifying for overtime at a time when we have increasing national needs, balancing the budget, moving forward with jobs and the economy, comprehensive immigration reform. There are so many issues crying out for our attention, but here we are debating yet another bill that not only won't go anywhere, but also would actually make life harder and more unpredictable for American families.

This bill claims to provide working families flexibility, but in reality it allows employers to avoid paying overtime and get interest-free loans from their own employees.

There are many hourly employees who struggle holding two or three jobs, depending on overtime to pay bills, to keep food on the family table. If this bill were to become law, employers would be able to save a couple of bucks by essentially requiring people, in effect, to take comp time instead of overtime pay if they want extra hours.

Many American workers want to work more, not less. Under this bill, people's paychecks would be reduced and people don't have a real choice. It's no wonder that the vast majority of labor unions and workers oppose this bill and are not asking for this bill or this ''kind of help.''

I also want to correct something that has been claimed by my Republican colleagues, that somehow this bill gives private sector employees the same protections as public sector employees. That is not true. Most public sector workers are already protected against arbitrary and unfair treatment by civil service laws. Private sector workers don't have anything like that kind of protection.

That's why my colleague, Mr. TIM BISHOP of New York, offered an amendment in committee specifying that private sector employers could provide comp time instead of overtime if they provided the same job security protections that public employees already receive. But this amendment was voted down in the Rules Committee yesterday, and we're not even allowed here on the floor of the House, where we're going to finish by 1:30 p.m., to have a debate. Somehow, there is not even enough time. Ten minutes is all we asked for on Mr. BISHOP of New York's amendment.

Madam Speaker, the presentation of this bill is not consistent with the content of the bill. Of course it sounds good. Why wouldn't employees want the choice of being able to choose how they take their time? It all sounds good.

□ 1250

But like so many things that Congress does, the devil is in the details.

Contrary to what this bill says, employers can already give their employees time off if they so choose. Many do. We had Representative JOE COURTNEY in our Rules Committee yesterday who talked about when he was in the private sector and he had employees who had to attend school meetings, et cetera, he gave them time off. That's what most responsible employers do. We don't need legislation to tell employers it's okay to give their employees comp time.

Contrary to what the majority party here in the House says, employees wouldn't get paid under this bill until the end of the year for saved comp time—at no interest. No interest. So effectively, an interest-free loan to the company. Let's say an employee does overtime, works 45 hours a week for 3 weeks, accruing 15 hours of overtime. If they want this so-called flexibility that's provided under this bill, they choose to say, ''I may use this as comp time.'' That's their choice. However, they pay dearly for that choice in a number of ways.

Number one, if they don't use that comp time after a year, they get paid the original amount by the company. While it is true that if they got a raise in the intervening period, they get paid at that level of the raise, there is no accounting for interest or the net present value of those dollars. That's less of an impact when inflation is 1 or 2 percent, but still, it's an interest-free loan to the company. There's a much greater impact should interest rates ever return to their historical norms. And it wasn't that long ago that interest rates were in the high single digits, even double digits, effectively taking money from the worker and giving it to the company.

Number two, let's say the employer does want to use this comp time. Effectively, the employer has a unilateral veto over that. All they have to do is show that it creates undue disruption. That's the standard of unilateral employer veto.

Now, this is nothing like what occurs under the Family and Medical Leave Act, the FMLA. We've heard them say it's the same; it's not. Under FMLA it's a factor that leave doesn't create undue disruption. There's a variety of factors. It's not a sole determinant as determined by the employer.

In this case, the language is wide open to effectively provide a complete veto right of when that employee takes their time off. So again, our friend works 45 hours a weeks for 3 weeks, accrues 15 hours of overtime, and they get sold on this program. They say, ''I'll set aside the 15 hours.'' They try to take it off for their kid's birthday, they try to take it off when their kid is home from school. The employer says, ''No, you can't take it off that week.'' So it turns out that at the end of the year they still have their 15 hours.

They finally get paid, but because of net present value and interest, they are out 2 or 3 percent of that. Again, with higher interest, they could be out 10 percent. They could be out 15 percent of that. We can and must do better for American workers.

This bill would have a devastating impact for workers in my home State of Colorado. Me and my staff talked to Debbie Olander from United Food and Commercial Workers, Local 7. Debbie is a leader in our community, and she told me that wage step is already a big problem for workers in Colorado, and this bill would make it easier for employers to avoid overtime obligations and make it harder for employees who need those hours to pay those bills.

What happens if the employer goes out of business in the intervening year? Of course, the person whose wages are due can line up with other creditors, but who has the time or, if you're living paycheck to paycheck, the ability to wait to see if you ever get paid by a bankrupt employer? Instead of improving the lives of working families by giving greater flexibility, this bill allows employers to avoid paying overtime.

My Democratic colleagues on the Education and Workforce Committee and I agree that we must give working families flexibility to meet workplace and family needs. That's why we support bills like the Paycheck Fairness Act, which would help ensure that women are paid as much as men in the workplace, and the Healthy Families Act, which would establish a national paid sick day standard.

I've also heard from hundreds of workers from my district and across the country who support the Employment Nondiscrimination Act, which would prohibit workplace discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. In more than half of the States, it's still perfectly legal in this day and age for an employer to fire an employee just because they're gay and what they do in their off work time. It's none of the employer's business who an employee is dating. To think that in this day and age it's legal in half the States for an employer to fire an employee because of who they're dating is absolutely absurd. We need to solve that by passing the Employment Nondiscrimination Act.

American workers are asking for these kinds of protections, unlike this sort of program that's being discussed today, which workers oppose or don't see as necessary. Well, you know, based on again the schedule for Congress, me and my colleagues aren't about to accrue any overtime anytime soon unless things change around here. Here we are, examining bills that are catchy, have good titles, might sound good on the surface, but don't address any of the real issues faced by American workers, the American economy, or our country as a whole. We need an agenda that's consistent with the needs of working families.

Madam Speaker, despite this fixation on changing the image and appealing to voters, many on the other side of the aisle seem to be recycling old ideas. In fact, an identical version of this bill was introduced in 1996, 1997, and 2003. It failed to pass the House each time. Madam Speaker, what this body needs is not just new branding, it needs new ideas, ideas that will actually help working families and make our country stronger.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the gentleman from Colorado.

Madam Speaker, this bill sounds good because it is good. This is the theme from our colleagues across the aisle: everything about the private sector is bad; everything about government is good. That is their constant theme. This bill allows voluntary participation by employees. It does not require things.

I would also like to point out to my colleague from across the aisle, who is very quick to point out any mistake that I might make, is we did not have an amendment from Representative BISHOP in the Rules Committee yesterday. Representative BISHOP's amendment was offered in the Education Committee, but was not offered in the Rules Committee yesterday.

I would also like to say that government employees do not get interest paid on the time that they eventually get paid for instead of comp time, so we are not setting up a double standard here. What we're trying to do is eliminate a double standard, again, that our colleagues across the aisle love to have—bash the private sector.

Madam Speaker, we live in the greatest country in the world, and what made us a great country? Look at the rest of the world. What's made us a great country is the rule of law, which means we believe everybody should be treated the same way. It's our capitalistic system which has worked wonderfully well for this country, and every other system has failed all across the world. We don't need to do much but to look at what is happening in the rest of the world and how sorry their economies are, and it's our Judeo-Christian underpinnings. Those are the things that I think have made us great, Madam Speaker, and this bill will allow us to give people who work in the private sector, which is part of what's made us such a great country, the same privileges that people get who work in the public sector.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

As a working mom, I know how tough it is to occasionally miss family events. And whether it's a parent-teacher conference, a soccer or a football game, or helping my mom, my family always comes first. That is why I support this bill.

The Working Families Flexibility Act would help hardworking Americans be there for their families by allowing all workers the same opportunities to manage their work-life balance.

Government employees have enjoyed the ability to exchange overtime pay for comp time for nearly 30 years, and it is not fair or logical to continue to prevent private sector employees from having access to this very same benefit. The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 is out of touch with reality, and it needs updating. We're not talking about creating a new regulation or forcing folks to give up overtime pay. This pro-worker, pro-family bill simply provides comp time as a voluntary option for private sector employees who want it instead of overtime pay.

□ 1300

There are many employee protections in this bill, and a worker can take their comp time whenever they choose, as long as they provide reasonable notice and avoid disrupting business operations. Workers can also cash out on their comp time for any reason, at any time, and the employer would be required to fulfill that request in 30 days.

This type of legislation is the exact reason I ran for Congress and why I'm proud to be a Republican: to make sure laws passed in Washington help people and don't make life more difficult for Kansans and their families.

I encourage my colleagues in the House to support this bill that will empower working moms and dads by giving them more control and freedom to be there for their families.

Mr. POLIS. Before further yielding, I yield myself a moment to respond.

I thank the gentlelady for the correction. What I was referring to is the vote in the Rules Committee yesterday on an open rule which we voted on in committee. Had we considered this bill under an open rule, I or Mr. BISHOP, or any other Member of this body, could have brought forth his amendment.

You're correct, it was not submitted to the Rules Committee. It was offered in the committee of jurisdiction, on which I also serve. And I argued, you might recall, to the chair yesterday that this bill is a fine candidate for an open rule. Given that there's nothing else this body's doing today and we're getting done at 1:30, we might as well allow amendments like Mr. BISHOP's and others to be able to be debated by the House and considered by the full House.

I also want to discuss something that the gentlelady said, something about how a mischaracterization of the opponents of this bill is somehow saying the private sector is bad or the government's good. I haven't heard anybody argue that. The private sector is great. The private sector is a chief engine of economic growth. This discussion is about the private sector.

In fact, it's the other side that's somehow trying to model policies that they say already exist in the public sector and force the private sector to comply with them. We're not here seeking to try to copy what exists in the public sector and apply it to the private sector. The private sector is the primary engine of economic growth.

I think where perhaps we disagree is that I hear from many on the other side that somehow government is bad. I believe, and many on my side believe, that the minimum amount of government is necessary to ensure the success of the private sector, to ensure the rules are followed and there's an open and competitive environment that allows the private sector to thrive and succeed and create jobs for American families.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the managers of this legislation. And I think it should be made very clear, since we'll have a general debate that I hope to engage in, that the underlying premise of this bill, H.R. 1406, is two simple points, and H.R. 1406 undermines this point.

The Fair Labor Standards Act only provides the incentive for employers to adhere to the 40-hour workweek by paying time and a half. H.R. 1406 removes that fundamental requirement and allows employers to pay nothing for overtime work at the time the work is performed.

I, too, am sensitive to those who want to join with their families, and clearly, that opportunity is there. But if you allow this bill to go forward, you take the choice out of the hands of the employee. And if you are looking at a boilermaker, or those in manufacturing, and a boilermaker can have close to 210 overtime hours making a certain amount per hour, literally, if you force them to take comp time and not be paid, you would cause them to lose their time and a half, and they would lose almost $6,000 in income.

I can tell you, with the economic divide between the top 1 percent and working Americans, many people work overtime in order to receive payment. And I think that H.R. 1406 goes in the wrong direction.

What I would encourage my colleagues to do is to spend some time discussing the budget, passing a budget, ending sequestration, creating opportunities for the private sector to hire more people; and, frankly, the private sector would do well to cut their costs by hiring additional persons.

So I oppose the rule and the underlying bill, and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this time to bring up H.R. 900, which would end sequestration at this time and begin to put us on the right track to ensure that we end the cuts in air traffic controllers, in Homeland Security, in Head Start, in Medicare, Medicaid, Meals on Wheels, and begin to get this Nation back on track.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to the Rule on H.R. 1406, the so-called "Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013." I thank Ranking Member MILLER for this opportunity to speak on behalf and in support of the working women and men in my District and against this rule because it does not fix this very flawed bill.

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

The rule for this bill should be open and allow us to do something to help workers and their families. When the economy is weak—workers and their families need more protection not less.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I stand today with America's workers. We are united in opposition to H.R. 1406, the Working Families Flexibility Act of 2013. We should not be wasting time on legislation that is going nowhere. Instead we should be focused on the real problems facing Americans, like creating jobs, ending the Sequester, and helping businesses grow.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to call up for immediate consideration H.R. 900, the Cancel the Sequester Act of 2013.

If Congress wants to do something for workers we should end the sequester.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Working Families Flexibility Act. This legislation would remove an outdated Federal mandate that prohibits private sector workers from benefiting from the personal option of flextime. Public sector employees have had the flextime option for 30 years, and it's time private sector workers had the same opportunity to spend more time with their families or more time engaged in other interests away from the workplace.

The State of Missouri has allowed flextime for years for a variety of State agencies like the Missouri State Water Patrol. The Lake of the Ozarks is in my district and is a destination for many during the warm summer months, and the Water Patrol work long, hard days over the summer to keep order on the lake and ensure safety for boaters, skiers, and swimmers.

With Missouri's seasonal climate, these State workers have taken advantage of working long summer days and saving flextime in the winter months for extended vacations or other seasonal work. These workers enjoy the flexibility and income stability of their jobs, and it works out to be mutually beneficial for the employees and the State. This commonsense labor provision makes the Water Patrol officer a very popular career choice and encourages the type of competition that has led to continuous quality in the force.

The Working Families Flexibility Act would modernize outdated regulations to allow private sector workers in Missouri's Fourth District and elsewhere to voluntarily choose paid time off as compensation for the overtime hours they work. It will remove the obstacles standing in the way of working families and will allow working women to better balance their work and family obligations.

As a working wife and mother, I understand how important it is to have a schedule that is flexible when children unexpectedly get sick or when high

school graduation nears and mothers need extra time to celebrate the child's accomplishments.

I support this commonsense legislation that allows flexibility for American workers and gives the power back to the workers and employers to voluntarily work together and find a solution that works best for everyone.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote for this pro-family legislation.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 377, Representative DELAURO's Paycheck Fairness Act. To discuss her bill, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in opposition to the previous question. Defeat of the previous question will allow the gentleman from Colorado to amend the rule to provide for consideration of the Paycheck Fairness Act, an act that addresses the persistent problem of unequal pay in our economy and would help to make the bill before us a real boon for workers and families.

Today, women are now half of the Nation's workforce. They are still only being paid 77 cents on the dollar as compared to men. And this holds true across all occupations and education levels. And for women of color, the disparities are even worse.

Let's take this body, the U.S. Congress, the House of Representatives. We come from all over the country. We have different educational backgrounds. We have different skill sets and different philosophies. And yet, while we are all men and women here, we get paid the same amount of money. That is not true for most women in the United States of America.

The only other institution in which there is same job, same pay, men and women, is in the U.S. military

□ 1310

Less pay for women means less pay for the entire family at a time when millions are struggling to enter the middle class, give their children a chance at a better life, and achieve the American Dream.

That's what paycheck fairness is all about: men, women, same job, same pay. Fifty years ago, Congress passed the Equal Pay Act to confront this ''serious and endemic'' problem of unequal wages in America. President John F. Kennedy signed it into law to end ''the unconscionable practice of paying female employees less wages than male employees for the same job.''

Fifty years later, it is clear that we have more to do. If this majority really wants to show good faith towards workers and their families and women in this Nation, then what they will do is they will join us, and they will take the steps that are necessary to end unequal pay, put an end to pay secrecy, strengthen a worker's ability to challenge discrimination, and bring equal-pay law into line with other civil rights laws.

What they will do is they will abandon the legislation that will gut the 40-hour workweek and that will allow employers to cut employees' overtime pay in order to save money.

America's women and America's families have waited far too long for this institution to act. They're watching us now, and I urge this majority to do right by them at last and help us to end unequal pay for women in this Nation for good.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would believe that the comments of my colleague from Connecticut would be a little more sincere if she would direct the issue of pay disparity to the White House. The White House needs to do something about pay disparity. If we had leaders who led by example, then the White House would straighten out the pay disparity that exists there.

Also, my colleagues don't seem to want to talk about the bill before us today because it is such commonsense legislation. They have no real arguments to offer about defeating it, so they want to distract the American people onto other issues.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, life is hard. Across Indiana, moms and dads are working hard to make ends meet, and it's anything but easy. The national unemployment rate is 7.5 percent. More businesses are reducing employees' hours under the immense pressure and weight of ObamaCare's red tape. On top of all that, President Obama wants $1.2 trillion in new taxes on families and businesses.

There is no timecard at the dinner table. Parenting is a 24/7, 365-day job. Unfortunately, moms and dads in the private sector have to consider missing a day of work when flu season strikes, when teacher conferences roll around, or when life throws another curve ball.

The last thing Hoosiers in the real economy need is an outdated Federal law that makes things harder. Under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, too many families are forced to make a difficult trade-off: sit down with your son's teacher and you could see a thinner paycheck at the end of the week. Often, mom and dad will take turns after they've looked at the budget and the calendar. For single parents, it's another uphill battle.

But while families on Main Street have to make tough choices, government workers have the flexibility to work overtime to cover these situations. We need to make sure that Hoosiers in the everyday world have the same option.

Here in the House, we've introduced a simple, commonsense solution. Our bill gives Hoosiers and Americans a choice between cash wages and comp time for the overtime hours that they work. Government workers already get this option. So should everyday Americans. By fixing an outdated law today, we can give working parents more flexibility tomorrow.

Mr. POLIS. Before further yielding, I want to address this fallacious concept that the gentlelady from North Carolina has brought up in previous debate as well as this one that somehow the White House discriminates against women. Again, that's been proven as untrue. We actually have a young lady on our Rules Committee staff who worked for the White House and tells us she earned the same amount as men.

Of course, for the same job, women get paid the same amount. That's what paycheck fairness is about. It doesn't say if you do a different job you get paid the same amount, and it doesn't mean that every man and every woman is compensated the same. It's just for the same job, same pay. As for the Obama administration, every one of their actions and the White House's actions have been consistent with that. We believe it should apply to the private sector because, of course, not every woman in the country has the privilege of working for the White House.

We're talking about American families with real private sector jobs out there, not these government jobs that the other side keeps alluding to.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Colorado for yielding time.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 1406. This isn't the first time we've seen anti-worker legislation paraded as a pro-family solution. But it's embarrassing that here in 2013 we are considering a bill that would reverse over 70 years of worker protections.

The so-called Working Families Flexibility Act is out of touch with what real American working families need. Real working families need protections against egregiously long hours and unreasonable management demands. Real working families need fair wages paid to them in a timely manner. Real working families need predictable schedules with time to care for their families and themselves, and real working families need the ability to take earned leave when they have earned it and when they need it.

This bill does nothing to address those needs. Instead, it sets up a false choice between time and pay. It incentivizes excess overtime scheduling. It reduces the employee's control over her daily schedule, and it provides no guarantee that the time off earned could be actually used.

The only flexibility provided in this bill is to bosses who would be given the flexibility to choose to do whatever they choose without standards and without consideration for the needs of the families of their workers.

I urge my colleagues to come together and support policies that would truly support our working families. A

real family-friendly bill would allow workers to earn paid sick days. It would extend access to job-protected leave. It would work to close the gender pay gap. Instead, this Mother's Day, all we have to offer our hard-working moms is a disingenuous bill that moves us backwards. Our mothers deserve better.

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

As my colleague from California knows, I am very fond of her and respect her a great deal; but I want to say that this bill is not a bad bill. This bill does not roll back the rights of workers at all.

And if the bill is so bad and what it does is give fairness to people in the private sector and it gives to the people in the private sector the same rights and privileges that people in the public sector have, then why are my colleagues not trying to roll back those rights for the public sector? It would make sense that all the horrible things they've said about this bill which apply to the public sector you would want to protect the public sector.

But that's not what my colleagues are doing. They're simply saying it isn't right to let the private sector employees have the same rights and privileges that public sector employees have. It doesn't make any sense for them to make that argument. It just doesn't make any sense to do that.

Mr. Speaker, the Working Families Flexibility Act makes it easier for American workers to juggle the needs of family and the workplace. That's what it accomplishes.

I want to urge the people watching this debate to read the bill. Unlike the thousand-page bill that came out that people have to ''wait until it passes'' before they understand what's in it, before we understand what's in it, this bill is basically 8 pages long. Any American can read this bill and understand it. So I would say to you, if you doubt what we are saying on our side of the aisle, read the bill. That is the best way for the American public to be informed.

□ 1320

Mr. Speaker, as we consider it, there are some things to keep in mind.

First, it in no way undermines longstanding essential worker safeguards or forces workers to give up overtime pay if that's how they choose to be compensated. It simply provides an additional level of flexibility that government workers already enjoy. I don't know how many more ways we can make that point, Mr. Speaker, but we will continue to do that.

Further, the bill does not allow employers to bully employees into picking comp time over cash payment. It provides new important safeguards to ensure that the choice to use comp time over cash wages is truly voluntary. Employees can change their minds and request overtime cash payment in lieu of unused comp time.

For employees represented by a labor organization, the labor organization and the employer must first reach an agreement to provide this benefit before the employee can choose to exercise it. For an employee who is not a member of a labor organization, the agreement is between the employer and the individual employee and must be entered into knowingly and voluntarily by the employee and may not be a condition of employment.

The bill does not change the 40-hour workweek or how overtime is currently calculated and accrued, and it does not affect comp time provisions regarding employees of Federal, State, or local governments.

Mr. Speaker, in fiscal year 2012, IRS employees accrued 246,450 hours of comp time in lieu of overtime pay. That amounts to 30,806 full 8-hour days. Employees at the Department of Labor accrued 51,097 hours of comp time, or 6,387 full 8-hour days. Employees at the Department of Education accrued 12,408 hours of comp time, or 1,551 full 8-hour days.

It's clear that Federal employees appreciate this flexibility. What is unclear is why my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are so hell-bent on denying private sector employees this same flexibility. What's good for the goose is good for the gander.

We hear the word ''fairness'' from the other side of the aisle constantly. This bill is fair, Mr. Speaker. H.R. 1406 simply affords private sector employees the same flexibility that Federal, State, and local government employees have enjoyed for over 30 years. It is unconscionable to me that our colleagues would vote against this and say you should be a second-class citizen if you work in the private sector.

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

Mr. POLIS. Before further yielding, I want to again address this great and sudden desire that the gentlelady from North Carolina has expressed to make sure that government policies apply to the private sector, to try to say somehow the way that government employees are treated needs to be the way that every private sector employee is treated. Usually it's the private sector that leads the way, not Big Government like the gentlelady from North Carolina is arguing. In fact, it's even a misinterpretation of what the public sector does.

The public sector has civil service protections for its employees. That's something that doesn't exist in the private sector. That's why, if we had been able to, under an open rule—which we don't have because, of course, somehow this body has to finish up by 2 p.m. so everybody can go home. But if we were allowed to have an open rule and actually bring forth amendments on this, we would be able to introduce Mr. BISHOP's amendment, which would have facilitated this discussion of, well, if it's good enough for the goose, it's good enough for the gander. If the Republicans are so keen to apply public sector personnel policy to the private sector, then why not apply civil service protections to the private sector?

Again, the truth of the matter is there's a night-and-day difference between the types of protections and policies that public sector and private sector employees have. One of the goals of the Civil Service Act was to add a degree of professionalism to public sector jobs, to take away the patronage components that had a corrupting influence on the system. By and large it succeeded in that goal, to its great credit. It's a very different set of rules that we have with regard to the private sector.

So, again, I think that that is, to a certain degree, a false analogy, and I hope that the information I provided helps correct that in the eyes of those who are listening.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), a colleague of mine.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank Congressman POLIS for yielding time and rise against the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 1406, the More Work for Less Pay Act.

Congress should protect workers' wages and overtime rights, not undermine them. USA Today reported yesterday that stock markets and corporate profits are breaking records, but workers who rely on paychecks for their income have been running in place—financially speaking—and falling behind, despite their productivity increasing consistently for the last several years. That means they're working harder for less. Adjusting for inflation, an average worker who was paid $49,650 at the end of 2009 is now making about $545 less, and that's before taxes and deductions.

Living standards aren't rising for the middle class; they're falling. Yet the profits of Standard and Poor's 500 companies hit a record in the first quarter. The roaring market is making the richest Americans even richer, giving them even more money to spend.

How about this? Brian Moynihan, Bank of America, he earns about $12.1 million that is reported in the papers—I'm sure it's even more than that—and Goldman Sachs, their CEO, Lloyd Blankfein, $21 million that he's willing to admit; and John Stumpf at Wells Fargo, $22.9 million. Frankly, how much more do they need?

Now, meanwhile, during the first 2 years of the recovery, while average net worth rose for the top 7 percent of households, it fell for the other 93 percent, according to the Pew Research Center. The reason is clear: corporate America isn't sharing its record earnings with those who are earning them. In fact, higher corporate profits owe partially to the employers' success at paying workers less even while those workers are working harder, and holding down their raises and forcing overtime rather than hiring from the ranks

of the 12 million who remain unemployed.

Productivity has been rising at an average of 1.5 percent a year since the recovery began, while companies are squeezing more out of each worker even as inflation-adjusted wages have stagnated and hiring remains sluggish.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman.

Still, so many Americans are out of work that employers can get away with giving no raises at all.

America is supposed to be about opportunity for all, not just the few. We're supposed to be about fair pay for hard work.

I ask my colleagues to oppose the Republican More Work for Less Pay Act, and I would urge us to pay fair wages for a fair day's work. All you have to do is go to parts of the country where people's faces are worn. You'll see what's really happening out in the real America. Let's oppose this Republican bill and the rule.

The bill gives employers the flexibility not to pay overtime to their workers; instead employees would be provided comp time.

However, employers, not the employee, are provided the flexibility to decide when and even if comp time can be used.

There is nothing in the legislation that guarantees that workers will be able to use the comp time they have earned when they need it.

In fact, the bill permits the employer to deny a comp time request if the employee's use of comp time would unduly disrupt operations.

Employers can even veto an employee's request to use comp time even in cases of urgent need under the legislation.

If an employee does not accept comp time, they could be penalized with fewer hours, bad shifts, and loss of overtime hours.

Given that it is cheaper to provide comp time than to pay overtime wages, this bill provides a significant incentive for employers to hire fewer people and rely on overtime to be paid for future comp time.

The Fair Labor Standards Act currently allow employers to provide workers with flexibility and time off without compromising their right to be paid fairly for the hours they work.

Consequently, this legislation is unnecessary based on current law.

Workers should not have to put in extra time beyond a 40-hour week and be forced to forgo pay to earn time to care for themselves or their loved ones.

The same bill proposed and died in committee in 2003 and failed in 1996 and 1997 to get through Congress.

[From USA Today, May 6, 2013]

ECONOMY LEAVES WAGES BEHIND

(By Paul Davidson and John Waggoner)

Stock markets and corporate profits are breaking records. The economy suddenly looks brighter after the government's surprising report Friday that employers added 635,000 jobs the past three months.

But instead of celebrating, many working Americans are borrowing a line from the 1996 movie Jerry Maguire: ''Show me the money.''

Hourly wages ticked up 4 cents in April to an average $23.87, rising at about the same tepid 2 percent annual pace since the recovery began in mid-2009.

But taking inflation into account, they're virtually flat. Workers who rely on paychecks for their income have been running in place, financially speaking. Adjusting for inflation, an average worker who was paid $49,650 at the end of 2009 is making about $545 less now—and that's before taxes and deductions.

Stagnant wages aren't only tough on workers—the American economy is paying a price too. Living standards aren't rising. Consumer spending, which is 70 percent of the economy, is more restrained. And the recovery advances at a slower pace.

Ultimately, for the economy to thrive we need everyone participating,'' says Mark Zandi, chief economist of Moody's Analytics.

The profits of Standard & Poor's 500 companies hit a record in the first quarter. Their healthy earnings have boosted stocks, and April's encouraging jobs report sent the stock market even higher Friday. The Dow Jones industrial average crossed 15,000 for the first time and closed at a record 14,973.96, up 142.38 points.

The roaring market is making the richest Americans richer and giving them more money to spend. But in 2010, only 31 percent of U.S. households had stock holdings of $10,000 or more, according to the Economic Policy Institute (EPI). During the first two years of the recovery, average net worth rose for the top 7 percent of households but fell for the other 93 percent, the Pew Research Center says.

Meanwhile, Corporate America isn't sharing its record earnings with employees.

''Don't hold your breath,'' for employers to become more generous, says John Lonski, chief economist for Moody's Investors Service. One reason, he says, is that revenue growth has been meager, up between 0.5 percent and 1 percent in the last year.

In fact, higher profits owe partially to employers' success in controlling labor expenses by getting workers to be more productive, holding down raises and hiring conservatively.

Productivity, or output per labor hour, has risen an average 1.5 percent a year since the recovery began. Companies are squeezing more out of each worker even as inflation-adjusted wages have stagnated.

Another reason for stagnant wages is the law of supply and demand. Sure, the job market has picked up: Employers added 165,000 jobs last month and an average 196,000 a month this year, up from 183,000 in 2012. And the jobless rate has fallen from a peak of 10 percent in 2009.

FEW INCENTIVES TO BOOST PAY

Yet today's 7.5 percent unemployment rate is still high. Nearly 12 million Americans are unemployed, and millions more want to work but are so discouraged they've stopped looking. With an abundant supply of potential workers, employers have little reason to shell out big raises.

''High unemployment hurts workers' bargaining power,'' EPI economist Heidi Shierholz says. ''Employers know they can go get someone else.''

So many Americans are out of work that employers could get away with giving no raises at all, Zandi says, leaving household income falling behind inflation. But employers realize that would hurt morale and, in turn, productivity, he says.

Still, wage increases that just barely keep up with inflation don't make for a prosperous economy.

''We're not seeing the living standard growth of American workers that we should be seeing,'' Shierholz says.

Stagnant wages also hurt consumer spending. Low- and moderate-income workers typically spend nearly all their paychecks, juicing the economy, while high-income workers tend to save a portion, says Dean Baker, co-director of the Center for Economic and Policy Research.

Larry Breech, of Milville, Pa., a retired farmer who makes about $10,000 a year, says his per diem pay for substitute teaching hasn't changed in several years.

''We will be frugal,'' he says. ''Fiscal restraint is imperative.''

Consumer spending, which has been growing at an average annual rate of about 2 percent during the recovery, would be rising by 2.5 percent if employers simply passed their productivity gains onto their workers, Zandi says.

Some workers are getting bigger raises. While the lowest 10 percent of income earners got average raises of 0.3 percent last year, those in the top 25 percent saw their pay jump 3.1 percent, say the Bureau of Labor Statistics and Moody's Analytics. Workers with higher skills and more education in booming industries, such as energy and technology, can command higher salaries.

Stephen Allen, an oil industry contractor in St. Louis, says his wages have increased by more than 60 percent the past three years. He makes about $85,000 a year.

For now, it's up to Americans like Allen and those with large stock holdings to generate a bigger share of spending and economic activity. The top 20 percent of households based on income account for nearly half of consumer spending, according to Barclays Capital.

GOOD NEWS FOR HOUSEHOLDS

A bright spot is that despite puny wage increases, other barometers of household finances show improvement. The housing market is continuing a solid recovery. Climbing home and stock prices have helped households overall recover the wealth they lost in the recession and housing crash.

And the share of income Americans are using to pay off debt has fallen to 10.4 percent, the lowest level since the government began tracking the data in 1980, reports the Federal Reserve. Meanwhile, falling gas prices are putting more cash in consumers' pockets. Such developments can partly offset sluggish wage growth and pave the way for higher spending.

After working off debt the past three years, Allen says he expects to be debt-free this summer ''and then save for a down payment on a house.''

Still, economists say consumer spending won't take off in earnest until inflation-adjusted wages return to a normal growth rate of about 1.5 percent a year. Baker says that likely won't happen until unemployment falls below 6 percent, probably in 2016.

Then, employers will begin to worry about not finding enough workers.

''They'll start to hire more aggressively,'' pushing up wages faster, Zandi says.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I assume the gentleman from Colorado has additional speakers, but at this time I would like to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I would just like to indicate I have one remaining speaker.

With that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in opposition to the majority's Working Families Flexibility Act.

It troubles me to oppose a bill that has the exact same name of a bill that I've introduced in the three previous Congresses that provided real workplace flexibility for working men and women. I believe that this bill, the Republican bill, would be more aptly named the More Work, Less Pay Act.

My bill would have provided employers and employees with protections in discussing flexible work arrangements. Under the More Work, Less Pay Act, workers would lose the basic guarantees of fair pay for overtime work and time off from work under the Fair Labor Standards Act. It would deprive hardworking people of their earned income and fail to guarantee them the right to use that overtime even for a personal or family emergency.

Shamefully, the U.S. ranks among the least generous of industrialized countries when it comes to family-friendly workplace policies like paid family leave and paid sick leave. Congress should be focused on increasing the minimum wage, expanding family and medical leave, and providing opportunities for real flexible work options.

□ 1330

These policies are common sense. True workplace advancement benefits both business and worker interests. Instead, the Republican bill hurts employees by giving them less pay at a time when their wages are stagnant.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation, to oppose this rule, and bring up the minority's alternatives and allow the minority to have amendments and alternatives to the rule.

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

A little while ago we had a debate about the pay in the White House. I have an article from the Daily Caller that I would like to enter into the RECORD, and I will quote briefly from the article. The article is dated January 15, 2013, posted by Caroline May:

While President Obama handily won the women's vote by 11 percentage points in November over Republican nominee Mitt Romney, his administration paid the women on his payroll less than his male employees last year.

A Daily Caller analysis of the administration's ''2012 Annual Report to Congress on White House Staff'' shows that while women comprised about half of the 468 staffers—as the President touted during his press conference Monday—they also earned about 13 percent less, on average, than their male counterparts.

The median 2012 salary for female employees of the White House was $62,000; for men that number was $71,000.

The article ends with a quote from New York Democratic Representative CHARLIE RANGEL. He, however, called Obama's failure to appoint more women and minorities to high-profile positions ''embarrassing as hell.''

''The questions I've heard are fair,'' RANGEL said January 10 on MSNBC. ''The record does speak for itself.''

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

[From the Daily Caller, Jan. 15, 2013]

OBAMA WHITE HOUSE PAID WOMEN STAFFERS LESS THAN MEN IN 2012

By Caroline May

While President Barack Obama handily won the women's vote by 11 percentage points in November over Republican nominee Mitt Romney, his administration paid the women on his payroll less than his male employees last year.

A Daily Caller analysis of the administration's ''2012 Annual Report to Congress on White House Staff'' shows that while women comprised about half of the 468 staffers—as the president touted during his press conference Monday—they also earned about 13 percent less, on average, than their male counterparts.

The median 2012 salary for female employees of the White House was $62,000; for men that number was $71,000.

The DC calculated the median male and female salaries by determining employee genders based on their names. In cases where the gender was not clear, The DC either identified the specific employee in other ways or—in a few cases—assigned gender based on the most common use of a given name according to databases of baby names.

The 2012 pay disparity represented an improvement from the disparity in 2011 figures the Washington Free Beacon reported last year. According to that analysis, the median female compensation in the White House was $60,000—$2,000 less than in 2012—and the male employees' median was unchanged at $71,000. That amounted to an 18 percent difference.

In his statement last year declaring April 17 Equal Pay Day, Obama lamented the pay disparity between men and women in America, echoing the well-worn yet often-questioned statistic that ''women who worked full-time earned only 77 percent of what their male counterparts did.''

He pointed to the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, which made it easier for women to sue for lost wages due to pay discrimination, and to the creation of the National Equal Pay Task Force in 2010, as examples of the administration's commitment to equal pay.

''At a time when families across our country are struggling to make ends meet, ensuring a fair wage for all parents is more important than ever,'' the president said. ''Women are breadwinners in a growing number of families, and women's earnings play an increasingly important role in families' incomes. For them, fair pay is even more than a basic right—it is an economic necessity.''

Obama's White House female employees achieved a slightly better 87 percent of what their male counterparts earned, compared to Obama's national 77 percent figure.

In recent weeks Obama has come under fire for the composition of his inner circle—initially sparked by an official White House photo of the president published by The New York Times in which he was surrounded by all men. His nomination of white men to all four second-term cabinet positions so far has also drawn criticism.

Establishment media outlets and women's groups have been troubled by the apparent lack of female leadership and diversity the administration has exhibited so far—with the National Organization for Women demanding to know ''President Obama, Where are the Women?'' Jane Fonda, Robin Morgan and Gloria Steinem, all co-founders of the Women's Media Center, have pressed Obama to adopt an inner circle that looks more like American.

''[Obama] wouldn't have been re-elected without 55 percent of the women's vote, something he earned by representing women's majority views on issues, yet now he seems to be ignoring women's ability to be not only voters, but leaders,'' the trio wrote Friday in a CNN website essay. NBC's Andrea Mitchell noted Sunday on ''Meet the Press'' that women inside the White House ''are not happy'' with the male-dominated face of Obama's administration.

Monday, Obama addressed some of the criticisms about the composition of his cabinet, saying that it is too soon to ''rush to judgment'' and that women were influential throughout his first term.

''So if you think about my first four years, the person who probably had the most influence on my foreign policy was a woman,'' Obama said. ''The people who were in charge of moving forward my most important domestic initiative, health care, were women. The person in charge of our homeland security was a woman. My two appointments to the Supreme Court were women. And 50 percent of my White House staff were women. So I think people should expect that that record will be built upon during the next four years.''

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

I would like to inquire if the gentlelady has any remaining speakers.

Ms. FOXX. We have no further speakers, Mr. Speaker, and I am willing to close after the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

First of all, conflating somehow paycheck fairness with compensation of women at the White House is comparing apples and oranges.

Nothing that we are supporting or that the Paycheck Fairness Act includes says that women and men should all be paid the same regardless of what their job is. It simply says ''equal work, equal pay.'' There's no evidence in the Daily Caller or anywhere else that for the same job, in the White House or anywhere in the administration, that women are paid less. They are not.

Even if you had paycheck fairness—again, we passed our law; it becomes the law of the land in the private sector—it doesn't mean every woman gets the same pay as every man. It simply means that for the same job men and women get the same pay. It is quite possible there could still be a differential either way. There's not a problem with that. It depends on what jobs people have. But for the same job, it should be the law of the land, just as it has been President Obama's policy that men and women receive the same pay.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, the ''more work, less pay bill,'' is yet another attempt to roll back workers' rights under the guise of doing just the opposite.

I wish we were here talking about things that would benefit American families like the Paycheck Fairness Act to ensure women receive equal pay for equal work; making sure that people can't be fired from their job just because of who they date. It is none of the boss's darn business.

But instead of collaborating with Democrats to produce a compromise bill we can be proud of, instead, this House is considering a bill that would

weaken over time and is nearly identical to bills that have failed in three prior Congresses.

There are many measures that we could be taking up to help grow the economy, reduce the deficit, create jobs, invest in the middle class, replace our broken immigration system with one that works; but this bill is none of those.

I wanted to point out and highlight the work of the Democrats on the Educational and the Workforce Committee. The Web site is Democrats.edworkforce.house.gov. They produced a video that shows exactly what this ''more work, less pay'' legislation is.

Mr. Speaker, I support giving American workers and families more flexibility. There could be a way to work together; but, again, this body has not done so. It does just the opposite. Instead of having an open rule under which many of us could bring forth amendments to discuss, Democratic Members offered several sensible amendments, which were rejected by the House majority, both in the committee of jurisdiction and the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 377, Representative DELAURO's Paycheck Fairness Act, of which I am an original cosponsor.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question so we can bring up the Paycheck Fairness Act. I urge a ''no'' vote on this restrictive rule and the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we are very proud of this bill. I can't understand why our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are so opposed to fairness when fairness applies to the private sector.

I would like to point out to my colleague that we would have entertained amendments in the Rules Committee had they been germane or if they had not been withdrawn. As he well knows, being a member of the Rules Committee, the amendments that were introduced by his colleagues were withdrawn before the committee had an opportunity to consider the amendments or were ruled nongermane.

I also assume that, based on the comments our colleagues have made across the aisle, that because the rights and privileges that are given to public employees are so horrible that they cannot be extended to the private sector, that they will probably be introducing a bill to withdraw those rights and privileges because they're only hurting public employees, and our colleagues don't want to be hurting private sector employees.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are committed to providing more opportunities for more Americans and helping make life work for more families. This legislation is a great step in that direction.

The rule before us today provides for consideration of a bill that gives employees across the country the flexibility that they deserve so they can better manage the many daily challenges of family life. Whether the employee is a new parent who wishes to stay at home with a newborn, a proud aunt who wishes to attend her nephew's baseball game, or a son or daughter who wants to care for an elderly parent, America's private sector employees should be able to determine for themselves what to do with the overtime compensation that they have earned.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today, H.R. 1406, the so-called "Working Families Flexibility Act" is a wolf in sheep's clothing. This bill would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in order to allow private sector employers to compensate their employees with compensatory time or comp time, instead of earned overtime pay. This proposal subverts the power and purpose of the Fair Labor Standards Act by making private sector workplaces less fair and certainly less flexible.

Instead of ensuring fairness and flexibility for employees, H.R. 1406 gives employers the legal cover for forcing employees to work more and then, in turn, paying them less. This bill does nothing to assist working families; rather it is an assault on the wages of working families all across the country. What would improve the lives of working families is a proposal to increase the minimum wage, such as introduced by Ranking Member MILLER and cosponsored by me and 134 members of this House. H.R. 1010 would increase the minimum wage in three tiered steps and then index future increases to inflation. Such a proposal would actually provide more flexibility by putting more money in the pockets of working families today and in the future. However, instead of considering a proposal which would directly benefit American workers, this Committee is considering a misleadingly named bill which does just the opposite.

Flexibility in the workplace is something that the government welcomes. However, H.R. 1406 is not the way to achieve that goal. Flexible workplaces do not force employees to choose between working more and earning less. Instead, flexible workplaces provide adequate leave options under the Family Medical Leave Act. Flexible workplaces provide a competitive, living wage for employees regardless of their gender. Flexible workplaces provide sufficient paid sick leave. H.R. 1406 does nothing to advance any of these proposals and most of all does nothing to foster a flexible work environment.

H.R. 1406 is nothing more than a message moment for the majority party. The bill weakens the worker protections under which we have lived comfortably for 75 years. This bill provides less flexibility, not more. Even if this deeply flawed bill passes this House, it will not be considered by the Senate nor will it become law. It is a diversion from the real issues that this Committee was tasked with tackling: creating jobs and fostering economic growth.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 198 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 377) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Each section of the bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 377.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

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

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1410

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM) at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The previous question on H. Res. 198, by the yeas and nays; adoption of H. Res. 198, if ordered; and approval of the Journal, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1406, WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 198) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1406) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 198, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

YEAS—230

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
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
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
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
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
Ros-Lehtinen
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
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—198

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
Castor (FL)
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
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
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, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
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
Pastor (AZ)
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

NOT VOTING—4

Hastings (FL)
Markey
Westmoreland
Young (FL)

□ 1435

Messrs. OWEN, SCHRADER, and ENYART changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. KING of New York changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. 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 228, noes 199, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 133]

AYES—228

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
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)
McCaul
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
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)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
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
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—199

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
Castor (FL)
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
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
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, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
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
Pastor (AZ)
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

NOT VOTING—5

Hastings (FL)
Markey
Rohrabacher
Westmoreland
Young (FL)

□ 1444

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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 293, nays 131, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

YEAS—293

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Barber
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Grayson
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maloney, Carolyn
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pascrell
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby

Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thornberry
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (IN)

NAYS—131

Amash
Andrews
Bachus
Barr
Bass
Benishek
Bishop (NY)
Brady (PA)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Butterfield
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crowley
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Denham
DeSantis
Duffy
Edwards
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Foxx
Fudge
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gibson
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Hanna
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Joyce
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Lance
Latham
Lee (CA)
Lewis
LoBiondo
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Miller, George
Moore
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Nugent
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pelosi
Perry
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Rigell
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schwartz
Sires
Slaughter
Southerland
Stivers
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Owens

NOT VOTING—7

Gohmert
Hastings (FL)
Issa
Keating
Markey
Westmoreland
Young (FL)

□ 1452

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 632

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw Mr. MIKE POMPEO of Kansas, Mr. RAÚL GRIJALVA of Arizona, and Mr. RUBÉN HINOJOSA of Texas as cosponsors of H.R. 632, who were mistakenly added to the bill.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL TEACHERS APPRECIATION DAY

(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, today is National Teachers Appreciation Day. There are many factors that contribute towards a quality education, but no one factor is more significant than the teacher.

Teachers make a difference in the lives of students every day across this great Nation. Teachers work to open students' minds to ideas, knowledge and dreams, and keep American democracy alive by laying the foundation for good citizenship.

To quote President Kennedy:

> There is an old saying that the course of civilization is a race between catastrophe and education. In a democracy such as ours, we must make sure that education wins the race.

Our Nation faces many challenges today, including a struggling economy and record unemployment. For these problems and others, the education provided by teachers can be the key to our success.

I am very appreciative to all of the teachers who have made such a difference in my life, including the lives of my children; and I urge my colleagues to take time to recognize and acknowledge the impact of teachers in our lives.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Today, the Environmental Working Group launched their Worth It campaign, highlighting the invaluable role that small and midsized farmers play in protecting our environment, contributing to our economy, and strengthening our core values.

I could not agree more. It's our small and midsized farmers who are some of the best stewards of our land.

Many of those farmers talk to me about climate change. They're worried. They're outside every day, seeing the impact changing weather has on their topsoil, crop patterns, and water availability. They're the people who experienced the 3,527 weather records that were broken last year, and they're the ones asking Congress to help them.

That's why, later this week, I will be introducing the Balancing Food, Farm and Environment Act, to assist farmers to better adapt to climate change impact and to continue to support their stewardship efforts by updating the conservation provisions in the farm bill.

THANK A TEACHER

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Kara was in the third grade when the school notified her parents about her difficulty in processing words. Her speech pattern was different. It affected every aspect of her life, including her self-esteem.

Kara's third grade teacher, Mrs. Morgan, at the Oaks Elementary in Atascocita, Texas, was determined to help the little girl speak better, so the teacher and the pupil worked very hard together on talking. The success of both of them occurred this way:

Later, that little girl who couldn't speak very well walked off the stage in high school as valedictorian. She also obtained her bachelor's degree, her master's degree, and today she is an associate professor at Baylor University in the department of—yes—English. The little girl with word problems is teaching about word patterns.

I come from a family of teachers. My mother, my mother-in-law, my wife, and my three daughters are teachers by profession—and Kara is one of those daughters.

So today, being Teachers Appreciation Day, we thank Mrs. Morgan and all of America's teachers for helping our kids be what they want to be.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1500

THE CLEAN ACT

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

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, the Federal Government has wasted millions of dollars maintaining empty bank accounts that serve no purpose. Last year, the Government Accountability Office found that the government was spending more than $170,000 maintaining over 28,000 empty bank accounts at an annual cost of $2 million. That's inexcusable.

No New Hampshire family or business would tolerate that type of waste, and neither should the government. That's why today I'm partnering with my Republican colleague, Representative KEVIN CRAMER, to introduce commonsense legislation that would put an end to this wasteful practice.

This legislation won't solve our fiscal challenges, but the fact is the Federal

Government shouldn't tolerate any waste, no matter how big or small.

Let's prove to the American people that we're capable of coming together to cut the most obvious examples of waste by passing the CLEAN Act.

HONORING ESPERANZA BRAVO DE VARONA AND LESBIA ORTA VARONA

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank and honor Esperanza Bravo de Varona and Lesbia Orta Varona on their well-deserved retirement after a long career with the Otto G. Richter Library at the University of Miami.

Their distinguished careers were marked by impressive contributions to a special collection called the Cuban Heritage Collection.

Their commitment to excellence has truly allowed them to shape the lives of many students, academics, and historians, and in that I count my father, Enrique Ros, who authored 19 books on Cuban history and local politics and relied upon the original documents found in the library's collection. Many other authors and historians have also come to rely on these documents.

I have great confidence that the library will continue in the positive direction that Esperanza and Lesbia have set for it and that their commitment will be remembered for many years to come, Mr. Speaker.

As a former Florida certified teacher, I know that there are few rewards greater than the satisfaction of investing in education, and I thank Esperanza and Lesbia for having empowered so many in our community with the resources and guidance to expand their knowledge.

I wish them both all the best in this new chapter of their lives.

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. The Republicans, under the guise of being family friendly, are going to strip American workers of overtime pay. That's right, work more than 40 hours a week, you don't get paid overtime anymore under their bill. Instead, you get comp time.

They say, Oh, this is family friendly, it's flexible. Well, there's certainly flexibility now that employers can grant people leave for family problems and other things. This would be essentially an interest-free loan to employers. They tell you you're working 50 hours, and I'll give you comp time, but it's up to them to give you the comp time. So they could wait until the end of the year, then pay you the overtime without having granted you comp time and having had an interest-free loan. This is outrageous.

Many Americans are having trouble making ends meet. They're dependent upon overtime pay to make ends meet. Wages are stagnant, and they need the overtime pay to make ends meet. Women still only earn 77 cents on the dollar compared to male workers. They need the overtime pay to help feed their kids. But, no, the Republicans want to take that away from them under the guise of being female friendly.

Happy Mother's Day from the Republicans.

NIDAL HASSAN'S ACTIONS SHOULD BE CLASSIFIED AS TERRORISM

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on November 5, 2009, Nidal Hassan, after coordinating with known terrorist leader Anwar al-Awlaki, opened fire at Fort Hood, Texas, killing 14 and wounding 32 others.

This was clearly an act of terror, yet the Department of Defense and the Army have classified this case as workplace violence. This is an insult to the brave men and women who were killed and injured that day. But this isn't about semantics; this is about who we are as Americans.

By declaring their deaths as injuries as a result of workplace violence, the Department denied these soldiers and their families benefits like VA health care, counseling and critical mental health services, disability benefits, and combat-related special compensation. It's also made them ineligible to receive the Purple Heart.

As someone who served in the Army at Fort Hood, I can say without hesitation that the Army should be ashamed of this poor level of care and outright disrespect it has shown our soldiers.

Yesterday, I joined one Republican and one Democrat, Congressman WOLF and Congressman FATTAH, in sending a letter to Secretary Hagel asking them to change the designation from workplace violence to combat-related.

Let us send a message that that is who we are as Americans and that is how we treat our veterans.

THE TURKISH AND ISRAELI GOVERNMENTS WORKING TOGETHER

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, last night, there was historic and important news from the Middle East. For the second time, the Israeli and the Turkish governments met and feel they're close to having an agreement to renew their diplomatic relations, which for 3 years have not existed.

There could be nothing more important to peace in the Middle East and America's interests than the Turkish and the Israeli Governments working together.

Having that historic relationship mended came about because President Obama, on his trip to Israel, urged Prime Minister Netanyahu to apologize for the incidents with the flotilla. He did so. That was a major act on Prime Minister Netanyahu's part. And for Prime Minister Erdogan to accept it was important too. They're working together. They're very close.

I'm pleased with both the Turkish and the Israeli Governments and their leaders, and I thank President Obama for his initiative.

NATIONAL PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOLS WEEK

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, this week we celebrate National Public Charter Schools Week. With over 2 million students attending public charter schools nationwide, it is important that we continue to create and develop this very important educational option.

Minnesota is a leader in developing innovative new ways to educate our children, including being the very first State to allow charter schools 21 years ago. In Minnesota, we have 146 charter schools, and we are now ranked number one in the country for having charter school friendly laws and developing high quality and independent charter school options.

Last Congress, we made significant bipartisan support and progress with the introduction of the bipartisan All-STAR Act and passage of the Empowering Parents through Quality Charter Schools Act. I'm building on this progress and success by working now to craft additional options that aid in the replication of successful charter schools.

America will continue to lead the world in innovation and ideas if our children receive the best education from childhood through graduate school, and all by strengthening charter schools and helping ensure that a child's ZIP code does not determine the quality of education they are able to receive. That is the direction we should go in Congress.

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, the so-called ''Working Families Flexibility Act'' would amend and would subvert the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in order to allow private sector employers to compensate their employees instead of paying them overtime.

It gives employers the legal cover to force employees to work more and to pay them less. What would improve the lives of working families would be an increase in the minimum wage. What would provide flexible workplaces would be to give adequate leave options under the Family and Medical Leave Act.

Flexible workplaces provide competitive living wages for employees. Flexible workplaces provide sufficient sick-pay leave.

H.R. 1406 does nothing to advance any of these proposals.

□ 1510

GIVING WORKERS MORE CHOICES

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

Mr. HARRIS. This week the House is going to take action on a bill that's going to give the American workers in the private sector the exact same rights that Federal Government workers have, and that is that if you're going to choose to work extra, you get a choice whether to take overtime pay or to get time off to go to your child's school.

In my district we have Patriot Days during the school day at elementary schools where parents would love to have the time to go and spend that time with their child. This bill will get the parent the choice, not a Federal law. This will allow the parent to take that time off as comp time instead of getting overtime. It just gives everyone more choice.

HONORING SYED HASAN-ASIF

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a sad opportunity to rise to acknowledge the loss of one of Houston's distinguished citizens—not only Houston, but recognized in places far away from this great Nation—Mr. Syed Hasan-Asif, a great leader and the father of a wonderful family, sons, and many extended family members. I am saddened that this great man has been lost, but I offer the words:

> Do not fear and do not grieve but receive good tidings of Paradise, which you were promised.

This gentleman leaves his wife, Tahseen F. Begun. But he was a great man that was a father to many. He was a businessman, trained his family to be able to be sharers of their opportunities that they had. And the prosperity that they were able to achieve they did not keep to themselves. He was a friend to many. He loved many. He stood strong. He took care of his family. He brought joy, and he was generous. I'm so very pleased that so many got a chance to know Mr. Syed Hasan-Asif and to know of his generosity and his spirit and to know that his reach was not only here in the United States, but also in faraway places.

I offer to his family my deepest sympathy, my respect and admiration for having such a great leader in our community, who generated businesses and created an economic engine of opportunity wherever he was able to come. Now as he rests in peace, may it be, as I indicated, for us not to fear and not to grieve, but receive good tidings of Paradise, which you were promised. May blessings be upon him and his family.

RECOGNIZING THE JEWISH STATE OF ISRAEL

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have just come back from a bipartisan trip to Israel where we met with top officials and really celebrated the alliance between the U.S. and Israel. Israel obviously is in a very dangerous neighborhood, and they were absolutely justified to carry out the bombing strikes in Syria where Hezbollah terrorists were attempting to get arms from Iran.

What happens is Iran sends the weapons, the missiles through Syria into Lebanon to arm the Hezbollah terrorists. No nation would put up with having terrorists prepared to attack them without striking back. So I think it is very, very important that we support Israel in its quest to rid itself of the scourge of terrorism.

Peace in the Middle East will come about when both sides recognize the other's right to exist. The problem has been that many of the Arab nations do not recognize Israel's right to exist as a Jewish State, and I think that really needs to change. I am glad President Obama said that he supports Israel in doing whatever it needs to do for its own self-defense, and I'm pleased that talks are being started with the help of Secretary Kerry to try to get peace talks online again. But again, in my estimation, peace will only happen when the Arab nations recognize the Jewish State of Israel.

DOCTORS' CAUCUS: HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the Speaker. The hour we are going to spend with our Physicians' Caucus is going to be on health care today. I'm joined by numerous colleagues here on the House floor from the Doctors' Caucus to discuss this extremely important issue.

When I was elected 4 years ago to the House, one of the burning issues at that time was health care reform in this country, and the greatest problem with health care in America was the cost. Certainly I could see it every day. I practiced for 31 years as an obstetrician-gynecologist in Johnson City, Tennessee, a small town in northeast Tennessee. I saw where it was becoming harder and harder and harder for my patients to afford care. The major problem was that.

Number two, we had a problem with access. We had working people out every day. Maybe one was a carpenter, maybe the wife worked at a local store that didn't have health insurance coverage. Together they made a living that was livable in northeast Tennessee, but certainly not enough money to pay $1,000 or $1,500 a month for a health insurance policy.

Thirdly, we have a liability crisis. When I began my practice, I thought about it, I began in 1977. I know this is hard to believe, but we would take care of a woman who was pregnant for 1 year and see her for a 6-week checkup and stay as long with her as we needed to when she was in labor, and that cost was $360. And if you had a Caesarean section, it cost another $100. So it was very affordable. Even young families could come in and make payments and pay for it. The hospital bill was more than that, but it certainly wasn't the exorbitant prices that we see today.

The malpractice premium I first paid, and obstetricians and neurosurgeons and others are very high risk, was about $4,000 a year. Five years ago when I retired from my practice to run for Congress, the malpractice premiums had ballooned to the mid-$70,000s, and the patients didn't get anything more for that. They didn't get better care. They just got a higher bill. It didn't improve the quality of their care. So we can see, number one, cost.

I remember when we had the debate down here. I stood in the well of the House the night we debated that bill, in March of 2010, to vote on it. I was one of the last people to stand down here, and I remember the President's remarks: If you like your health insurance, you can keep it. And your costs are going to go down by $2,500.

Now 3 years later, let's see what the reality is. Many of us here in the Doctors' Caucus brought decades, and I do mean decades. I look around, and I wish each speaker as they step up, would tell how many years they practiced medicine. You'll see the experience that's on the floor today. So what happened was the cost has gone up; it didn't go down. And I'm not even sure after this is all implemented that access is actually going to increase because as we discuss during this hour, you'll see that for some people there's more access, but for others it may be cut off; and I think it was unintended. I don't believe that they wrote a bill to actually do that, to actually cut access. But I think the reality is it's going to happen.

Before I continue, I want to introduce one of my colleagues, Dr. PHIL

GINGREY, who is in the well today. Dr. GINGREY and I are both OB/GYN doctors. He is from Georgia, and a good friend. Dr. GINGREY, I yield to you.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding, my physician colleague and cochairman of the House GOP Doctors' Caucus, several of whom are here on the floor in the House on this Special Order hour to discuss the impending train wreck that Dr. ROE referenced.

Mr. Speaker, it is not just Dr. ROE's words, but it is almost a direct quote from the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Senator MAX BAUCUS. I don't know how many years Senator BAUCUS has served, but he has been chairing that committee for many years. And, of course, the Senate version of ObamaCare was essentially written by Senator MAX BAUCUS and his senior staff of the Senate Finance Committee.

So of those 2,700 pages in that final bill that we saw President Obama sign as his legacy, ObamaCare, on March 25, 3 years ago, the Senator knew everything that was in that bill. And just last week, there was a hearing on the Senate side, the Senate Finance Committee asked the secretary who is in charge of the rulemaking. You know, after a piece of legislation is passed, Mr. Speaker, then come the rules.

Well, I don't know how high 2,700 pages stack, but the rules stacked 7 feet tall. In fact, Senator BARRASSO was doing a Special Order recently or a press interview, and he is 6 feet tall and he's standing next to these rules and regulations that came through the Department of Health and Human Services, led by Secretary Kathleen Sebelius, and they're 7 feet tall. I don't know whether it was 40,000 pages or 400,000 pages, but it was a big number.

□ 1520

What I'd like to point out to my colleagues before yielding back to my good friend from Tennessee so he can yield to some of the other doctors who are members of the House GOP Doctors Caucus, I want to point out, colleagues and Mr. Speaker, this poster. And I give credit for this poster to Representative KEVIN BRADY from Texas, a senior member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

I was speaking with Congressman BRADY a little earlier this morning, and I said, KEVIN, I'm going to use your poster today because we're doing this Special Order because of this impending train wreck—the words of Senator MAX BAUCUS, Democratic Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, not just Dr. ROE's words—and I said I was trying to count real quickly how many new bureaucracies, agencies—not number of people, mind you, but, literally, new agencies—of the Federal Government, talking about expanding the Federal Government and taking over one-sixth of our economy, which is health care. Pretty soon it'll be a fifth, and pretty soon it'll be a fourth as we continue to go broke.

But KEVIN told me, Representative BRADY told me, 159. I didn't have time to count them all. But in the center, of course, my colleagues, you can see the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and today that's Ms. Sebelius. Tomorrow it could be somebody else.

But, I mean, the whole point is it is a train wreck. And this law is going to be fully implemented, Mr. Speaker, on the first day of January 2014. Well, what is that? Here we are, May. That's 7 months away.

And all of these exchanges that you're hearing about, colleagues, that many of the States have said, ''We can't do this; we're not going to do it,'' they're not even close to being set up. And yet people, the general public who doesn't have health insurance, can't get it from their employer or can't afford it, whatever reason, they are supposed to be able, on October the 1st, October the 1st of this year, 2013, to begin signing up for health insurance through those exchanges. But this is why they can't.

This is a train wreck. I mean, these lines are not railroad tracks, but they could be. So I thought I would, colleagues, I would point that out to you. I think you all are aware of it.

The gentleman from Tennessee is generous with his time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. It reminds me, Dr. GINGREY, of biochemistry in college. Looks like the Krebs cycle, the sugar cycle. It is incredibly complicated, this bill is, and I think we need to spend more time explaining it to the American people.

And one of the frustrations, Dr. GINGREY, that I've had is that I've read the bill, as you have, as many of us have, probably all of us have in the Doctors Caucus.

I went to a hearing the other day on the Veterans' Affairs Committee on which I serve. We spent 2 hours and 15 minutes explaining the effects of the Affordable Care Act on veterans with Dr. Petzel, who is the medical director of the VA. The IRS, the Treasury Department was represented. And when we walked out of that room, I don't think anybody could explain to you the effects of the Affordable Care Act on our veterans.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield back quickly.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I yield to Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. My colleagues, the IRS is just right up here. That's 15,000 new IRS agents to make sure that the poor people have purchased health insurance or they're going to get taxed. Right?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Correct.

I now yield to my good friend, Dr. ANDY HARRIS from Maryland One. And Dr. HARRIS serves on the faculty of Johns Hopkins University. He's an anesthesiologist.

Dr. HARRIS.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you very much. I want to thank my colleague from Tennessee.

I've practiced for 28 years before coming to the body here 2 years ago. Part of the reason is because of what the gentleman from Georgia mentions, the train wreck, to use the Senator's term, the train wreck that's coming upon us.

Mr. Speaker, the people in Maryland got a little rude awakening last week when BlueCross Blue Shield CareFirst, which is our nonprofit provider in Maryland, announced their new rates in the individual market on these exchanges that the gentleman from Georgia mentioned.

Now, in Maryland we're going to have an exchange October 1. You're just not going to be able to afford to buy the insurance on the exchange because that nonprofit insurer announced that their average increase was 25 percent—25 percent increase in the already high cost of health insurance. And it ranged from a small savings in a small number of people to—and I want you to hear this number—150 percent increase for healthy young people, a 150 percent increase in the premium to the people who are supposed to make that decision to do the right thing and buy insurance.

So this is the decision someone's going to be faced with coming out of high school or college, getting that first job, is: Should I buy health insurance? Maybe my employer no longer offers it because of the penalties that are in this bill and the mandates, so their employer may not offer it. Their choice is going to be: Should I do the right thing and get it?

And now they're faced with a 150 percent increase in that cost. And that was supposed to be—as the gentleman from Georgia said, and the gentleman from Tennessee, we were promised more affordable, and it was, you could keep it if you have it.

Well, let me tell you something. For that employee who's going to lose it because their employer can no longer afford it, they're not going to have it; and in Maryland, they're not going to be able to afford it.

So I want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee for keeping this issue in front of the American people because there are going to be many more surprises like we got in Maryland coming out across the United States in the next few months as this train wreck comes upon us.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

Dr. HARRIS, if you would stay there just a moment so that people understand: How could this possibly happen? How could young people—which I have three children, and I think it's a good idea to keep our under-26-year-olds on. I think there were a lot of things we could have all agreed upon. But the thing that we didn't explain to people is: How did you get this number? Why did that happen?

Well, here's why it happened. Young healthy people are going to be subsidizing people who are not as healthy and older. How does that happen?

Well, this bill does not allow you—when actuaries look at it, they know that I'm six times more risky than someone who is my children's age, who is in their twenties. In other words, I've got six times the actuarial risk that they have. The bill only allows an actuary to charge 3 to 1.

So a healthy young person that's 25—Dr. HARRIS and I were laughing. Having a son—and I know that he has a fine-looking young son. We know that you insure young boys for stupidity. They're going to go out and trip and fall and jump off things, but illness is not it. So we're taking young healthy men and women, 20 to 25 years of age, sometimes doubling and tripling their costs so that someone else's can be a little less expensive.

Now, what would a young person do if all of a sudden they were going to pay $80 or $90 a month for a basic health insurance policy and now it's $300, or they can pay the first year a $95 fine, a $95 fine and they have guaranteed issuance, they cannot be turned away? There can be no preexisting conditions, so they can get the insurance. So what do you think these smart young people are going to do? They're going to figure it out pretty quickly. They're not going to subsidize that, and they're going to be very upset when they look at their first paycheck and realize what's happened to them.

I yield to Dr. HARRIS.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you very much for yielding.

And the gentleman has hit the nail on the head on this one. We want to encourage young folks to do the right thing and buy insurance. And in Maryland, our insurance was affordable for the young because we did allow appropriate risk to be priced.

But the Federal Government—and by the way, we also had high-risk pools. Anyone with a preexisting condition in Maryland could not be turned away by the high-risk pool that was actually run by the State of Maryland. So we didn't have a problem with someone not being able to get insurance in the State of Maryland.

But the Federal Government came in and fixed our problem in Maryland. Now, we didn't have one, but the result is going to be that all that risk that used to be in the high-risk pool which everybody paid a little bit for is now all on the backs of the person, the individual now going into that exchange to buy insurance.

□ 1530

Again, Mr. Speaker, a 150 percent increase in the cost of that policy for those young people just entering the workforce. These are the people who have big student loans if they've gone to college. They've got other costs. They've got the costs of raising a young family. And now, thanks to the Federal Government and to the President's Affordable Care Act, a 150 percent increase in the cost of their insurance.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would now like to yield to my friend and colleague, a new Member, Dr. BRAD WENSTRUP from Ohio, near Cincinnati. Dr. WENSTRUP also has served in Iraq in our military. I now yield to Dr. WENSTRUP.

Mr. WENSTRUP. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to take a little time to discuss a portion of the Affordable Care Act known as the Independent Payment Advisory Board. As you look at this chart, it's one of the agencies that has been developed here on this chart.

I'd also like to point out on this chart that right down here is the physician, and over here is the patient. It seems to me that all we're really trying to do is get the patient to the physician. It behooves me to be able to explain why we need all this in between when we are just trying to get a patient to the physician. I would also like to point out that I think at the center of our health care in America should be the patient, not the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

But let's talk for a minute about the Independent Payment Advisory Board. Who are they? Who are these people? Well, they're actually 15 unelected bureaucrats appointed by the President. To date, as this law is being enacted, no one has been appointed yet.

What do they do? Well, they limit options. They limit care options. They limit access to care. They drive a wedge between the doctor and the patient, and they're responsible for denials of payment for certain types of treatment. I contend to you that really this is a wedge that we cannot afford if we are to have the best health care in the world, which we have been known to have.

I would like to share with you a little story that I experienced in my 26 years as a doctor, as a surgeon. I had a patient who came in one time, and she explained to me that she's had a problem for 10 years. For 10 years she's had a problem, and she's had multiple treatments. She explained to me what those were. Between cortisone shots and physical therapy, she's had previous X-rays, she had paddings and strappings, different things that might put the painful area to rest and make it better, but none of it got better. They were all acceptable treatments, but for 10 years, they failed.

So I said, Well, your X-ray looks normal. Have you ever had an MRI? She said, No. So I said, I don't want to repeat all the things that have failed. Let's go ahead and get an MRI and take a look inside.

Well, later that afternoon, I get a call from the insurance company where I have to speak to a doctor about ordering this MRI. The doctor says to me, Why are you ordering the MRI? I explained it. And he said, Well, you've only seen her one time, so I'm not going to allow it. I'm not going to allow this to be ordered. I said, Well, maybe I've only seen her one time, Doctor, but you haven't seen her at all. You've never seen her. And I said, And you haven't taken the 10-year history that I have taken, and yet you're going to be deciding the care? I said, How can I get this patient to come and see you? The doctor said, Well, you can't do that. I said, Well, what's your specialty? He said, I'm an emergency room doctor. I said, Okay, fair enough. You would probably, in the emergency room then, refer her to a specialist, which is where she is today, and yet you, in your specialty, are denying this care.

I went back and I explained this to the patient. But not until I said to the doctor, I said, I hope this call is being monitored for quality assurance because I want someone to hear what you said to me today.

I went back to the patient and I said, You need to talk to your person at your work, your H.R. person, explain to them that you are being denied care and have them make a call to the insurance company.

Do you know, the next day we got approval for that MRI. I was able to look inside, find out what was wrong and treat this patient, and within 3 weeks, she was better. But the advice from the person who had never seen the patient was, You can't have that MRI.

This is what we are dealing with today. At least in this situation we had the opportunity to have her work call the insurance company and make a case saying, You need to take care of this patient.

But imagine when it is a government agency. What kind of recourse do you think that we will have between the doctors and our patients? At least in this case it was a doctor. The Independent Payment Advisory Board will not be made up entirely of doctors, and they will not have people on there from every specialty with knowledge about everything that comes across medically.

So do we want a third party deciding who gets care? Frankly, I don't think anyone should have the ability to determine someone's care unless they have looked the patient in the eye, they have looked and they've discussed the options, and the patient and the doctor decide together. This is a dangerous course that we're on in America and in Americans' health care.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

And before you leave, Doctor, I want to ask you a question. This is an issue that is very near and dear to my heart. I have a bill, H.R. 351, which is to repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board. When I read that health care law, this was not in the original version of the House version of the bill. This version came from the Senate version. The House version did not. And Representative NEAL from Massachusetts wrote a letter to then-Speaker PELOSI, which I signed in a bipartisan way, to not put this in. It was included in this side.

So to better understand, let me sort of go over just a minute and we'll talk about it in just a little more detail. I know you have another appointment, but there are 15 people on here, and only one of them may be a doctor. These are health care policy people. Basically, all this board does is to determine how Medicare dollars are spent. There's a preset budget in Medicare, and if you spend more than that, this board is charged to give the Congress, they have to cut. If they don't make different cuts, they have to make the ones that this board—and that's how it's going to affect care.

Guess where the cuts are coming from? They come from providers. And if you keep cutting the providers, you will lessen access. I've seen it happen, and I'll go through that after you leave. But that is exactly what's going to happen. If you don't believe me, simply read a New England Journal of Medicine article in June 2011. This is an article that is not for it or against it. It just analyzed it. It looked at the formula, and they looked back 25 years. In 21 of the 25 previous years, this would have cut providers.

Guess what the Congress has been able to do? The Congress has been able to override those cuts in the SGR, the way doctors are paid through Medicare now, and prevent that loss of access. Without a three-fifths majority in the Senate, we've lost that ability; we've given up our constitutional right for the people to come to us and say that we don't believe this is the way it ought to be going. It is a huge mistake.

I believe in that poster of gibberish down there that you're looking at. It's the single worst thing in there because it will ultimately deny access for our seniors. I believe that in my heart of hearts. I've seen it in Tennessee with our TennCare program, which I'll discuss later.

I will yield back to you if you would like to make any closing comments.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Just in closing, I would just like to reiterate the importance of decisions being able to be made between a doctor and a patient, because that's what we expect, and that's what Americans deserve in their health care system.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

He pointed out something that's clear from his statement down there—he is and has been a practicing physician—because each of us know this, Mr. Speaker, that health care decisions should be made between a patient, the doctor, and that patient's family. It shouldn't be made by insurance companies. It shouldn't be made by organizations, ACOs, the government, IPABs and so forth.

When you're in need, you see the person, the doctor most capable of taking care of your needs, and you make a decision based upon that between you and that family. We're losing that in this country with the doctor-patient relationship, and it is a very, very, very bad thing to happen.

I would now like to yield to my good friend, JOHN FLEMING, from Louisiana. He is also a veteran and a three-decade family practitioner.

Dr. FLEMING.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

Of course, all of us here today talking are physicians of different specialties. Most of us were actually here during the ObamaCare debate. We actually began that in 2009. It actually went in to law, it was signed into law March 23, 2010.

The interesting thing about this law—the Affordable Care Act, which I refer to as the Unaffordable Care Act, but lovingly and affectionately known as ObamaCare—is the fact that what it does is it adds 15 million more Americans on to Medicaid, which already way underreimburses physicians, which means most doctors don't accept that as payment, and it adds another 15 million Americans to a system that's already stressed.

□ 1540

Ultimately, what's going to happen is you're going to have more Americans carrying more cards that entitle them to health care, but it really will entitle them only to a waiting line—a waiting list—just as we see today with Canada and Great Britain.

Let's talk for a moment about the promises. You know, Washington, Mr. Speaker, has a reputation for making promises it can't keep, and indeed that applies to ObamaCare.

First of all, the President said if you like your plan, you can keep it. Well, we know that's not true. We know now that you're going to get whatever plan and mandates that go with it, and you'll have to pay the cost that goes with it.

ObamaCare will not add one dime to our deficits. The CBO has now come back to show that the early estimates were way out of line. It's going to add billions of dollars to our deficit, and I think that's really an underestimation.

''No Federal dollars will be used to fund abortions, and Federal conscience laws will remain in place.'' Federal conscience laws have been totally gutted. We know that, for instance, Hobby Lobby will be fined to the tune of millions of dollars as a result of its unwillingness to pay for abortifacients—that is, pills that can cause an abortion—and other things that are against the conscience of those who are in management and ownership there.

President Obama said, ''I will protect Medicare.'' Well, if he's going to protect Medicare, why did he take $716 billion out of Medicare to fund ObamaCare? He says that's savings. Well, if we can save that kind of money out of Medicare over 30 or 40 years, why didn't we do it once? We didn't because we can't without changing it structurally. It will simply be cuts to services.

ObamaCare will not raise any of your taxes. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare includes 21 new taxes. And they're not just on rich people; about half of them are on the middle class.

I'll just give you an example of one very nasty tax that's coming your way. If you're a business owner, there is a tax—3.8 percent—on unearned income, which includes capital gains, dividends, rents, royalties and interest, which means that you're going to get hit hard and very hard. And then also a device tax on revenues—not on profits—which those who make everything from tongue blades to artificial hearts tell us will drive them out of this country into another country. And we'll have to buy back those devices, killing tens of thousands—maybe hundreds of thousands—of American jobs.

ObamaCare will ''lower your premiums by $2,500 per family per year.'' Mr. Speaker, no one has told me their premiums have gone down as a result of ObamaCare. In fact, in most cases, it's gone up $3,000. That's a net of $5,500 change, and many of them are expected to double and even triple as a result of ObamaCare. You can't just keep adding mandates to insurance and expect not to have to pay for them. That's just the simple truth.

What about IPAB? We heard some discussion about the Independent Payment Advisory Board, and it's really straightforward what they do: they take out of the hands of Congress our ability to find more efficient ways and ways to limit costs to Medicare patients. In fact, it's a 15-member board that's appointed by the President—not necessarily health care providers—who will have more power than Congress itself. It will actually be able to determine what gets paid for, how much it gets paid for, what type of doctors/providers will be paid for their services to Medicare patients. Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely the beginning of rationing and long lines for health care.

One other point before I yield back. Let me quote something that's already been referred to today in our discussion.

Senator Finance Committee Chairman MAX BAUCUS, who helped author ObamaCare, before a hearing, out of frustration, he asked Secretary Sebelius, he said, we've got all kind of problems, aren't you going to help us on this? Here's a quote from Senator BAUCUS—who shortly after this decided to retire. He said:

> I am very concerned that not enough is being done so far. Very concerned. When I'm home, small businesses have no idea what to do, what to expect. They don't know what affordability rules are, they don't know what penalties may apply.
>
> I just see a huge train wreck coming down. You and I have discussed this many times and I don't see any results yet.

And we've yet to hear a good answer, a reasonable answer from Secretary Sebelius on how this has come together. We know that much of this has to be implemented really by October and finished by the first of January of 2014, and nobody knows what's going to happen, how it's going to happen.

Business owners today are looking at, should they have 50 employees or less than 50 employees? What kind of penalties are they going to have to pay, which is not tax deductible. There is nothing but chaos across America among small businesses.

Even parts of ObamaCare have already either been repealed or just simply dropped. The CLASS Act, long-term care, which was unworkable and is not going to help fund it. A very onerous 1099 tax reporting requirement has been dropped. So, little by little, this bill is beginning to fall apart. I'll just say, finally, that this train wreck not only is coming down, but the wheels are falling off the train.

So with that, I would like to yield back to the gentleman and certainly stick around for more discussion.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And let me reminisce before I yield to my friend from Indiana.

As a young medical student in Memphis many, many years ago in the late 1960s, my first pediatric rotation was at St. Jude Children's Hospital, a remarkable place. At that point in time almost 90 percent of children died of their disease. I would go in and start an IV, and Dr. FLEMING, I can still remember seeing some of those kids, I knew they wouldn't survive. It was very hard for me emotionally to deal with that.

Fast forward today, almost 90 percent of those children live today. And they are treated at no cost, their families are sent there at no cost. I've had children of patients of mine who have gone to that wonderful place. I hope that we don't end up in a Middle Ages in health care, with device taxes and disincentives for new medications.

You and I both remember, when I graduated from medical school there were five or six anti-hypertensives, three or four of them made you sicker than high blood pressure did. Well, today there is a plethora of wonderful new medications to use for people. There wasn't a day that went by that I went in the operating room that I didn't see somebody that needed surgery for a bleeding ulcer—almost every day. It's unheard of now because of new medications.

I just found out today, in my own State of Tennessee—and I did not know this—the largest thing that we export in the State of Tennessee is, guess what? Medical devices. It will hurt my State dramatically in jobs, as you clearly point out—and I know, Dr. BUCSHON, in Indiana you're very concerned about that.

You mentioned the IPAB. If the President right yet has not appointed anyone and no one is approved, or they don't have a quorum, they don't have at least eight people confirmed by the Senate, guess who makes all those decisions at the IPAB? One person. That's the Secretary. That's who makes all the decisions. Not the Congress. We have given up, this body—even though it may look funny down here with us debating and contentious, that's what we're elected to do. We are turning over that power—could be—to one single individual. It's Secretary Sebelius right now; there will be a different name 4 years from now. I don't want that person, be it Republican or Democrat—that power should be here.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLEMING. Your experience is exactly the same as mine when it comes to blood disorders, blood cancers, solid tumors in children. That used to be a death warrant when you and I were in medical school. Today, the vast majority of those children survive and live a happy life.

Yet, what we see today is some of the oldest chemotherapeutic agents, some that are 60 years old—and of course the patents have run out a long time ago—are in severe short supply because, again, the heavy boot of government on the neck of industry that can't produce these at a rate that can meet up with demand. So it's important that we begin to pull back on this now, because we're going to be in the same situation as Canada and Great Britain, who have government-run health care, where early diagnosis, early treatment and using the best chemotherapeutic agents shows up in their statistics. Their death rates from cancer are much higher than ours are.

□ 1550

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to take the opportunity to yield to my good friend from Indiana, a cardiothoracic surgeon, Dr. LARRY BUCSHON.

Mr. BUCSHON. Thank you, Dr. ROE, for yielding. It's great to be here with many members of the Doctors' Caucus and again remember the focus of what we are trying to do here is focusing on the patient, what's best for the American people and our patients.

It's already been quoted a number of times today—I've got a couple other quotes. Senator SCHUMER also said:

> The Affordable Care Act could cause rates to go through the roof.

That's exactly what we are seeing in the private health insurance. I won't repeat Senator BAUCUS' statement about a train wreck. But Senator ROCKEFELLER also said:

> It's so complicated, and if it isn't done right the first time and it's not being done at all, it will just simply get worse.

What I'm going to focus on now and the rest of the time is what this means to employers and people that have employer-provided health insurance and what this law is going to do to employers.

Let me focus on first what the city of Long Beach, California, just came out and said recently. They are going to be limiting most of their 1,600 part-time employees to fewer than 27 hours a week on average. So these are employees that had a 40-hour workweek and now they are being cut to less than 40 hours to comply with the law.

You say, Why would that happen? Well, because city officials say that without cutting payroll hours, new health care benefits would cost up to $2 million more next year and that expense would trigger layoffs and cutbacks in city services. This is a city in southern California. This isn't an isolated event.

Regal Entertainment Group, the Nation's largest movie theater chain, with over 500 movie theaters operating in 38 States, recently said they plan to cut many nonsalaried employees back to part-time to comply with ObamaCare.

In a memo to company managers, Regal stated:

> To comply with the Affordable Care Act, Regal had to increase our health care budget to cover those newly deemed eligible, based on the law's definition of full-time employee, which is 30 hours or above. To manage this budget, all other employees will be scheduled in accord with business needs in a manner that will not negatively impact our health care budget.

That needs a translation. The translation is: everybody is getting cut back to less than 30 hours, and they are going to see their income dramatically drop.

There are other examples. The State of Virginia, Palm Beach State College in Florida, and CKE Restaurants, among others.

I have an example in my district. We got an email the other day. A constituent said she and 52 other employees at a school district in my district in Indiana were recently informed that their hours will be cut to 28 hours a week because the school can't afford to comply with the health care law.

Municipal government officials are telling me, city government officials are telling me in my district this may hit city government, municipal government, county government, and school districts. This is just people being cut.

Now, let's talk about people losing their health insurance. Here's a chart right here that says we were promised that everybody could keep their health insurance. Here are some, what I consider, conservative estimates of the number of Americans who are going to lose their health insurance after full implementation of the law.

Why is that? Well, because I talk to small business owners all the time who have more than 50 employees. I talked to one young man who has been very successful in starting a business and creating jobs. He says, Not only will I probably not be able to afford it and have to just pay the penalty rather than complying with the law, but I don't know a small business owner that I've spoken to—this is his words—that is not going to pay the penalty and not going to jettison their employee-provided health insurance.

All of those employees are going to be forced to go to these State-based exchanges, which aren't set up and which are going to cost more. The gentleman

from Maryland just talked about that about half an hour ago. People aren't even going to be able to afford it, so employer-provided health insurance is going out the window.

I think estimates like this are very conservative, according to the people that I've talked to.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCSHON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Here is what absolutely amazes me about—and I'm glad Senator BAUCUS mentioned this as a train wreck. I wrote an editorial about it 3½ years ago describing the train wreck of TennCare. But that's not what I want to talk about.

What I want to talk about, Dr. BUCSHON, is we have people right now today, for instance, in Medicaid, a system that what did we do? We expanded a system that was already broken.

If you look at surgical outcomes for Medicaid patients, they're worse. The outcome is a huge study—eight hundred and something thousand patients—done by the University of Virginia. Those outcomes were worse than people who did not have health insurance coverage.

Why would you expand a program that's already broken? Why don't we fix that first? I know Dr. FLEMING has talked about this at length.

Mr. BUCSHON. I practice in southern Indiana where I get patients from southern Illinois, northern Kentucky, and southern Indiana. Every year, the Illinois Medicaid system ran out of money before the end of the year, September-October. They just ran out of money. No money for their Medicaid population.

This is exactly what you are talking about, Dr. ROE, is that a system that is already broken and we are going to expand it. And what it's going to do is, like Dr. FLEMING said, put a card in your pocket that says you have health insurance, but you don't have access to health care providers, except guess where. Through the emergency room, which is one of the biggest problems we are already trying to defeat.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I've always thought this: Why do our lower-income patients deserve different care than somebody else? They don't.

Mr. BUCSHON. They don't.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. And they do not. They should get the same care and deserve the same care that anyone else has.

Maybe the President when he said, I'll go over this bill line by line with anybody who wants to, maybe he should have taken that up with us and gone over it with the Doctors' Caucus line by line, because we came here in a totally nonpartisan way.

Health care should not be a partisan issue. Dr. BUCSHON has taken care of numerous cardiac patients with heart attacks. He doesn't know whether they're Republicans or Democrats. He could care less. They are just patients who need care.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. BUCSHON. I would agree with that. And let me tell you, there are some things that we could have agreed on that we could have made some advances on in health care reform. Preexisting conditions, all of us agree.

I had a patient that had Hodgkin's disease when he was in his twenties. He worked his entire life. He is now in his fifties. He needed bypass surgery. He was never able to get health insurance the whole time because of a preexisting condition. That's just wrong.

Mr. FLEMING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCSHON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. I just want to expand a moment on what you were talking about small business is critical. I'm a small business owner myself, apart from my medical practice. We employ around 500 employees. Many of them are entry level. Businesses and business owners across America, at this very moment, are in a state of panic. Mr. Speaker, businesses across the country are, at this moment because of ObamaCare, in a state of panic.

The reason is because of what you said. They're calculating if they have more than 50 employees, they've got to ratchet below them if they can. They've got to know how much of the punishment—or penalty, I really should say, but it's more like punishment—they can absorb for those employees that they can't afford to pay for their insurance. This is having a direct impact on our economy and on job creation. This is something that's critical going forward what this is doing to small business, which, arguably, employs about 75 percent of Americans.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I just spoke to a physician today from Massachusetts. He said what had happened there, and what's not clearly understood by the public—unless you're in this line of work you don't—is how the payers pay.

Medicaid, for instance, pays about 60 percent of the cost of actually providing the care. Let's say private insurance is a 1. Medicare would pay about 90 percent.

The people they added in Massachusetts paid about the same as Medicaid. What happened was big insurers, big corporations with lots of employees could negotiate a really good price, but small business could not. So when the hospital had bills to pay, they shifted those costs to private business, forcing their premiums up and up and up and up. That's why you are seeing those premiums for small business escalate until you really force them out of business.

□ 1600

We talk about the exchange, and what absolutely frustrates me is that, on the 1st of October—and this is a person who works in Congress, who is a doctor who understands health care—I can't even tell the people who work for me here in the Washington office and in my office back in the district in Tennessee what their health care premiums are going to be or how they're going to get their health insurance coverage, and that is 90 days from now I can't tell them. You can imagine what other businesses are going through. I can tell them this: that I bet it's going to cost them a lot more money.

Mr. BUCSHON. Let me add a few final comments.

Again, on the things that we can agree on, many of us agree on children up to age 25 or 26. A lot of us agree that we need to look at finding ways to expand the affordability of health care. Remember, this was supposed to bring down the costs. There are a lot of things that could be done to bring down the costs. There are a lot of things we could have agreed on, Dr. ROE, if we would have just worked together and not put in, what I would consider, a near government takeover of the entire system.

I've been a practicing physician for 15 years, and if I count my residency, it's more than that. Imagine if you're out there as a physician today and you have to look a patient in the eye and you have to tell him, Well, I'm sorry. The IPAB told me that this is not statistically something that we can provide because, based on statistics calculated in Washington, D.C., it's not cost-effective for the Medicare system to provide this service anymore.

This is going to happen, and I hope we all wake up in America and realize that it will happen. This happens in other countries that have government insurance. The Canadian system could not exist if it did not sit next to the United States. It's two-tiered. People come to the United States, if they have money, to get health care in a timely manner. The same thing is true in England. If you have money, you get private health insurance. If you don't, you wait for months. So this is bad for patients, and it's bad for business. There are things we could have done. It's a shame that we didn't and that we weren't consulted.

With that, I want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee for this hour to talk about this.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

It is ultimately about the patients that we take care of. Really, it's not about systems and organizations and insurance—it's about people. That's the frustrating part to me because I think people are going to be harmed by this.

I know Dr. FLEMING mentioned small business. I was in North Carolina last Tuesday, a week ago today, holding a hearing, which I hope we have time to go through maybe a little later, on small businesses and how this is going to affect them. It's really eye opening to see businesses that have done everything exactly right. Mr. Horn is someone I want to talk about in just a minute who provided health insurance—all preventative services. He is

self-insured. He did everything right. It shouldn't have cost him a nickel, and yet it is going to cost his business thousands of dollars. So we'll go into that.

At this point, I want to yield some time to my good friend G.T. THOMPSON from Pennsylvania, who is part of our Health Care Caucus and who is a health care administrator.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank my good friend from Tennessee.

What an important topic. As you have been, Dr. ROE, I have been out in the community throughout my congressional district, listening, sitting with individuals and families and businesses, a lot of small businesses. All indications are, at the very best, costs are going up, and there are so many questions that people have. Most is unknown, but what is known is very negative. It will have a negative impact on individuals and families and businesses.

I'll be careful here because, as with scope of practice, I'm with a bunch of physicians. I know even as a former therapist and rehab services manager and manager in hospitals, I know not to diagnose, but I can't resist. I'm going to diagnose. ObamaCare is terminal. It is. It is going to fail under the crushing weight of its own flawed design, and all evidence points to that. I'm not going to re-plow the fields that you all have as to what Democratic Senators are admitting and acknowledging in going public, but many of us have held concerns about this law for some time, and I'm glad that some proponents of the law are now really finally speaking the truth on it.

For example, this past week, on May 3, Investors Business Daily reported how retailers are slashing work hours in anticipation of the implementation of the President's so-called Affordable Care Act.

I quote:

> Retailers are cutting workers' hours at a rate not seen in more than three decades, a sudden shift that can only be explained by the onset of ObamaCare's employer mandates.

Opponents of this law haven't been far off the mark when it comes to predicting the harm this law would impose on the economy, and this week's report from the Investors Business Daily is just the latest in a long list of failed promises under the Affordable Care Act. I think about each new tax or regulatory mandate and about the number of regulations that came out under HIPAA, and those of us who were working in health care, we saw the cost that that added to care. Now multiply by over 100 the new bureaucracies that there will be—so it's HIPAA on steroids—and what that will do to crush the availability of affordable health care.

The President's so-called Affordable Care Act becomes even more unaffordable for individuals, families and for businesses. I had the opportunity and the privilege of working for almost 30 years in health care, serving people facing life-changing disease and disability. I always followed four principles during my professional work, and they've guided me in health care here in that whatever we did to make changes in health care should decrease costs, increase access and make sure America always remains a place of quality and innovation, and it should be the patient who makes decisions in consultation with his physician. When I read that bill, it stood out to me that the language of the Affordable Care Act was going to violate those four principles, and we've seen nothing but evidence mounting that that is occurring today.

In terms of cost, we've seen what happens to premiums, and the American people know that because they see what those premium costs are that are coming to them. It's beyond what their budgets can sustain, and it's much more than what they were paying prior to the signing of that bill. The fact is that there are more than two-dozen new taxes that are coming. I don't care who you tax in the end, there is only one person who winds up paying the tax, and that's the consumer in the end. So that's adding to their costs.

It has redefined full-time employment to 30 hours. I have to wonder as, today, we have record unemployment and underemployment. How many more Americans are going to be pushed into underemployment? I know it's an unintended consequence, but if you're underemployed, how do you afford the costs of those increased premiums coming your way?

Mr. FLEMING. I just want to put an asterisk to your comment about employment.

We met with Mort Zuckerman, economist and editor of U.S. News & World Report. He says that much of the ''growth'' in jobs reports that you see is actually people reentering the job market, but they're actually getting part-time jobs instead of full-time jobs and, in some cases, getting a second or third part-time job so that we're actually seeing an inflation of the actual number.

So ObamaCare—and I would argue Obamanomics in general—is actually taking us to not only an underemployed society but to an unemployed and underemployed society, and much of it is from ObamaCare.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I couldn't agree with the gentleman more.

We talk a lot about and we hear a lot about unemployment numbers, but underemployment is a terrible story in itself. This, unfortunately, puts the wrong types of pressure on the business community to actually have people working part time, which is now anything under 30 hours and working two and three jobs in trying to make ends meet.

Access, I said, was the second principle. The Affordable Care Act—ObamaCare—has violated access from many different perspectives. You just look at the announcement in the past 2 weeks about the preexisting condition fund. That was one of the two target groups under which this piece of legislation was shoved down the throats of the American people, and that fund is depleted. It was so poorly designed that now the President appears to have no intention of doing anything with it, so it's leaving out all the folks with preexisting conditions.

I think all of us would agree, in our vision of what we're to do in health care, that that is a group for which we want to try to find a way for them to be able to purchase affordable health insurance. Just because you're born with or develop a disease or a disability, it shouldn't keep you from coverage. ObamaCare is failing on that.

The other one I would say is the expansion of Medicaid, which Dr. BUCSHON did a nice job of capturing. We're going to put somewhere between 18 and 50 million Americans on medical assistance, and they're all going to get this nice card that says they have medical assistance, and they'll have it in their wallets or they'll have it in their pocketbooks.

□ 1610

But the reality is most physicians today will not accept a patient on medical assistance. So just because you have coverage, it doesn't mean you have access. The folks that wrote this bill clearly were clueless about the approach that we need to take. There are things out there that we should be doing, and I think those are things that we can agree upon.

Finally, quality and innovation. The excise tax is going to stymie innovation and quality that we've enjoyed here in this country. With regards to patient choice, I just come back to one thing among many, the Independent Payment Advisory Board. The Independent Payment Advisory Board is where you've got a group of bureaucrats appointed by the President that will make decisions about which procedures are approved by Medicare.

Medicare is an area I worked very closely with. Actually, after the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, I was asked to serve on a technical-expert panel to review prospective payment for Medicare. This Independent Payment Advisory Board is going to determine and give a blessing of ''yes'' for that procedure and ''no'' for that one. That's not patient choice. That's being dictated to by bureaucrats who are unelected and therefore unaccountable.

Let me close very quickly.

You meet a lot of people that have been impacted by this early. There was one woman in particular who lived her whole life planning her retirement and was so looking forward to it. She is a smart lady. She had laid her plan out. She had worked for a company. Part of her plan was health care, what was going to be affordable. She had her company plan and had invested, and

then it was announced that the employer was going to switch over and put them into the exchange with the retirees.

This woman spent most of her adult life taking care of a brother and a sister who were less fortunate in life and needed a family member to step up and be there. This woman's retirement plan has been totally crushed by ObamaCare, and she's concerned now. As a smart lady, she went out to get some estimate of what it was going to cost her in her retirement now for health care compared to what it was before. It's completely unaffordable. So does she choose health care, or does she choose to still be there for her brother and her sister who have come to rely on her? I think there's many of those stories.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

As we finish, I want to go over just a couple of things. One of the things the Secretary stated, Dr. FLEMING and Mr. THOMPSON, is that she needed to use some money, and the prevention fund was one of the things she was going to use to help implement the exchanges. We've now had prevention funds used for massage therapy, kickboxing, kayaking, Zumba and pickleball. I didn't know what pickleball was. But that's tennis, badminton and ping pong. I can go on and on. It's utterly ridiculous. It should have been spent on health care. That's what this bill was supposed to be about.

Let me finish by saying that even with this 1 hour here, we have lots more to talk about. We've barely scratched the surface. It's a complicated issue. Democrats and Republicans should have gotten together in a bipartisan way to work out a health care plan that does the principles that were pointed out here today, which is to increase access and quality, lower costs and to leave health care decisions in the hands of doctors, patients and those patients' families.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

JOBS AND HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, once again we're back here on the floor of the House of Representatives to talk about what I believe is the most pressing problem here in the United States, and that's jobs. Americans want to work, Americans are capable of working, and it ought to be our job here on the floor of the House of Representatives to talk about how we can create jobs.

We've just heard about 1 hour of discussion from our good friends on the Republican side, the Doctors' Caucus, about how to destroy the Affordable Health Care Act. For 36 times, the Republicans have put up legislation that would essentially gut, amend, or destroy the Affordable Health Care Act, which has the promise and the probability of providing health insurance for 50-plus-million Americans that are today uninsured.

Why would you want to deny those people health insurance? I can see no reason for it.

I notice that they also did not spend any time at all talking about their effort to destroy Medicare. Medicare was a promise made to seniors by the American people that when they reach 65 years of age, they would have a guaranteed health insurance program. Yet, for the last 2 years and 4 months, the Republicans have continually put up legislation that would end Medicare as we know it and turn Medicare over to the insurance companies.

One of the last statements made here on the floor by one of our colleagues was decisions on medical services ought to be in the hands of the physician and the patient. I agree. I was also the insurance commissioner in California, a statewide elected position for 8 years; and I can assure you that under the private health insurance programs, it is the insurance companies that are making the decisions about what medical care will be given to individuals. That is wrong. We did our best in California to stop that. But if you turn Medicare over to the private insurance companies, as the Republicans want to do with their voucher plan, then it will be the insurance companies that will decide what medical services will be available, if at all, to seniors.

I'd like to put that aside and go back to the issue that I really wanted to talk about, but there are some things that you just cannot let go, things that are said on the floor that need to be at least discussed in their fullness.

Let's talk about jobs. Let's talk about the fact that over the last 30 years we have seen the middle class in America held down. The middle class in America has made very little economic progress over the last 30 years. We're going to discuss that in some detail and specifically what we can do here with public policy, with proposals that have been put forth by the Democratic Caucus in the House and our colleagues in the Senate, solid proposals to put Americans back to work and to rebuild the American Dream so that every American has the opportunity to put their foot on the rung of the ladder and climb just as high as they can do so.

Before we get to those rungs on the economic ladder, I'd like to have a more full discussion about what has happened to the middle class over the last 30 years. Joining me in that discussion is the Representative from South Carolina, the Honorable JIM CLYBURN.

JIM, if you'll join us, I know you have some things you'd like to discuss; and I see you have your own chart there.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, Congressman GARAMENDI, for his leadership on this very important issue.

Just a few minutes ago, we received some breaking news: the stock market just closed, and for the first time in the history of this great country, the Dow Jones Industrial Average closed over 15,000 at 15,056. Standard & Poor's also closed at a record 1,625. So much for a socialist President.

Now, during my 20 years of service in this body, I have often reflected upon my experiences growing up in a church parsonage in the little town of Sumter, South Carolina. Early on, I internalized an Old Testament scripture, Micah 6:8: To do justly, to love mercy and walk humbly.

Today in this great country, we are experiencing an injustice that continues to get worse, one which I believe demands our attention. Indisputable evidence continues to show that income inequality has worsened over the last 30 years. The Congressional Budget Office released a report back in October 2011 on the distribution of household income between 1979 and 2011.

□ 1620

On the distribution of household income during that time, you might remember that report came out just a few days before the so-called supercommittee held its first public hearing. I served on that special panel, and I raised concerns with the CBO director about the ever-widening gap between America's rich and poor.

This chart is from that CBO report, and it shows that over the past 30 years, the wealthiest 1 percent have enjoyed income growth of more than 275 percent, while the lowest 20 percent have experienced only 18 percent growth.

Working families across the country have seen their wages stagnate and decline as earnings for the wealthiest few continue to soar. In fact, earnings for the top 1 percent during the current economic recovery have risen 11.2 percent, but declined for the other 99 percent by 0.4 percent. I'm going to repeat that.

The 99 percent have seen a decline of 0.4 percent—that is a negative—while the upper 1 percent, a positive growth of 11.2 percent.

Now, my friends across the aisle will talk about the American Dream and the ability of every American to work their way up to the top. But numerous studies have shown that there is less economic mobility in America than most people think. The fact is that if you work hard, play by the rules and

take responsibility, it is currently harder to get ahead in America than it is in many parts of the world.

Let me cite an example. Thirty years ago, CEOs made an average of 42 times as much as rank-and-file workers, 42 times as much.

Today, a newly released report confirms that last year, CEOs of the biggest companies in the United States made 354 times what the average worker made, 354 times. That is the widest pay gap in the world.

Do most Americans believe that our CEOs work 354 times harder than their average employees?

Here is another example. Over the last 45 years, average income for 90 percent of Americans went up just $59—almost no change at all. That's over 45 years, an increase of $59. For the top 10 percent, average incomes rose roughly $116,000. For the top 1 percent, average income rose $628,000; and for the top 1 percent of the top 1 percent, the average incomes rose $18.3 million.

The numbers are so staggering it's almost difficult to comprehend. So if we convert the dollars to distances, the vast majority of Americans, 90 percent, saw their average income increase by 1 inch. The top 10 percent went up 168 feet; the top 1 percent, 888 feet; and the top 1 percent of 1 percent, their incomes rose by almost 5 miles relative to that 1 inch.

We are recovering from one of the greatest economic recessions in American history. As I said in the beginning, the Dow Jones Industrial Average just a few minutes ago closed for the first time in history over 15,000. The stock markets are setting record highs, but working families continue to struggle.

Wages have stayed low, and unemployment is still too high. It does not have to be that way, and it should not be that way. This Congress can and must take direct action to restore a just economic system for working people.

We need to raise the minimum wage. We need to boost Pell Grants, Head Start, and other support for public education. We need to invest in innovation and infrastructure to create jobs now and foster broad-based economic growth and prosperity. And we need to pass a budget that reflects the values of working Americans.

It is time to ''do justly.'' It is time to refocus on the American Dream, on building ladders of opportunity, on restoring fairness in our Tax Code, and on creating good, high-quality jobs so that every American who wants a job can find a job.

I call on Speaker BOEHNER to appoint budget conferees as soon as possible so that we can get to work on a budget that puts America back to work.

I thank my colleague from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. CLYBURN, for your excellent exposition of the problem faced by the middle class, by the working families of America: the fact that over the last 40 years they've seen virtually no progress in their economic status while those very, very few at the very top have seen extraordinary wealth. It's also a shifting of wealth, and some say that this discussion is a discussion of class warfare. Well, I wouldn't call it warfare, but I would say that the middle class of America is clearly losing, while those very, very few at the top are clearly winning. And the reason is the policies of the United States are pushing the wealth to the top and literally taking the wealth from the working men and women. We need to change those policies, and our discussion here is very, very much about that.

Thank you for your excellent discussion.

I see that our colleague from Washington, D.C., ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, is here. Thank you very much for joining us. And, Mr. CLYBURN, if you'd like to stick around, we will engage in a discussion, but I think you have other obligations.

Mr. CLYBURN. I do, but I appreciate the time.

Ms. NORTON. I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina, one of our leaders, and my good friend from California for his leadership, his almost weekly leadership on the issue of jobs. Both of my colleagues have discussed long-term declines in the middle class, much of it owing over the last decade to the policies of this Congress and the Federal Government.

The last thing you would expect Congress would do in the face of a recovery that is still in the throes of recovery is anything to hurt it, so I wanted to come to the floor to discuss the early warning signs we are seeing of jobs loss because of the sequester so that we can do something about it now.

First, let me indicate, quite unexpectedly, the best statistics I've seen in a long time, and how we are stepping on these statistics with each day of the sequester.

□ 1630

The April jobs report unexpectedly showed 165,000 workers added to nonfarm payroll. That was terrific news. What it tells us is that the private sector is making jobs, trying its best, because those jobs were not created in the public sector; those jobs were created in spite of the public sector, in spite of the fact that the Congress is furloughing people, cutting programs to the States and, thus, jobs.

So the April jobs report, you might say, means maybe it's going to be all right after all. Early signs are absolutely not. April reported the first 2 months of the sequester. It's 4 months to go, and already we see horrific news, each day, a kind of rolling disaster on jobs and the economy.

Deep cynicism spread the week before last throughout the country as Americans saw Congress vote to relax the sequester on the air traffic controllers, just as Congress was about to take a week-long recess; deep cynicism because nothing had been done for the American people, for their jobs, for their programs, but the skies were cleared.

Actually, there was a good reason for that, and that reason was, of course, that the controllers, who were only doing their jobs, about 10 percent of them had to be furloughed each week; therefore, with less people, there were slowdowns. That was already beginning to have a catastrophic effect on the economy, and that's why I think, yes, Congress, and even the administration, moved to correct that.

Sequester-driven flight delays were already placing over 80,000 American jobs at risk. And if it had gone on, if just this one sector had gone the full sequester, that would have lost $9 billion, one sector alone, in the economy. All right. One sector. One sector and only one sector.

Have we shown we understand what our bottom line responsibility is?

Whether you come here you think to reduce the deficit, or whether you come here as a Member of Congress you think to add revenue to grow an economy, both sides should agree that the best way, and perhaps the only way, to do that is to create jobs. People with jobs pay into the economy rather than requiring us to spend and add to the deficit.

Yet, when the sequester began and the administration warned of its effect on jobs and the economy, howls came from my good colleagues on the Republican side that the claims of the administration were overblown, that they were exaggerated, that the President was crying wolf, not to mention those of us on the Democratic side.

Here are the early signs, and I bring some examples to the floor this evening because there's still time to correct the sequester. I bring them to the floor to ask the appropriators to do what the President has done in his budget and correct the mistake of the sequester, recognizing that neither Democrats or Republicans anticipated that the sequester would ever happen, so neither side has to take credit or blame if we change it since neither side wanted it.

But look at the early effects, and let's look at some of the effects that flow directly from what Congress has done:

250 workers at the Hanford nuclear reservation laid off;

The contractor that repairs our U.S. Naval ships, Continental Maritime, laid off 185 employees;

418 contract workers laid off at the Tobyhanna Army Depot in Pennsylvania;

Northrop Grumman Information Systems in Lawton, Oklahoma, lays off, or anticipates laying off, 270 workers.

Those jobs add up. I'm not trying to call the roll. I'm trying to give examples of what the sequester directly does to jobs in the military sector, no less.

U.S. Army Garrison-Rock Island Arsenal, 175 employees laid off.

By the way, these are not furloughs. These employees are gone.

That's how we get, I say to my good friend from California, to the CBO figure of the loss of 750,000 jobs. Imagine this Congress doing anything to cause, to be the direct cause of the loss of jobs when we should be trying with all our might to create jobs after the Great Recession.

The examples abound. You will find them with every small business in your district feeling the effect by laying off people or refusing to fill vacancies. You will find it in every sector of the country.

Military bases are now going on a 4-week schedule for schools. Workers at missile testing fields are being fired.

We're having the functional equivalent of the meat inspectors exception to the sequester. Remember that they were the one sector, because we were afraid that rancid meat would appear all over the country, and you have to have meat inspectors to inspect.

Well, now the dairy farmers are saying that they can't get access to production information about milk and are anticipating higher prices on milk. So look at how that affects the farmer, whom he employs, and the milk, that's us, the consumer. That's how it's passed through. That's how it's passed on.

You know, you'd expect some of these examples from a depression, or even the recession that we are just coming out of, but who would have expected that hospitals are now reporting that medical schools anticipate not taking on as many residents, not with the sequester and the amount of money that comes to hospitals from the Federal Government. And they say that means fewer residency spots and fewer doctors in various communities, since residents tend to stay in the communities where they do their residency.

I've come to the floor when we're discussing, jobs precisely because the sequester cuts to jobs in the public sector and the private sector and speaks to whether we're going to make it in America, keeping what we have, much less making in America and growing what we need to have.

The sequester itself is even affecting what was always exempted from cuts in the Congress, public safety cuts, even at the Federal level. U.S. attorneys throughout the country are cutting. We never would have allowed that to happen before.

After Boston, I asked the Federal police forces to come and have a conversation with me. The Capitol Police, the Federal Protective Service, the Park Police, none of them are exempt. And to the extent that they are not doing furloughs, it's because they are requiring people to work tours of duty that no public safety officer should have to work if he really means to keep us safe.

So I say to my good friend, Mr. GARAMENDI, whom I'm so grateful to for keeping us focused on jobs when every other day we're talking about something else, I'm grateful because these dumb cuts are, above all, cruel cuts.

I haven't begun to mention their effect on the domestic programs for the very needy, the 70,000 children who will be off of Head Start, the 600,000 off of the WIC program, Women, Infants, and Children. That is the program for the most vulnerable children, who will lose basic nutrition assistance.

□ 1640

I was concerned that we weren't paying any attention to this, that it was only crisis by crisis. After the controllers matter came to the floor, the very day we left I, myself, came to the floor and said, with the controllers, you're only moving money around. That's what we did with some appropriations. If we had a budget meeting or even a meeting of any kind of both sides, we'd probably come to a compromise where some of what it would take to get off the sequester might mean doing what we did with the controllers, just moving from one program area to another.

But other ways to relieve the effects of the sequester would surely mean doing the kind of budget we meant to do in the first place. You'd want to do something with respect to matters that can only be fixed by some addition of funds, as, by the way, I think will be done in the next appropriations.

To be sure, sequester cuts go over to the following years, but they'll go a full year, and you will see some funds added just because it will be too heartless, too impossible to otherwise begin to justify.

So I come to have this conversation with my good friend, who focuses us, I think correctly, on the long term. We are forgetting to think about the long term when we see the sequester cuts that have a gnawing effect on the middle class so that, by the time we get to the point when we must do something about it, we will have a very steep hill to climb. That's what Mr. CLYBURN was talking about when he talked about what is now an impossibly large income gap of the kind we have not seen in my lifetime, of the kind we are making as we speak.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you so very, very much for really bringing to all of our attention the extraordinary impact that the sequestration is having on American families. Jobs are being lost. Real jobs are disappearing, and Americans, working men and women, are feeling their paychecks being significantly reduced.

Now, another word for sequestration is austerity budgets. Shortly after the Great Recession began in 2008, there was the debate about should the governments of the world, the United States, Europe, China and Japan, should they take a policy of actively engaging in the economy to boost demand, which would be a Keynesian model of increasing the purchasing power within the economy, or should there be a reduction in government spending because of the deficits that were created as people lost their jobs and as tax revenues declined?

That debate was robustly engaged here on the floor of the House, with the decision being made to engage the government in increasing the demand. So the stimulus bill came forth, and it really worked. It really had an effect. Hundreds of thousands of jobs were created. The decline was stopped, and slowly in 2009 and 2010, the American economy began to recover.

Now, Europe made a different decision. In Europe, they made a decision not to stimulate the economy but rather to go into austerity, to reduce the budgets of the governments. The result in Europe has been perfectly clear. They have headed into a deep, deep recession yet again. They never came out of it. And so the entire European economy has been continuing to decline over these years. Austerity has gained in Europe a very, very bad name. In fact, conservative magazines such as The Economist magazine have been for the last 2 years saying, no more austerity, you have to stimulate the economy. We now see policies in Europe that are now turning around and looking to the stimulation of the economy as we did here.

China did exactly the opposite of Europe. They followed the American model—or we followed theirs, depending on how you want to look at this—and they put into place a very heavy stimulus program, almost all of it in infrastructure, creating enormous demand and growth in China.

Now, unfortunately, here in the United States, our initial effort at stimulus was cut short. It was cut short by the 2010 election. We had a new Congress, and the American Government since that moment has been involved in an austerity program. The sequestration is but one of the austerity programs that have been foisted upon the American public by our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle. We have had fiscal cliff after fiscal cliff, and every time we come up against that cliff, we've seen a reduction in the role of the Federal Government in so many ways.

Ms. NORTON, you so clearly pointed out dozens of ways in which the Federal Government is backing away from previously important tasks, tasks such as, well, flight controllers, airline flight controllers. Now, we passed a bill to deal with that, but nevertheless, we took money out of the construction of airports and the upgrading of air traffic systems to keep the air traffic controllers going. So the austerity continued even in the airline sector.

We've seen it in my district. I've got maybe more than a thousand miles of flood levees. The Army Corps of Engineers, $250 million reduction in their ability to upgrade and to deal with the levees and to prevent flooding. On and on. I won't go through all the list that Ms. NORTON put forward. But those are

the continuing austerity measures that have been forced upon us.

It can't continue. It cannot continue. Our task is to create jobs. Our task is to put Americans back to work. Our task is to make sure that this incredible income disparity ends and that we find ways to rebuild the American middle class.

Ms. NORTON. If the gentleman would yield, this has been a very important, it seems to me, a very clear explanation the gentleman has given as to how we got where we are, and particularly his description of the difference between the European model and the American model. With the European model you would think that would be all the object lesson we would need because Britain is one of our closest allies. And what austerity has done to Europe it will almost certainly do to us.

What I don't understand, Mr. GARAMENDI, is why my good friends—our good friends—on the other side would believe that you can get something for nothing. Many of them believe in the economy of the private sector. Well, the first thing the private sector does is to invest. Once it invests, it hopes to yield from that investment. The kind of approach you're speaking about says that if you do nothing, if you—you, the Federal Government—step back and contribute nothing to a recovery, then recovery will happen.

Well, let me tell you why I think that's impossible. The economy is of a piece. You can't pull an important piece out and expect the whole to remain whole, particularly when ours is a demand, a consumer-driven economy. What that means is what the Federal Government does is really meant to get people out there spending so that other people can make jobs. Well, the last thing you want to happen, if you want to make sure people have jobs, so that they're spending so that other people have jobs, is to cut back yourself on the jobs that you're responsible for.

□ 1650

The sequester does that with the furloughs. Imagine what will happen in their counties across the United States—3 million Federal workers—when those workers who feed their economy go on furloughs. That's the equivalent of a job cut. They have got to cut back spending. That cuts back demand. That works its way through the entire economy.

What we're doing is dampening demand because we're sending the signal to the private sector that we are cutting the programs that made jobs. You can look at Head Start as a program for kids if you want to, but I bet the thousands of teachers and other Head Start workers look at it as a jobs program. So if 70,000 kids are gone, imagine how many workers are also gone.

It's almost as if our colleagues don't understand the way the economy works, that you could take one sector of it that's very important—the Federal sector—damp it down, and expect the rest to keep growing. And the operative word, my friend, is ''growth.'' We were doing almost nothing for growth because we had no balanced approach that allowed some revenue to fuel growth. What we're doing now is keeping growth from happening because we are deliberately cutting jobs that we need, which, in turn, feed the economy.

People with jobs buy goods and services. People who make goods and provide services will look to see if anybody is cutting jobs. If I run a department store in my county and the auto plant there lays off people, I cut back on inventory.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Exactly.

Ms. NORTON. Because that's how the economy works. The sequester is working that way, I say to my friend, and we can do something about it. There are 4 months left in this sequester. Before it becomes more of a rolling disaster with some of the examples I have given as emblematic of the disaster, we could, all of us, decide, let's just do a budget, a budget that I'm sure I would disagree with in many ways—in other words, it's not a budget I would want, because my good friends on the other side would want the things they would want. They would want some cuts. I would want to add some revenue, to WIC—Women, Infant and Children, for example. But together, at least we could stop the sequester and stop the catastrophic sequester cuts that drive down jobs as if we were creating a new recession of our own.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, we certainly will create a new recession. We know that 750,000 Americans will be unemployed, lose their jobs by the end of this fiscal year—that would be the first of October—as a result of sequestration.

Now, it's not that we haven't tried to do a different proposal. Our budget proposal is one that would maintain the reduction, but push it forward so that it doesn't immediately dampen the American economy. The President has made a similar proposal, but we've had no action. Right now, we are calling on our colleagues and Speaker BOEHNER to appoint a conference committee so that we can actually do a budget. Please, let's get that budget going. Let's get this thing out of the way of America's job growth.

Ms. NORTON. You remember how our colleagues said, for 3 or 4 years now, that the Senate refused to do a budget; and if they would just do a budget, then maybe the kind of meetings we've all been calling for would happen and we could work together? They did a budget, and still we get no action so that we can sit down and try to work the sequester out.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, that's exactly the problem. We need to get this sequestration out of the way of America's growth.

There are many things that we can do. I'd like to remind everybody that the President, more than 2 years ago, put forth an American jobs proposal, an American Jobs Act. In that proposal—which has never been taken up by the leaders of the House of Representatives—those who are in control of the House now, our colleagues here on the right side of the aisle, have never taken it up.

So what was in it? There was a $50 billion immediate investment in infrastructure. Well, what is infrastructure? Infrastructure is highways, our roads, our streets, our sanitation facilities, our water facilities, airports, flood levees, the kinds of things that upon which the economy can grow and be built. It is the foundation of the economy. They brushed it aside, wouldn't even consider it. One of the most basic things that any economy, any government must do is to make sure the foundation is in place.

The President had also proposed—and it's part of our Make It in America—an educational program to make sure that our students are ready for the jobs that are part of the American economy today and to retrain American workers.

A proposal that I have is that our tax dollars be spent on American-made equipment. Oh, my, how strange would that be. But yet we go out and buy Chinese steel to build the new San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge. No, we don't buy American-made steel and give Americans the jobs; we turn the jobs over to China.

Wind turbines, solar panels, all of the new energy systems, our tax money supports those systems. Shouldn't we be buying American-made equipment with your tax money? I believe we should. That's my legislation.

The Democratic agenda, the Make It in America agenda, is about 30 different bills dealing with rebuilding the great American manufacturing sector. I know that if we were to carry these policies forward, if they were to become law, we would see a resurgence in the American manufacturing sector.

The reason that that is so important is this—Mr. CLYBURN spoke to this earlier when he was here. I've got a little different display. This is what's happened to the American middle class, and beyond.

I'm going to use a football analogy here—I played football back at the University of California a few years ago—actually, many years ago. So we can use a football analogy.

The bottom 99 percent of America, 99 percent of every family and 99 percent of all of the workers and men and women in America have, since 1966, seen a net increase in their take-home pay of $59. This is in constant dollars. The top 10 percent have seen their income grow by $116,071 over that period, '66 to 2011.

The top 1 percent—remember the 99 percent thing? Well, this is the top 1 percent—have seen their income grow by $628,817. Now, the very, very tippy top, that is, the one-tenth of 1 percent—we're talking the superwealthy

billionaires here; Mitt Romney wouldn't fit into this category—they have seen their income grow by over $18 million annually.

So what we're seeing in the American economy is a skewing of the wealth in this economy. Literally, the wealth in the economy is flowing to the very top so that the wage increases are not among the men and women that work every day, that put in their 40 hours a week or more. But, rather, it's flowing to those at the top. This is the result of economic policies that are put in place here in the Congress—tax policies, educational policies, other kinds of policies that lay the foundation for this extraordinary inequality.

This has never been seen in America. During the Gilded Age in the 19th century, this kind of wealth disparity was not in existence. During the Roaring Twenties, this type of wealth inequality was not seen in the American economy. Only now, in the last 20, 30 years, have we seen policies put in place that have created the most inequality ever in modern American history.

□ 1700

What does that mean? What does that mean to the average American family? It means that both mom and pop are working. It means that they cannot afford to send their children to school. And added on top of that, the Great Recession has stripped the wealth from the 90 percent. The wealth was stripped, mostly in the housing market collapse.

So now we are faced with the situation, what can we do? Well, what we can do is to rebuild the American manufacturing sector, because this is where the middle class had decent wages. We are not talking about a $7.50 an hour minimum wage. We are talking about wages that a man or a woman could earn to protect and to provide for their family.

Ms. NORTON. If the gentleman will yield on that point?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I would be happy to.

Ms. NORTON. The point you are making about disparities in income needs to be understood as you are portraying it—as a new phenomenon in American life. That, yes, there were recessions and there were very hard times, and there were times before the New Deal when government did not do much about it.

The kind of policy-made disparity that we are experiencing today, not disparity that comes because a few wealthy people created wealth in the last part of the 19th century, and even then there was a need for so many workers the disparity was not as great as today, but disparities that come straight from policies like failure to raise the minimum wage, come straight from policies like 20–25 years of failing to raise the user fee so that we could build roads.

Now, construction jobs are classic middle class jobs. If we want to build the middle class, we've got to go in the modern era to the post-World War II economy. Americans who didn't have a college education could raise four and five children because they had good manufacturing jobs made in America.

My good friend talks about how if we take the materials for bridges, however, and you buy them in China, we are not making it in America, and we're having a downward effect on our own manufacturing sector. But at the same time, as he points up, infrastructure—he points to the classic way to come out of a recession by building what you would have to build anyway.

Here is the government investing in something that's never controversial, because building roads and bridges and water infrastructure are always the function of government. If you would have to do it anyway, the theory goes, you do it when in the process of doing it you can create jobs and fuel the economy.

We are about to have to do another infrastructure bill. We did one 2 years ago that will last only 2 years because we did not raise the user fee, so it goes for only 2 years at a time. And even though we had some of the materials from abroad—something we've got to keep from doing next time—every bridge had to be built by an American worker, all that cement had to be the work of the American middle class.

If we have to do it anyway, construction is probably the best way to revive the economy in the first place, because it has an effect on all the rest of the economy. It wakes up the rest of the economy.

Because we should be working right now—and I know Mr. SHUSTER, who's chair of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, does want to do something—we ought to be thinking about precisely the sector that you have mentioned, the sector that creates jobs, does what we have to do for the crumbling parts of our country, which turn out to be the parts underground where our water and sewers are and the parts above ground where we drive to and from work every day.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If the gentlelady would yield for a moment, you're exactly right about the infrastructure. We need to build it.

I notice that our colleague from Ohio has joined us. The last time we were on the floor, we talked about these issues. So if you would like to carry on here for awhile, please, Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would just like to support what the gentlelady from the District of Columbia has been saying, that this is bread and butter, this is Economics 101 in how you get the economy back up and running. At a time when we have these high unemployment numbers for the building trades and the construction trades, what a shot in the arm.

For work—and I think this is the essential point—this work needs to be done anyway. So it's either going to get done now or it's going to get done later. Why not do it now when you can get the best bang for your buck, to put people back to work when they need to go back to work and also jump-start the economy as opposed to say, Oh, we're going to wait, we're going to do it 5 years from now when cement is more expensive 5 years from now, labor is more expensive 5 years from now, all the other costs associated with the project and the materials are going to be more expensive 5 years from now. So let's get the job done now, let's make these investments now, let's get the economy going now.

We are having some job growth and the sequester is hurting, but we have got to make these investments. Let's rebuild the country, and let's rebuild the way our cities look. Let's have an innovative approach to the way we create and invest in our downtowns and tie it into what we are doing in many older industrial areas where we are knocking down a lot of old homes. Cities like Youngstown—180,000 people lived in that town a few decades ago, they're at 70,000 now—were knocking down homes because of the neighborhood stabilization program. Now we have green space. Now we are planning urban gardens, urban farming, so we can get fresh foods into some of these food deserts because of the investments that we are making. We should do the same thing with bike trails and downtown redevelopment and incentives for investment downtown as we do the roads, the bridges, the big heavy infrastructure.

Combined sewer—how many cities have hundreds of millions of dollars, billions of dollars, in need for combined sewer overflow? These cities don't have the money to do it. And if they do it, if they even can, if they have the bonding capacity to do it, they're going to drive rates up so high in their own communities they are going to further create sprawl, which means more new waterlines, more new sewer lines, in more green space, and that's counterproductive.

Let's drive people back into the urban core, let's have urban space, urban farming, urban gardens, farmers' markets, fresh food for our young people and people who are living in our cities, at the same time we make these investments. When you are building roads and bridges and needing steel, it's going to affect manufacturing.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If you use American taxpayer money to buy American-made equipment, supplies and products.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Right. And you look at the supply chain with manufacturing and you see the six or seven or eight jobs for every one job that's created on the manufacturing floor.

I love representing my district, like we all do, but I'm in northeast Ohio, so I could do a factory tour a day for my career and not even scrape the surface as to what the manufacturers are. And whether you're talking about the defense industrial base, whether you're

talking about construction all the way down the line, auto, the manufacturing capabilities in this country, they're tremendous.

Now we see on the defense side that maybe a lot of the defense industrial base isn't in America like it used to be. How do we come together, Democrats and Republicans, and say, well, we are spending this money, why don't we drive it into Youngstown, Ohio? Why don't we drive it into Mobile, Alabama? Why don't we drive it into Iowa? Why don't we drive it into some of these old industrial areas? This can be done.

I want to make one last point.

□ 1710

The narrative today is that everything that the government does—every dollar the government spends money on—is bad. Well, that's the narrative we're all operating on now because our friends on the other side, quite frankly, have won that discussion. But here we are. We can't get a transportation bill because that falls into government spending. Early childhood education, Head Start—that all somehow falls into this abyss of wasteful government spending when the fact of the matter is that these are investments that yield results and that create value and wealth in our society.

I will just say that we were in the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee hearing today, and we were talking about the Navy. We were talking about the sea lanes, and we were talking about the Strait of Hormuz and all of these different areas that we protect, that tax dollars protect, so that commerce can go—government investments to help business thrive.

It's a delicate balancing act, and to come up with just the bumper sticker slogans in order to score political points has damaged our ability to do what we did from post-World War II into the eighties, and that's to invest in research, invest in infrastructure, invest in American workers, and then let the free market go from there.

So I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership on the Make It in America caucus—in promoting manufacturing. I thank the gentlelady from the District of Columbia. It's an honor to be with you.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio, who knows what it is to rebuild the manufacturing base, and I thank you for the work that you've been doing.

We have just a few seconds, Ms. NORTON, if you could wrap and then I'll wrap, and we'll call it a day.

Ms. NORTON. When the gentleman speaks about manufacturing, both of you have spoken about manufacturing in its different aspects.

Look at what is happening today. The private sector is bringing manufacturing home because of the low cost of energy, and we are producing more of our own natural gas because of the low cost of energy. The government just needs to do its part. Don't countermand what the private sector is doing. Do what the gentleman says. Don't take jobs from Youngstown. Help Youngstown to rebuild Youngstown. It's going to be built anyway. Now is the time to rebuild it.

So I thank the gentleman for yielding to us in this very important discussion every week.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We must start thinking about what we can do rather than what we cannot do. This is America. This is the country that built the future—we really did—and we can claim the future if we reach back into our history and do what we did before. We were builders. We built the foundations.

Mr. RYAN, as you said so very clearly, it's investment. It's investment in the intellectual ability of Americans—in education and research. It's investment in the infrastructure. It's investment in the business community. There is a combination of government and private sector. It's the history of America. It's an exciting history. It's a potential. Unfortunately, we are ignoring the key role that the governments—local, State and Federal—play in that process. We're builders, we're Americans, and we're going to do it. We will make it happen, and I will tell you this: when America begins to make it in America, Americans are going to make it.

I thank my colleagues.

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

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE ACTIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SYRIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113–22)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAINES) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency, unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions of the Government of Syria declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004—as modified in scope and relied upon for additional steps taken in Executive Order 13399 of April 25, 2006, Executive Order 13460 of February 13, 2008, Executive Order 13572 of April 29, 2011, Executive Order 13573 of May 18, 2011, Executive Order 13582 of August 17, 2011, Executive Order 13606 of April 22, 2012, and Executive Order 13608 of May 1, 2012—is to continue in effect beyond May 11, 2013.

While the Syrian regime has reduced the number of foreign fighters bound for Iraq, the regime's brutal war on the Syrian people, who have been calling for freedom and a representative government, endangers not only the Syrian people themselves, but could yield greater instability throughout the region. The Syrian regime's actions and policies, including pursuing chemical and biological weapons, supporting terrorist organizations, and obstructing the Lebanese government's ability to function effectively, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue in effect the national emergency declared with respect to this threat and to maintain in force the sanctions to address this national emergency.

In addition, the United States condemns the Assad regime's use of brutal violence and human rights abuses and calls on the Assad regime to stop its violent war and step aside to allow a political transition in Syria that will forge a credible path to a future of greater freedom, democracy, opportunity, and justice.

The United States will consider changes in the composition, policies, and actions of the Government of Syria in determining whether to continue or terminate this national emergency in the future.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 7, 2013*.

THE CASE OF DR. KERMIT GOSNELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLEMING. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is, indeed, a pleasure to be here tonight to talk about a very, very important subject, and that is the case of Dr. Kermit Gosnell.

Before I do, I do want to mention a couple of things about the previous Special Order of my friends on the other side of the aisle who were talking about, for instance, Medicare and coverage under Medicare and ObamaCare, pointing out that insurance companies are not as good as the government in terms of denying care. I would suggest to my friends that at least you can change your insurance companies. You cannot change your government. So I see that as a fatal flaw, among many, with ObamaCare.

Also, a lot of time was spent talking about income disparity. I absolutely agree with my friends that the rich are getting richer and that the poor are

getting poorer in America—but President Barack Obama has been our President for the last nearly 5 years. It's his policies that are creating that situation. In fact, unemployment levels among minorities, particularly Hispanics and African Americans, are at historically high levels. It is because of the policies of Obamanomics, ObamaCare regulations, Dodd-Frank, and the excessive spending that has been occurring in Washington that have led to this problem.

Then, finally, my friends talked about the fact that the President has submitted a couple of jobs bills and that we've refused to take them up or to pass them. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that these jobs bills are nothing more than mini-stimulus bills which passed this House, under Democrat control, in the first 2 years of the President's first term. What did we get as a result? Only more deficits and more debt. We did not get an improvement of the jobs picture.

On the other hand, in the last term, under a Republican-controlled House, we passed 33 jobs bills, and the President and the Senate, controlled by Democrats, would not take up even a single one. One of them included diverting revenue from energy on Federal lands to rebuilding bridges and highways, the very infrastructure that they're talking about.

□ 1720

So again I would submit, Mr. Speaker, and to our friends on the other side of the aisle, that perhaps they need to update their talking points. They're giving the same ones they gave in 2009 at the beginning of the Obama administration. Now we're nearly 5 years down the road in the second Obama term, and the policies we're living under and have been the Obama economic policies, not Republican policies, and certainly not President Bush.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to talk about Kermit Gosnell. The mayor of Philadelphia says that Dr. Kermit Gosnell is an aberration, an outlier, a rare case. Gosnell, of course, is the abortionist in Philadelphia who is awaiting a verdict on charges of killing four babies and a woman, though we know that there were many more. Philadelphia's mayor said of these atrocities, ''This is a highly unusual situation.''

Perhaps it's no wonder why some see Gosnell as an aberration. His clinic was inspected only three times in 31 years, and it was never inspected from 1993 to 2010. The gruesome discovery of multiple body parts from aborted babies, blood splattered on the walls, and other deplorable conditions were discovered only by accident.

I want to point out that I think we know what Dr. Gosnell was all about. He was not about elevated principles of doing right for women, women's health and this sort of thing. Mr. Speaker, it was about money, and you'll see why.

Despite the fact that this had been going on for 31 years, it went undiscovered. Agents from the Drug Enforcement Administration entered the clinic with the correct belief that Gosnell was running an illegal prescription drug business selling OxyContin and many other highly addictive drugs. He was writing about 1,900 prescriptions a month, and customers were picking them up in a takeout fashion.

Again, it was not about elevated principles and women's health; it was about money.

Law enforcement had no idea, until they raided Gosnell's clinic in 2010, that the pill mill he was running by day was a gruesome abortion mill by night. Gosnell had been performing late-term abortions for decades, and his procedures caused so much harm to women that he was being hit with malpractice lawsuits.

You see, in late term, doing those kind of abortions, it is very damaging to the womb. In many cases, they use sharp instruments to literally cut up the little baby, to puncture the skull. That's very damaging to the womb, and, of course, women can have excessive bleeding, a perforated uterus. These things lead to complications and, of course, lawsuits.

So it is a sad irony, but abortion supporters have argued for years that making abortion legal protects women from the kind of butchery performed by doctors like Gosnell. But you see, Dr. Gosnell, after having literally dozens of lawsuits, he decided that it was safer for Gosnell—not for the women—to stop trying to kill the babies in the womb. He just went ahead and induced labor in late term and then killed the baby shortly thereafter the birth.

How did he do it? He did what he referred to as ''snipping.'' He would thrust a pair of scissors in the base of the skull, in the back of the neck, clip the spinal cord, destroy the lower part of the brain and make the baby stop breathing. In fact, witnesses said that in a number of cases, the late-term babies, but somewhat premature but certainly well enough mature to have survived outside of the womb, would be there breathing before he did his heinous acts, or in some cases were actually crying.

I know we'd like to wish that Kermit Gosnell was an aberration. In fact, I hope there's a day when we look back and see the practice of abortion itself as a horrible aberration in a culture that should defend life and protect the innocent.

Since Bill Clinton first said it in 1996, the pro-abortion side has been telling us that abortion should be safe, legal, and rare, yet there are still more than a million abortions each year in the United States. We know that they're never safe for the unborn child because the child dies, of course. And as we can see, they're often dangerous for the women involved not only during the procedure, but shortly thereafter and often long term. We know statistics tell us that the infertility rate down the road, suicide rate, depression and many other scales by which we measure quality of life are all diminished after abortions. And the more abortions, the worse the outcomes.

How many other Gosnells work in secret without inspections or regulations, as in this case? Perhaps they're not really so rare. Take, for example, Dr. LeRoy Carhart, who was responsible for the abortion procedure earlier this year in Maryland that ended with the death of a 29-year-old woman who was 33 weeks pregnant. Carhart had another patient die after a similar procedure in 2005.

In Muskegon, Michigan, details are just surfacing about another abortionist who is accused of leaving the decapitated head of an unborn child inside a woman's womb after rupturing her uterus and nearly taking her life. The Michigan State Legislature is investigating why the State Board of Medicine did not pursue earlier complaints about this same doctor.

You see, what we're finding in many cases is that the medical agencies who are responsible for oversight are turning their heads when it comes to the issue of abortion. They're all about inspecting hospitals and doctors' offices; but when it comes to abortion, they don't want to even go there, apparently.

In recent weeks, we've seen undercover videos from the group Live Action showing doctors and medical personnel at abortion clinics with a callous and even heinous disregard for life. In the most recent video, a woman who is at 23 weeks gestation in her pregnancy asked if there was any chance her baby might be born alive and could she take it home if it is. A clinic counselor assures her that it is not likely to happen and says that if the child happens to be born alive during the abortion procedure, the medical staff will make no efforts to preserve the child's life but will allow it simply to die.

That's no surprise, considering the Planned Parenthood representative who testified about the late-term abortions in March before a Florida State House subcommittee. When asked what Planned Parenthood would want to happen if a baby was born alive and still struggling to live after a botched abortion, she said, ''We believe that any decisions that's made should be left up to the woman, her family, and the physician.''

When pressed further about what Planned Parenthood physicians do if a baby is alive and moving and breathing on the table, she answered, ''I do not have that information.''

Doesn't that sound familiar?

Remember that President Obama was once asked, ''When does life begin?'' of course implying, does it begin at conception? His answer was it was above his pay grade. Mr. Speaker, if it's above the President's pay grade, where do we go from there? Certainly Planned Parenthood doesn't know the answer either.

I can tell you I do. I'm a physician. It's called the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, a Federal law that was enacted in 2002, that extends legal protections to any infant born alive during an attempted abortion. There shouldn't be any doubt or any question about what to do with that baby. It is a life that is to be preserved.

Remember, Planned Parenthood is the largest provider of abortions in this country. So if a Planned Parenthood representative in Florida thinks it's okay for the family to decide to let the child die, is there really any doubt that there are many more cases like Kermit Gosnell?

Beyond cases of infanticide, badly injured women, and even women who have died during abortions, there has been an increase in the number of reports of dangerous and filthy conditions at abortion clinics. State officials in Delaware are investigating Planned Parenthood of Delaware for unsafe and unsanitary conditions.

□ 1730

In Virginia, again, elaboration here, there are many different examples of problems. In Virginia, an abortion clinic closed this month because it didn't want to operate under new safety standards and proper inspections that have been long overdue in the Commonwealth. Virginia's State Legislature and the State's Board of Health overwhelmingly saw the need for commonsense rules, like making sure doorways are wide enough for an emergency gurney to pass through so a patient can be taken to an ambulance in case of an emergency.

Sadly, the abortion industry, with its focus on bottom-line profits—and remember Kermit Gosnell. He ran a pill mill during the day and performed late-term abortions at night. We know what he was all about. It was not elevated principles. It was not women's health. It was all about the almighty dollar.

What the Gosnell case and these others have helped to expose is the sad truth that some States simply look the other way while abortion clinics run amuck and the health and lives of women are endangered. Let's be clear: there's no such thing as a safe abortion. Not only does the pregnant woman face emotional and physical risks, up to and including death, but each abortion is the ending of an innocent human life.

So, how is it that we have a Humane Society for animals but we don't have a humane society for the most vulnerable and innocent humans, babies? Why is it that the media and many Americans go crazy over the treatment of wild and domesticated animals, yet seem to turn a deaf ear to the silent screams emanating from inside the womb of millions of young women.

Mr. Speaker, what can be done about such alleged murderers as Gosnell? How many more Gosnells are out there damaging wombs and killing babies? If we wait on the media and State health care officials to find them, we may have to wait many years while many deaths occur.

Therefore, I call on State legislatures and Governors to write ironclad laws and regulations to protect mothers and infants from these heinous acts, State regulators to ensure that abortion clinics and abortionists are adhering completely to every rule and law now in place and the many more that will be established in the future, we hope. And, I call on prosecutors and judges to make sure that abortionists and abortion clinics that break the law and that defy the Born-Alive Act face the full measure of law.

Finally, we stand today with our national conscience stirred by the Gosnell trial to stop and look again at life in the womb. Kermit Gosnell was killing babies who could otherwise survive had they been given the chance. But his trial is merely scratching the surface of the greater reality that medical technology has been showing us now for more than a decade: the life that is developing in the womb is a baby. It is a growing and developing child that feels pain, we know scientifically, as early as 20 weeks gestation, midpregnancy, and maybe even earlier. And destroying that life is extremely painful to the baby and should not—that is, abortion—be an option.

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

END HUNGER NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, next Wednesday the House Agriculture Committee is expected to mark up the farm bill. The farm bill is an important bill for many reasons, but chief among them is the reauthorization of our Nation's antihunger safety net programs. The largest and arguably most important is the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP.

As I continue to remind my colleagues through my series of End Hunger Now speeches, it is important to acknowledge that hunger is a real problem in America. Even as we slowly come out of this recession and as Americans struggle to get back on their feet, there are still nearly 50 million hungry people living in this country. Nearly 17 million are kids. The hungry, labeled by some as food insecure because they don't know where their next meal is coming from, aren't like those who starve in Third World countries. They don't have sunken eyes and swollen bellies, and that's primarily because of SNAP and other antihunger safety net programs.

SNAP has prevented millions of people from going without food when they desperately need it. The population served by SNAP is not the rich. They aren't living in mansions or driving expensive cars or eating in five-star restaurants. No, Mr. Speaker, they are primarily low-income families who are trying to make ends meet. They are trying to provide healthy food for their families while they try to keep a roof over their head and pay the bills to keep utilities running. And that's why the farm bill is so important.

Every 5 years, we have an opportunity to look at SNAP and other programs that make up the farm bill. We have an opportunity to look at what is and what isn't working. We have an opportunity to make the program run better, at least that's what we should be doing. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, as we move to the markup of this farm bill, we haven't had a single hearing, not a single hearing this year, on the SNAP program.

But next week, the House Agriculture Committee will mark up a farm bill that we're told, if reports are to be trusted, that will cut $20 billion from SNAP. That's $20 billion that could go to feed hungry Americans. That's a $20 billion cut that will literally take food out of the mouths of hungry Americans. In short, it's a bill that will make hunger in America worse, not better.

SNAP is among the most effective and efficient, if not the most effective and efficient, federally run program. Error rates are at an all-time low. In fact, when it comes to error rates, more SNAP benefits are underpaid rather than overpaid. That means that a SNAP error will likely result in a beneficiary receiving a smaller benefit than they are eligible for rather than a higher benefit. Waste and abuse is almost negligible, and USDA continues to crack down on fraud. People who defraud SNAP, those who break the law, are being arrested and they're going to jail.

The program is working, Mr. Speaker, and I defy anyone to show me any other Federal program that is as effective and as efficient as SNAP. Yet some Republicans are hell-bent on cutting the program. I should say, obliterating the program, and I simply do not understand why. What do they have against poor people? Why do they think that it's okay to hold back a helping hand. SNAP isn't a get-rich scheme. People use SNAP to put food on their table during difficult times. The way to reduce the number of people on SNAP is by creating jobs, by helping to get this economy going again. The more people go back to work, the less people need to rely on SNAP.

But what some in this House are proposing is that we arbitrarily and indiscriminately cut the help that people need. A $20 billion cut will do real damage. It will be harder for some to get SNAP. For others, they will see their SNAP benefit cut, meaning they'll have to buy the same amount of food with less money. And we'll see, at a minimum, several hundred thousand

poor kids lose their free school meals. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this bill will take food away from poor kids.

For the life of me, I cannot understand why anyone—I don't care what your political party is—would want to do this. Cutting SNAP is a bad policy. Cutting SNAP in the name of fiscal responsibility is not just a misnomer, it is a falsehood that must be debunked.

There are many other programs in the farm bill that have higher rates of fraud, waste, and abuse—programs like direct payments and crop insurance, just to name two. These programs must be reined in rather than going after programs that help poor people struggle to feed their families during difficult times.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to believe that we can end hunger now if we muster the political will to do so.

□ 1740

But cutting SNAP, passing a farm bill that cuts $20 billion from this program will not end hunger now. It will make hunger worse. It is the wrong thing to do at the wrong time in our history.

I'd like to believe that my Republican colleagues on the Agriculture Committee would realize this before they embrace a bill that would have such a Draconian cut, that would have a $20 billion cut in SNAP.

And, Mr. Speaker, I'm urging my Democratic colleagues on the Agriculture Committee to join me in rejecting these cuts. And if these cuts prevail, then we should vote against this farm bill. I think it is simply wrong to send a bill to the House floor, or if it passes the House floor, over to the United States Senate that decimates this important program. It is just wrong.

And for some reason, it has become fashionable in this House to not worry about the poor and to not worry about the vulnerable. Every time we need to find a cut, you go after programs that benefit the most vulnerable. It is wrong. It is outrageous. It goes against everything we're supposed to be doing in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, rejecting these cuts is the right thing to do, especially if we want to end hunger now.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind my colleagues that hunger is a political condition. Hunger is a political condition. We have the resources, we have the means, we have the infrastructure to end it; but we don't have the political will.

We have the political will when it comes to going to war. We have the political will when it comes to giving tax breaks to wealthy people. We have the political will when it comes to protecting special interest subsidies to Big Oil.

But when it comes to ending hunger, the political will is not here. It is not here. And what a shame, Mr. Speaker.

I would also remind my colleagues that there was a cost to hunger. When people say to me, oh, we can't afford to help these people; we can't afford to expand these programs because this is a tough budgetary time that we find ourselves in, I remind my colleagues that there is a cost here.

There's a cost in avoidable health care cost, for example. People who do not eat on a regular basis, children who do not eat on a regular basis, who are denied food, who are hungry, you know, their immune systems are compromised. They get common colds, and it ends up turning into something worse, and they end up going into emergency rooms and staying for several days. There's a cost to this.

Senior citizens who can't afford their food and their medicine, they take their medicine on an empty stomach, they end up getting sick. They go into the hospital, they stay for several days, sometimes weeks. There is a cost to that.

There's a cost to hunger in terms of lost productivity in the workplace. Workers aren't as productive.

And, oh, let me just remind my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, when people think that SNAP is only a program for those who are unemployed, millions and millions and millions of people on this program work for a living. They work, but they don't earn enough to not qualify for this benefit.

If you want to do something to help more people get off SNAP, increase the minimum wage, invest in this economy, get more people back to work. But there are millions of working people who rely on this program to feed their families. So there's a cost, Mr. Speaker.

There's also a cost in terms of kids going to school hungry who can't learn. I mean, if you're hungry, you can't focus.

If I had my way, Mr. Speaker, I would require universal school breakfast for everyone who goes to school in this country at the bell, because the bottom line is that meal, that nutrition is every bit as important to a young child, in terms of learning, as that textbook is because that textbook doesn't do a kid any good if he or she is hungry, if all they're worried about is where they're going to get their next meal. And there are too many kids, as I said, 17 million children in this country that are hungry.

Mr. Speaker, we are supposed to be a political body here that is dedicated to solving problems. That's what our job is supposed to be. We're supposed to try to help people and solve problems, not ignore them or make them worse.

There are millions of vulnerable people in this country who need our attention and who need our help. They don't want a handout; they want a hand up. They want to enter the job market; they want to enter into a secure economy. They're looking for some help to get them to the point they could survive long enough to be able to see this economy get back on its feet.

Hunger in America is a real problem. This is an issue. No one talks about it here, but it is an issue. You don't see the leadership of this House, the Republican leadership of this House, paying any attention to this. They never even mention the word hunger. They never mention the word poverty when they speak.

But this is a real problem. This is a real problem, and I would urge my colleagues who are about to embrace a $20 billion cut in SNAP to get out of Washington or, better yet, just leave the Capitol Grounds and go out and meet some people who are struggling on this benefit. Meet some people who don't have enough to eat, who end up going to food banks even when they get the SNAP benefits because it's not enough. This is not a get-rich scheme.

And here's the other thing that my colleagues need to understand. Even if we did nothing in the farm bill, even if we protected everything, as it is, I mean, and didn't make any cuts in the farm bill next week, guess what? The average benefit, the average food stamp benefit, the average SNAP benefit, is going to go down anyway because we have dipped into SNAP to pay for other programs. It has been our ATM machine to pay for a lot of other programs, and so the benefit already is going to go down for people. People are already going to feel it even if we were to do nothing.

But to pile on $20 billion worth of cuts—and my friends will say, oh, well, you know, it's this categorical eligibility, or it's this, you know, we don't like the way this State does it or that State does it——

Here's a point I want to make. If people were truly interested in making this program run better, then we would be doing hearing after hearing after hearing, not only here in Washington, but out in the field, listening to people who are beneficiaries, listening to the food banks, listening to the anti-hunger advocacy groups, listening to the mayors, listening to the Governors, listening to people; and we would figure out how to do this in a way that made sense.

And by the way, I think any savings we find in SNAP we ought to put back into programs to combat hunger and to promote nutrition, you know, not take this money and help pay for a subsidy to some big agri-business or continue to fund some cockamamie crop insurance scheme. We ought to put this, we ought to put any savings we find and any reforms back into these programs.

Let's do this right. But my friends who want to cut this program don't want to do it right. They're not interested in helping this work better. All they're interested in is taking this money so they don't have to take it away from the special interests that fund political campaigns around here. And I find that outrageous.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, don't turn your backs on the poor. Don't turn your backs on the hungry in this country.

As Members of the United States Congress, we should be ashamed, we should be ashamed that there are 50 million people in the United States of America that are hungry, that 17 million of them are children. It is outrageous.

We're the richest, most powerful country in the world. There shouldn't be any hunger here. There shouldn't be anybody who has to worry about whether or not they're going to be able to put good, nutritious food on the table.

So I urge my colleagues, Democrats, Republicans, please do not fall for this notion that cutting $20 billion won't make any difference to anybody, that we're just kind of tightening the program up. Don't fall for that line, because it's just not true. It's just not true.

$20 billion in cuts from this program will mean that people today, who today are getting food tomorrow will not. And, again, if people qualify for this program, their kids automatically qualify for the free breakfast or lunch program at school. You cut these families off this program, those kids will no longer be eligible for that.

How that serves our natural interest, how that helps anything in this country, how that even deals with our deficit, our debt problem is beyond me because we're creating a whole slew of new problems.

□ 1750

We are so much better than that. We are so much better than that.

Let me just close with this, Mr. Speaker. Some people have said to me, well, hunger has been around for a long time. There's nothing we can do about it. Those people are wrong, Mr. Speaker. They're wrong. In 1968, there was a documentary on television on ABC that documented for the entire Nation to see the hunger problem in America. And in the aftermath of that documentary, in a bipartisan way, people like Senator George McGovern of South Dakota, Senator Robert Dole of Kansas, Senator Jake Javits of New York and Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota, in a bipartisan way came together and helped put together an effort to end hunger.

In the 1970s, in the mid- to late 1970s, we almost succeeded in ending hunger in this country. We almost succeeded. And then came along a Congress that undid everything, and today we have seen the results of the negligence of Congress and of various White Houses over the years, and that is 50 million Americans—50 million Americans—who are hungry.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we can do better than that, and I believe that we are a much better country than that. I plead with my colleagues here, please don't do this. Please don't do this. The people we're talking about who benefit from this program don't have any big political PACs, and they don't have a lot of high-priced lobbyists here in Washington. I'm not even sure how many of them are going to vote in the next election. But they're our neighbors. They're our friends. They're part of our community. We're supposed to represent them. We're supposed to help people, not hurt people.

If this farm bill goes forward with a $20 billion cut in SNAP, we will be hurting people in this country. We will be hurting millions and millions of people in this country.

I hope we don't go down that path. I urge my colleagues, in a bipartisan way, to join with me. End hunger now. Reject these attempts at cutting SNAP by $20 billion, support a farm bill that supports not only our farmers, but supports good nutrition and supports an effort that will end hunger now.

I thank my colleagues for listening to me, and I yield back the balance of my time.

SNAP AND IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives and also the times that I've had to be here on the floor and listen to the dialogue and the debate that's delivered by Members of both sides, the Republican and the Democrat side of the aisle. I listened with interest as my friend and colleague on the Agriculture Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN, talked about the SNAP program and the necessity to maintain the dollars that were there.

I was a little surprised that he didn't ask for more dollars going into the SNAP program as opposed to opposing any reduction in the programmed increase in the SNAP program. We have about $78 billion a year that are going into food stamps now—$78 billion, a little more than that. And by next year it will be $80 billion.

Now, we do calculate our budgets and spending in a 10-year budget window, so that means $800 billion is the universe of money that he's talking about, and he's pleading with us not to reduce that growth from a little bit more than $78 billion a year up over $80 billion a year. So of that $2 billion a year that's programmed between this year and next year over the period of time of 10 years there would be $20 billion trimmed off of $800 billion, which comes to about a 2½ percent decrease in the overall projected expenditures of the food stamp program known as SNAP.

Now, after all of that technical gibberish, the bottom line is a $20 billion cut is a $2½ billion cut in the increase. $20 billion spread out over 10 years is not something that's going to be noticeable. When the gentleman speaks of how we would ''literally take food out of the mouths of hungry Americans,'' Mr. Speaker, it's important to point out, literally taking the food out of hungry Americans has never happened as an action of government in the history of the United States. It is very unlikely to ever happen into the future of the United States. And it certainly isn't something that would be the result of a piece of legislation that would come out of this Congress and specifically out of the Agriculture Committee and specifically from the subcommittee which I chair.

No, Mr. Speaker. There is not going to be any literal taking food out of the mouths of hungry Americans, to quote the gentleman from Massachusetts. Literally means ''really.'' It means ''actually.'' It means it physically happens. Now, if you're literally going to take food out of the mouths of hungry Americans, you would have to think in terms of some way to extract it once they have put it in their mouth. That's what the man has said. That's a little bit perhaps over-the-top rhetoric, and I understand he's passionate about the issue.

But even figuratively speaking, it's a little bit of a stretch to argue that a 2½ percent reduction in anticipated expenditures of the food stamp program over a 10-year period of time is going to do something to starve kids when we're addressing the eligibility for the food stamp program. And we are seeing narratives—facts, actually—of people that are using their EBT card—that electronic benefits transfer card, that card that has spawned rap music about its easy accessibility and its marketability on the street—to get tattoos, and using that food stamp EBT card to bail at least one individual out of jail.

There has to be a place where the gentleman from Massachusetts and I would draw the line and say, enough. Enough. We've taxed the taxpayers enough. We've punished the producers enough. We've borrowed enough money from the Chinese and the Saudis. We should not be borrowing money from the Chinese and the Saudis to fund somebody's tattoos, to hold up a tattoo parlor that in the neon sign says, we take EBT cards. No, Mr. Speaker, there has to be a place to draw the line and actually say no. The gentleman from Massachusetts gave me no indication, even though I listened to every word, of where he would say enough is enough, or even an amount being too much.

So I would suggest that I have watched as the numbers of Americans that have signed up for the food stamp program have gone from 19 million people to 49 million people. Think of that. Thirty million new people on the food stamp program, millions of dollars being spent by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to advertise food stamp sign-ups so that we can expand the numbers of people that are on another government program and encourage them to sign up. What for? It grows the empire of dependency which grows the empire of politics of the people on the

left. They know that. They are not stupid. They have a whole different set of motives than I have, but they understand what they're doing.

Not any longer are there 19 million people on food stamps. There are 49 million people on food stamps, and the Secretary of Agriculture has an advertising budget spending millions to go out there and recruit more to sign on.

Now there are communications going on and publications popping up from Mexican consulates that in Spanish say, in foreign countries even that you can—we don't have to ask you and will not ask you about your status in the United States. If you are here illegally, sign up anyway and we'll do that in your native language, and we'll give you American benefits and advertise in Mexico to get people to sign up on the food stamp program here or there. Do they send the EBT card through the Mexican consulate? Or does it just go in regular mail? Or do you have to show up to claim it?

I question all of these things, Mr. Speaker. In the question about what do ''they''—and he means Republicans—what do ''they'' have against poor people? Here's what we have. We have an aspiration for everybody to be the best they can be. We have an aspiration for everybody to have an opportunity to succeed to the limit of their God-given abilities and to demonstrate their ambition and to be challenged out here in this society. That's why people come here. It's not because we offer 80 different means-tested Federal welfare programs, and we advertise that if you come here, you don't have to be responsible, you don't have to work, and you don't have to carry your share of the load. You might have thought that America had a safety net. No, sir; it's a hammock. It's a hammock with 80 different means-tested welfare programs in it, and they're out of hand. And this administration is promoting the expansion of them for political purposes, whatever the level of compassion might be of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

By the way, when he said arbitrarily and indiscriminately cut, and that there are 17 million kids that are hungry and 50 million Americans that are hungry, this reduction of this 2½ percent over the next 10-year period of time that's in the anticipated formula for food stamps is not going to be arbitrary, and it's not going to be indiscriminate.

□ 1800

It is going to be a number close to $20 billion. But instead, it's going to lower the eligibility so the people that need it less—in fact, many of the people that don't need it at all won't qualify. So that we're not paying for tattoos and we're not paying to bail people out of jail, and that we're not sending food stamps along with everybody's LIHEAP claim. Where in the past, if you qualify for $1 and the Low-Income Heating Assistance Program, you qualify for the full array of SNAP benefits. That's going to be adjusted upwards so that the evaluation of LIHEAP raises the bar a little bit. That's a tiny little trim and a little haircut that is 2.5 percent, but it's not arbitrary and it's not indiscriminate. It will be those that don't need this nearly as much as others.

We're going to protect hungry kids, and we're going to protect people that need the benefit; but we're not going to be paying for tattoos and we're not going to be bailing people out of jail. By the way, I don't think we're either going to be paying for the deposits on those $7 water jugs that people are going in and using their EBT card to buy a big old jug of water, take it out in the parking lot of the grocery store, dump it upside down and dump the water out and carry it back in and turn it in for the $7 cash refund for the deposit. That is a place where millions of dollars have been wasted by people who have EBT cards. If they're hungry, they're not going to be spending that EBT money on water, dumping the water out in the parking lot, and converting the empty jug into $7 worth of cash. The gentleman from Massachusetts, I'd like to see him look at some of the fraud that's going on here and have some compassion for the American taxpayers.

Several hundred thousand kids will lose their school meals, he said. Mr. Speaker, that may or may not be true. I don't know about the basis of that statement, but I know this: that decision is not going to be made by the Ag Committee; it's not going to be made under the SNAP program. The school lunch program is a product of the Ed and Workforce Committee. That will be authorized out of that committee. It will be appropriated out of a different committee than what we'll expect this farm bill is appropriated under. Several hundred thousand kids will lose their school meals, that he's worried about this being part of the markup that's coming up of the farm bill in the Ag Committee this month. That won't be a subject matter—as much as I'd like it to be.

If the gentleman from Massachusetts is concerned about hungry kids, then I would think he would sign onto my bill—my bill, Mr. Speaker, which prohibits the U.S. Department of Agriculture from rationing food to our children in the school lunch program. That is what they're doing, Mr. Speaker.

There was a piece of legislation that passed through this House in the lame duck session of 2010. It was the First Lady's bill, the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act. They always have a way of putting these real nice labels on bills that do something else. I understand her initiative on this. She wants people, especially young people, to get good, healthy, well-balanced meals, get some get exercise; and I think that's a good message for the First Lady to send.

When you promote a piece of legislation, however, and that legislation then requires that there be a certain mix of vegetables and fruit and carbohydrates and that kind of thing spread out through the USDA school lunch program—which the Ag Committee doesn't have jurisdiction over—that recommendation on its basis was relatively sound, Mr. Speaker. And even though I didn't agree that we should be dictating that at the Federal level, I didn't have a major objection to that initiative either.

But we've seen what's happened. The Secretary of Agriculture has taken license that doesn't exist within the bill and capped the calories to our kids in schools. So they have put a lid on the amount of calories that can be served in each of the categories of elementary, middle school, and in high school. That cap on the calories, at least in one case with the middle schoolers, the calorie limitations that they had as a minimum coming into this school year was greater than the maximum that they allow for some of those middle school kids today. They have put every kid on the school lunch program in this country on a diet, Mr. Speaker.

The administration—a policy supported by the gentleman from Massachusetts, a policy driven by—manufactured, I think, out of thin air, but with a self-assigned license by the Department of Agriculture—is rationing food to our kids in school.

I listened to the gentleman from Massachusetts and he said that if you're hungry in school, you can't focus. I agree. I think kids need to go to school, and they need to have food in their belly. They need to go to lunch knowing they can get all the nutritious food they want to eat because for many of them that's the only decent meal they're going to get all day.

They need to be fed in school. I will make this statement, Mr. Speaker: there is not a single kid in America that's getting fat on school lunch. That's not where it's happening. It's in the junk food afterwards because they can't wait to get out of the school door because they've been starved at the school lunch program, shortened on calories.

So if I were going to set up a new franchise and try to make money today, I would set up a little junk food wagon like the ice cream truck out there in the parking lot outside of the school and as soon as those kids are released, sell them all the junk they're going to be out there clamoring for. That's what they do: they race to the convenience store, they jam themselves full of junk food, then they sit down in front of the TV and continue to eat junk food.

And somehow this administration thinks our kids are getting fat on a school lunch program, and so they ration food to all kids. Same level of calories to a 70-pound freshman in high school as there is in a 250-pound high school football player with a high level of activity and energy requirement. How is it that one size fits all for four

grades in school, a 70-pounder and a 270-pounder need the same amount of calories? You know that you're going to be starving the biggest kids and probably not providing enough opportunity for that younger one to grow. Meanwhile, we're not just inhibiting their mental growth; we're inhibiting their physical growth as well.

If you think that you can reduce calories and ration food to kids that are growing and are active and somehow they're going to grow physically and mentally in an environment like that, that is a tragedy. I'd say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, that's a tragedy we should be able to work on together is starving kids in the school lunch program.

I point out that North and South Korea—let me say as close as you can get ethnically speaking and genetically speaking—have been separated for over 60 years. The people in North Korea don't get a lot of diet. The people in South Korea have been successful, and they do get a far more healthy diet. The people in South Korea are, on average, 3½ inches taller than the people in North Korea.

So if we're going to starve our kids in school under some myopic idea that we're going to train them to eat their raw broccoli and their raw cauliflower, and that they'll somehow get enough to eat and that they'll be active and healthy and grow, that's a mistake. Give them all the healthy food that they want to eat at least once a day. Do not starve them. I could go on with the gentleman's statement.

We're going to write up and mark up a good farm bill that does the prudent thing, and it doesn't starve people. It doesn't take food out of the mouths of babes or adults or anybody else. It just prohibits the utilization of these EBT cards, food stamps, SNAP program, from being used by people who aren't needy or by people that use it for something that it wasn't intended for.

That's just the beginning of my response to the gentleman. But this fits in with the broader theme, Mr. Speaker, that I came here to speak about, and that is the issue here in the United States of this massive dependency that's been growing in this country.

The gentleman is worried about 50 million people that are hungry—I don't know where that number comes from. I think we've all been hungry at one time or another, so that would be a subjective number. But I would point out that we have over 100 million Americans that are simply not in the workforce. When you add the unemployed to those who are not in the workforce by the definition that's put out by the Department of Labor, that number is over 100 million Americans.

The highest levels of unemployment that we have in the country are at the lowest skilled jobs. No skilled jobs, low-skilled jobs, double-digit unemployment. This isn't a country like it was back in 1849, when we needed to build the transcontinental railroad and we brought people in from across the ocean or the Pacific to drive spikes and lay ties and lay rail coming from the West. We brought people in from Western Europe to go build the train tracks from the east, and they met at the golden spike territory in that period of time. This country needed labor then. We needed low-skilled labor then, people that would put their hands and their back to this work.

Some folks think that America needs that kind of labor today. Well, if we did, we wouldn't have double-digit unemployment in the low-skill jobs. And here we have the United States Senate that seems to be poised—and too many people in the House of Representatives that seem to be prepared to support them—to move an immigration bill out of the Senate that would be this: it would grant instantaneous amnesty to everybody that's in America illegally, with a few tiny exceptions—maybe later, not right away. It would send an invitation off to everyone who has been deported in the past that, why don't you apply to come back into the United States. We really didn't mean it when we bought you a ticket to wake up in the country that you were legal to live in. And it's an implicit promise that anybody that's in America after the cut-off deadline—December 31, 2011—or anybody that should be able to come after that date—today, tomorrow, next year, next decade—all would be granted a presence in America where they didn't have to fear that the immigration law would be applied against them unless they committed a felony and were brought to the attention of law enforcement or unless they committed a series of three misdemeanors—undefined in the law. That would be the discretion of—I suppose it would be ICE or Janet Napolitano. And this open borders policy would be perpetual.

□ 1810

I knew in 1986 what this meant, Mr. Speaker. Ronald Reagan only let me down twice in 8 years. One of them was in 1986 when he gave in to the advisers around him and public pressure and signed the amnesty bill of 1986. I knew then that the stroke of Ronald Reagan's pen did severe, severe damage to the rule of law in this country and that to restore it and reestablish the respect for the law was going to be a very difficult task indeed.

But I also lived in fear that if I had job applicants coming into my company and I didn't have all of the I's dotted and the T's crossed on the I–9 form, if I didn't review the proper identification documents, fraudulent or not, and keep my records to protect myself, I expected ICE would be knocking on my door at any time—actually, it was INS at the time, Immigration Naturalization Services—and that they would be scouring through my records to make sure that I didn't violate one of the details of the Federal law of the 1986 Amnesty Act.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, we know the INS agents, later on to be ICE agents, never showed up in my office. They didn't show up at thousands and thousands of companies where there are employers in the United States. And that the roughly a million people—it started out to be 800,000—roughly a million people that were estimated to be the beneficiaries of this Amnesty Act—which at least they were honest and called it amnesty then—that that million people became, not a million, 3 million people because of underestimates and because of a massive amount of fraud, including document fraud.

So the rule of law was eroded in 1986, and Ronald Reagan really did intend to enforce the law to the best of his ability. It was undermined by leftist and ''open borders'' people in America that didn't really want to let that happen.

Each succeeding President enforced immigration law less and less and less from 1986 through Bush 41 through Bill Clinton, who accelerated a naturalization process of a million people in 1986 just in time to magically vote in the reelection of that year. Following that, George W. Bush in his two terms, and now Barack Obama, who says, I refuse to enforce immigration law.

There are 300,000 people on the list that had been adjudicated for deportation, and with a stroke of his Presidential edict pen, he forbade that the law be enforced and required that they simply waive their applications, on an individual basis, I might add. That gets a little tiring to read that when it is group and it is class.

Nonetheless, the President got away with that. He told a high school class here in town—if I remember the date correctly, it was March 28, 2011—that he didn't have the authority to grant the DREAM Act by executive order, that had to be a legislative act. And a little over a year later, by the stroke of his Presidential edict pen, he did so, however, created four classes of people, and gave them a legal status by Presidential edict by a memorandum from Janet Napolitano and John Morton, supported by a Presidential press conference, gave people a legal status in this country unconstitutionally, unlawfully, and granted them also a work permit manufactured out of thin air.

Every document that allows people to be in the United States who are not American citizens is manufactured by the Congress of the United States, except the President took it upon himself to take on article I activity legislation from article II, the executive branch.

So ICE and the president of ICE, Chris Crane, sued the President, sued the executive branch. They had the first decision that came out of the circuit in Texas. And the answer is, on 10 points, the judge held with the ICE union on nine of the 10. And the 10th one, I think today is the deadline for them to come back with their response to this in a cogent fashion so the judge can also rule again.

I'm hopeful that he'll be consistent in the theme. The theme of his decision is this: Mr. President, executive branch, all who we will see and hear, ''shall'' means ''shall.'' When Congress means ''shall,'' they don't mean ''may.''

That doesn't mean that the President may do whatever in the world he may wish to do. If Congress writes it into law and it's signed by any President, it's going to be a preceding President, that means ''shall.'' You shall enforce the law. You shall follow the directive in statute. If you don't do that, you undermine this constitutional Republic that we have.

Tomorrow morning, Mr. Speaker, at 8 in the morning in a ''Members only'' gathering, Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation will be delivering his report that was released yesterday around 11 or so. This report is about 101 pages, of which the executive summary is around five. I have read through this. It is definitive economic data that I believe will be assailed, but it's logically unassailable.

He says in this document that ''at every stage of the life cycle, unlawful immigrants on average generate fiscal deficits.'' That's benefits that exceed taxes. ''Unlawful immigrants on average are always tax consumers. They never once generate a fiscal surplus that can be used to pay for government benefits elsewhere in society.''

This situation, obviously, will get much worse after amnesty. And if you believe that the second generation will make up for the first, if they were all college graduates, they would still have a tremendous struggle to make up the $6.3 trillion deficit that's created by this in expenditures minus taxes collected from this group of people. But only 13 percent of their children will go to college, so that will tell you how difficult this will be.

This is a generational economic burden taken on, proposed out of the Senate. If the American people take this on, there is no undoing this. We must get this right. We must have a Congress that's informed and educated and pays attention.

I urge all to take a look at the Heritage Foundation report by Robert Rector released yesterday. It is titled, Mr. Speaker, as I close, ''The Fiscal Cost of Unlawful Immigrants and Amnesty to the U.S. Taxpayer,'' dated yesterday, and that is May 6, 2013. I would urge that you and all pay attention to that, and I yield back the balance of my time.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1904

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT) at 7 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.

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

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–52) on the resolution (H. Res. 202) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 807) to require that the Government prioritize all obligations on the debt held by the public in the event that the debt limit is reached, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 8, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1391. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Controlled Import Permits [Docket No.: APHIS-2008-0055] (RIN: 0579-AD53) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1392. A letter from the Director, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Order Imposing Recordkeeping and Reporting Obligations on Certain U.S. Financial Institutions with Respect to Transactions Involving Kassem Rmeiti & Co. for Exchange as a Financial Institution of Primary Money Laundering Concern received April 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1393. A letter from the Director, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Order Imposing Recordkeeping and Reporting Obligations on Certain U.S. Financial Institutions with Respect to Transactions Involving Kassem Rmeiti & Co. for Exchange as a Financial Institution of Primary Money Laundering Concern received April 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1394. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Aerovias de Mexico, S.A. de C.V. (AeroMexico) of Mexico City, Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1395. A letter from the Acting Director, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting Office of Minority and Women Inclusion's annual report for 2012; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1396. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority; National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research —— Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program —— Disability Rehabilitation Research Project [CFDA Number: 84.133A-8] received April 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1397. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, ''Innovative Products and Treatments to Achieve Abstinence From Tobacco Use, Reductions in Consumption of Tobacco, and Reductions in the Harm Associated With Continued Tobacco Use''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1398. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Matters Incorporated by Reference [Docket No.: NHTSA-2011-0185] (RIN: 2127-AL25) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1399. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report for the period January 16, 2012 to January 15, 2013 on the activities of the Multinational Force and Observers (MFO) and U.S. participation in that organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1400. A letter from the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Chigaco, transmitting the 2012 management reports and statements on the system of internal controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Chicago, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1401. A letter from the Associate Commissioner/EEO Director, National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for FY 2012 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1402. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XC575) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1403. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administrations final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan; Amendment 19 [Docket No.: 120822383-3277-02] (RIN: 0648-BC48) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1404. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Wage Methodology for the Temporary Non-Agricultural Employment H-2B Program, Part 2 (RIN: 1205-AB69) received April 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1405. A letter from the Vice President, Government Affairs and Corporate Communications, Amtrak, transmitting an addendum to the Fiscal Year 2014 Legislative and Grant Request of March 27, 2013; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1406. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0932; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-014-AD; Amendment 39-17426; AD 2013-08-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1407. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report entitled, ''Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Report to Congress and the President for both FY 2010 and FY 2011''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1408. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's FY 2014 General and Legislative Annual Report; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1409. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Services final rule — Relief from the Anti-cutback Requirements of Section 411(d)(6) for Certain ESOP Amendments [Notice 2013-17] received April 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1410. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a report required by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1807; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Intelligence (Permanent Select).

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. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 202. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 807) to require that the Government prioritize all obligations on the debt held by the public in the event that the debt limit is reached. (Rept. 113–52). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. TIERNEY):

H.R. 1842. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to improve the protections for servicemembers, surviving spouses, and disabled veterans against mortgage foreclosures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 1843. A bill to modernize laws, and eliminate discrimination, with respect to people living with HIV/AIDS, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. BASS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CHU, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DEUTCH, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 1844. A bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself and Ms. CHU):

H.R. 1845. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants to promote the education of pregnant and parenting students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 1846. A bill to amend the Act establishing the Lower East Side Tenement National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 1847. A bill to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POMPEO (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. ROKITA):

H.R. 1848. A bill to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes, and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 1849. A bill to amend the Hobby Protection Act to make unlawful the provision of assistance or support in violation of that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 1850. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for 2 years the deduction for expenses of elementary and secondary school teachers and to allow such deduction with respect to home school expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 1851. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an income tax credit for the costs of certain infertility treatments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YODER (for himself and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia):

H.R. 1852. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to update the privacy protections for electronic communications information that is stored by third-party service providers in order to protect consumer privacy interests while meeting law enforcement needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 1853. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to reform payment to States under the Medicaid program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CHU (for herself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 1854. A bill to increase the recruitment and retention of school counselors, school social workers, school psychologists, and other psychologists qualified to work in schools by low-income local educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. HANABUSA (for herself, Ms. CHU, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PETERS of California, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 1855. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to establish a process to determine whether individuals claiming certain service in the Philippines during World War II are eligible for certain benefits despite not being on the Missouri List, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. MESSER, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK):

H.R. 1856. A bill to eliminate unnecessary Federal bank accounts; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

H.R. 1857. A bill to make demonstration grants to eligible local educational agencies for the purpose of reducing the student-to school nurse ratio in public elementary schools and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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 Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1858. A bill to amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to provide enhanced enforcement authority for occupational safety and health protections applicable to the legislative branch, to provide whistleblower protections and other antidiscrimination protections for employees of the legislative branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, 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. SCHIFF (for himself and Ms. CHU):

H.R. 1859. A bill to revise the process by which the Federal Emergency Management Agency evaluates a request for major disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1860. A bill to modernize, shorten, and simplify the Federal criminal code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. JONES, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 1861. A bill to stop motorcycle checkpoint funding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 1862. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act to allow non-Federally insured credit unions to become members of a Federal Home Loan Bank; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. VELA (for himself and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 1863. A bill to require the Secretary of State to submit a report on water sharing with Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 1864. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require an Inspector General investigation of allegations of retaliatory personnel actions taken in response to making protected communications regarding sexual assault; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1865. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 Park Street in Danville, Vermont, as the ''Thaddeus Stevens Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1866. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to promote sustainable-use conservation, to harmonize that Act with the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. TITUS):

H. Res. 203. A resolution recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster-care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policy to improve the lives of children in the foster-care system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 204. A resolution commending Korean American veterans of the Vietnam War for their service to the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HORSFORD (for himself, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. NORTON):

H. Res. 205. A resolution recognizing the goals of National Travel and Tourism Week and honoring the valuable contributions of travel and tourism to the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 1842.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the reported bill is authorized by Congress' power ''To provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.''

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, the reported bill is authorized by Congress' 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.''

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 of the United States Constitution, the reported bill is authorized by Congress' power ''To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years.''

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 1843.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 1844.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Cl. 3

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 1845.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1, All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 1846.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States grant Congress the authority to make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.''

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 1847.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment IV

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

By Mr. POMPEO:

H.R. 1848.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 1849.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 1850.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have the 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.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 1851.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. YODER:

H.R. 1852.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment IV

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 1853.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 [the Spending Clause] of the United States Constitution states that 'The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay for Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.'

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 1854.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, known as the ''General Welfare Clause.'' This provision grants Congress the broad power 'to pay the Debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

Please note, pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Congress has the 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. HANABUSA:

H.R. 1855.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 1856.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the 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) of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

H.R. 1857.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1858.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 1859.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Disaster Declaration Improvement Act is constitutional under Article I, Section 8,

Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. The bill is constitutionally authorized under the Necessary and Proper Clause, which supports the expansion of congressional authority beyond the explicit authorities that are directly discernible from the text.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1860.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and the First, Second, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Eighth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1861.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Tenth Amendment to the Constitution

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 1862.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. VELA:

H.R. 1863.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 10

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 vestedi by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 1864.

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 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1865.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof..

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1866.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. WOODALL, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 47: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 140: Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 164: Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 176: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 185: Mr. VELA.

H.R. 199: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 207: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 258: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 259: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 274: Mr. TONKO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 301: Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 320: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 324: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 333: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. BONNER, and Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 357: Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 367: Mrs. BACHMANN and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 411: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 427: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 431: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 452: Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. KUSTER, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 460: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 474: Mr. PETERS of California and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 481: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 487: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 495: Mr. REED, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. BASS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 518: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 519: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 543: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 556: Mr. LATTA and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 569: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 570: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 578: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 594: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 627: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. LONG, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 630: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 685: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 693: Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 708: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 719: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 725: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 730: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 739: Mr. WOLF and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 755: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 783: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 795: Mr. HUELSKAMP and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 813: Mr. JONES, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 842: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 830: Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 855: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 838: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 911: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 958: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 961: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 963: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 930: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 933: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 990: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 991: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1014: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 1015: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1020: Mr. LANCE, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1024: Mr. PETERS of California and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1026: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1030: Mr. SARBANES and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1078: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1094: Mr. FARR, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 1098: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1341: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1149: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 1151: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 1153: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1155: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 1189: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 1191: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 1201: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1213: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1214: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1221: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 1240: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1245: Mr. BARBER and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1248: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 1250: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 1252: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 1257: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1293: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1304: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 1317: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 1327: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 1333: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1386: Mr. BENISHEK and Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 1413: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1416: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1417: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1453: Mr. O'ROURKE and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1461: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 1462: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 1488: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 1493: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 1496: Mr. TERRY, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 1497: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 1502: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1510: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 1518: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1526: Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 1528: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LONG, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1565: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MENG, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. VEASY, Mr. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WATT, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1566: Mr. SIRES, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1579: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1587: Mr. OLSON and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1592: Mr. POSEY, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 1594: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 1595: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1513: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 1520: Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 1538: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 1546: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1648: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1649: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1657: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. PITTENGER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 1692: Ms. SCHWARTZ and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1696: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 1708: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1724: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MESSER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1727: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 1729: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. MENG, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RIGELL, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1735: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1748: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1750: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 1759: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1761: Mr. LATHAM and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1768: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 1780: Ms. JENKINS, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1788: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1790: Mr. O'ROURKE and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1809: Ms. MENG, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 1814: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 1825: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1826: Mr. BROUN of Georgia and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 1830: Mr. HANNA, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. BARTON, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. TONKO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.J. Res. 26: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. SABLAN.

H. Con. Res. 36: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H. Res. 36: Mr. LABRADOR and Mr. GIBBS.

H. Res. 69: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H. Res. 76: Mr. KLINE.

H. Res. 95: Mr. ENYART.

H. Res. 112: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. YOHO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. HANNA.

H. Res. 144: Mr. MATHESON and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H. Res. 147: Mr. GOWDY.

H. Res. 167: Mr. BARR, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. TITUS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. SIRES.

H. Res. 173: Mr. TERRY.

H. Res. 174: Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H. Res. 177: Mr. COTTON and Mr. LATTA.

H. Res. 190: Mr. COBLE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. LONG.

H. Res. 195: Mr. RUSH.

H. Res. 196: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H. Res. 200: Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. CHU, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SALMON, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative CAMP, or a designee, to H.R. 807, the Full Faith and Credit Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.