

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 210, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 245, nays 182, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 211]

YEAS—245

Aderholt	Gohmert	Murphy (PA)
Alexander	Neugebauer	
Amodei	Gosar	Noem
Bachmann	Gowdy	Nugent
Bachus	Granger	Nunes
Barber	Graves (GA)	Nunnelee
Barletta	Graves (MO)	Olson
Barr	Griffin (AR)	Owens
Barrow (GA)	Griffith (VA)	Palazzo
Barton	Grimm	Paulsen
Benishek	Guthrie	Pearce
Bera (CA)	Hall	Perry
Billrakis	Hanna	Peters (CA)
Bishop (UT)	Harper	Pitts
Black	Harris	Poe (TX)
Blackburn	Hartzler	Pompeo
Bonner	Hastings (WA)	Posey
Boustany	Heck (NV)	Price (GA)
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Quigley
Braley (IA)	Herrera Beutler	Radel
Bridenstine	Holding	Rahall
Brooks (AL)	Hudson	Reed
Brooks (IN)	Huelskamp	Reichert
Brown (GA)	Huizenga (MI)	Renacci
Buchanan	Hultgren	Ribble
Bucshon	Hunter	Rice (SC)
Burgess	Hurt	Richmond
Bustos	Issa	Rigell
Calvert	Jenkins	Roby
Camp	Johnson (OH)	Roe (TN)
Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Capito	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Carter	Joyce	Rogers (MI)
Cassidy	Kelly (PA)	Rohrabacher
Chabot	King (IA)	Rokita
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Rooney
Coble	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Roskam
Cole	Kirkpatrick	Ross
Collins (GA)	Kline	Rothfus
Collins (NY)	Kuster	Royce
Conaway	Labrador	Ruiz
Cook	LaMalfa	Runyan
Cotton	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Cramer	Lance	Salmon
Crawford	Lankford	Scalise
Crenshaw	Latham	Schneider
Culberson	Latta	Schock
Daines	Lipinski	Schweikert
Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Scott, Austin
Denham	Loeb sack	Sessions
Dent	Long	Shimkus
DeSantis	Lucas	Shuster
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Simpson
Diaz-Balart	Maloney, Sean	Sinema
Duckworth	Marchant	Smith (MO)
Duffy	Marino	Smith (NE)
Duncan (SC)	Markey	Smith (NJ)
Ellmers	Matheson	Smith (TX)
Farenthold	McCarthy (CA)	Southerland
Fincher	McCauley	Stewart
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Stivers
Fleischmann	McHenry	Stutzman
Fleming	McIntyre	Terry
Flores	McKeon	Thompson (PA)
Forbes	McKinley	Thornberry
Fortenberry	McMorris	Tiberti
Fox	Rodgers	Tipton
Franks (AZ)	Meadows	Turner
Frelinghuysen	Meehan	Upton
Gallego	Messer	Valadao
Garcia	Mica	Wagner
Gardner	Miller (FL)	Walberg
Garrett	Miller (MI)	Walden
Gerlach	Miller, Gary	Walorski
Gibbs	Mullin	Weber (TX)
Gibson	Mulvaney	Webster (FL)
Gingrey (GA)	Murphy (FL)	Wenstrup

Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder

Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—182

Amash	Grijalva
Andrews	Gutierrez
Bass	Hahn
Beatty	Hanabusa
Bentivolio	Hastings (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Heck (WA)
Bishop (NY)	Higgins
Blumenauer	Himes
Bonamici	Hinojosa
Brady (PA)	Holt
Brown (FL)	Honda
Brownley (CA)	Horsford
Butterfield	Hoyer
Capps	Huffman
Capuano	Israel
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee
Carney	Jeffries
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.
Castor (FL)	Jones
Castro (TX)	Kaptur
Chu	Keating
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)
Clarke	Kennedy
Clay	Kildee
Cleaver	Kilmer
Clyburn	Kind
Cohen	Langevin
Connolly	Larsen (WA)
Cooper	Larson (CT)
Costa	Lee (CA)
Courtney	Levin
Crowley	Lewis
Cuellar	Lofgren
Cummings	Lowenthal
Davis (CA)	Lowe
Davis, Danny	Lujan Grisham
DeFazio	(NM)
DeGette	Lujan, Ben Ray
Delaney	(NM)
DeLauro	Lummis
DeBene	Lynch
Deutch	Maffei
Dingell	Maloney,
Doggett	Carolyn
Doyle	Massie
Duncan (TN)	Matsui
Edwards	McCollum
Ellison	McDermott
Engel	McGovern
Enyart	McNerney
Eshoo	Meeks
Esty	Meng
Farr	Michaud
Fattah	Miller, George
Foster	Moore
Frankel (FL)	Moran
Fudge	Nadler
Gabard	Napolitano
Garamendi	Neal
Grayson	Negrete McLeod
Green, Al	Nolan
Green, Gene	O'Rourke

Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
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—7

Becerra	McCarthy (NY)	Whitfield
Campbell	Pittenger	
Conyers	Thompson (CA)	

□ 1112

Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Ms. SHEA-PORTER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. NEUGEBAUER changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for rollcall vote 211, as I had stepped away from the House Floor momentarily. If I had been present for this vote, on final passage of H.R. 2217, Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act of 2014, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 211, I inadvertently voted “aye” when I intended to vote “no” on final passage of H.R. 2217, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act.

The addition of the Amendment to H.R. 2217 offered by Mr. KING altered the true intent of the bill. Mr. KING’s Amendment would prohibit the use of prosecutorial discretion by Immigration and Customs Enforcement, preventing Immigration and Customs Enforcement from focusing its limited enforcement resources on those who pose a real threat to public safety and national security.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall votes 207, 208, 209, 210 and 211. If present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall 207, “no” on rollcall 208, “no” on rollcall 209, “yea” on rollcall 210, and “no” on rollcall 211.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1249

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 1249.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADEL). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to my friend for next week’s schedule, I would like to join, I know, with all of our colleagues in wishing him a happy birthday. It is the majority leader’s birthday today, and because I don’t want him to retaliate, I’m not going to mention which birthday it is, but I want to congratulate him and wish him the very best. We’ll have a birthday colloquy today.

I thank him for his leadership, and I yield to him to explain our schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my friend from Maryland, for those kind birthday wishes.

Yes, it is my 50th birthday. I’ve been saying all day that my wife, Diana, and I are empty nesters now, so it’s about time I’m 50. But I do thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentleman that I’ll be glad to take him up on a kinder and gentler colloquy for the birthday.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet in pro forma session at 3 p.m., and no votes are expected. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and at 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and at noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

□ 1120

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few bills under suspension of the rules, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business tomorrow. In addition, the House will consider H.R. 1910, the National Defense Authorization Act. Chairman BUCK McKEON and his committee once again will bring a bipartisan bill to the floor to ensure that our men and women in the armed services have the tools and resources necessary to protect the freedoms that all of us enjoy here at home.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

We have started the appropriations process. We did two bills this week. They were relatively bipartisan in nature.

I regret, of course, the adoption of the King amendment, which we thought was a very bad policy. It precluded us from voting for a bill that we otherwise would have voted for and that we failed to reach bipartisan agreement. I think there were some on your side who did not want the King amendment offered which precludes any discretion for prosecutors, which I think is bad as general policy and certainly bad as it relates to the DREAM-ers.

I would hope that as we move forward on the appropriation bills, that we would be able to do those as we did the Military Construction, Veteran Affairs, and Related Agencies bill on which we passed on an almost overwhelming vote on both sides of the aisle.

One of the problems, Mr. Leader, is going to be the amount of dollars that have been made available to the nine remaining bills—perhaps Agriculture—so the eight remaining bills after we do MilCon and Homeland Security, which essentially were done at the agreed-upon levels of the Budget Control Act, similar to what the Senate is marking their bills to. I'm not sure what the defense number is going to be, but our fear and concern is that these bills will be marked so that substantial dollars that would otherwise have been available to other subcommittees will not be available because, in effect, we front-loaded spending on the first three bills.

The Ryan budget, as the gentleman knows, is almost \$100 billion less than the agreement of August 2011 on how much dollars would be available for priorities on the discretionary side of our budget.

Can the gentleman give me any information with reference to whether or not we may still be going to a budget conference where we perhaps could reach elimination of the sequester and a new number that could be agreed upon between the Senate and the House, as we always have to do? Whether there's a budget or not, we have to agree on the numbers. We are

about \$100 billion apart, and that has to be overcome if we're going to pass bills.

Can the gentleman give me any thoughts on whether or not we're going to go to conference? There is nothing on the schedule for a motion to go to conference or appointment of conferees.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I understand his concerns.

I think all of us have concerns about the way spending reductions are implemented under sequester. As the gentleman knows, we in the majority have continued to try and advocate. We've put proposals forward to accomplish the spending reductions and reforms in a smarter way. I think both of us, Mr. Speaker, would agree there are much smarter ways for that to happen.

Unfortunately, it is the law. In fact, again, the House has posited its formula for better reductions in spending. The White House and Senate refused to go along. So sequester is the law. As the gentleman knows, 302(b)s are set according to the post-sequester numbers, and that is our intention, Mr. Speaker, to abide by the law with the sequester in place.

I would respond to the gentleman's inquiry about budget conference, and the gentleman knows, as I've said before, Chairman RYAN stands ready to work with Senator MURRAY on drawing an outline and structure for the way a conference would proceed. Unfortunately, there can be even no discussion on that point because there is an insistence on the part of the Senate and the White House that any budget conference discussion include a discussion of tax increases. We have said repeatedly that we can't be raising taxes every other month, every 6 months in this town. There was a significant increase in taxes, an impact on working Americans this year because of the fiscal cliff. We remain committed to addressing the problems of the budget, but will not do so while there is an insistence that a prerequisite is raising taxes.

Mr. HOYER. In other words, I think the gentleman is saying there is not going to be a conference because there is disagreement on what the result of that conference will be? Is that what I'm hearing you say?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I will respond to the gentleman that we would like to have agreement that we can begin discussions of a fiscally sane path to balancing our budget.

As the gentleman knows, Mr. Speaker, our conference has made its stand saying we want to balance the budget, we want to promote spending reductions and reforms that get us there in 10 years. In that vein, we would like to see that it's not punishing the American taxpayer the way that we get there, as far as the budgeteers are concerned here in Washington, that it's

from growing our economy and from reforming the kinds of things that are necessary to take care of those unfunded liabilities at the Federal level.

Mr. HOYER. I would say that we have indicated on a number of occasions that we would love to see some growing-the-economy legislation on the floor, jobs bills on the floor, bills that the administration and Republicans and economists on both sides say would grow the economy. We haven't seen those, and we're concerned about that.

First of all, let me make the observation that we don't believe the first three bills that you're bringing out—you've brought out two defense bills—are being brought out at the Ryan-budget levels. In fact, they're being brought out substantially above the Ryan-budget levels, if, in fact, you perceived equal distribution under 302(b) of the allocations of discretionary money.

We don't share your view that the two bills we voted on—the two bills we voted on, frankly, have been at the Senate level, essentially, which is why they were relatively bipartisan. Not only was it at the Senate level, but it was at the level we agreed to in 2011, and August of 2011 would, in fact, be the discretionary number for fiscal year 2014.

There's not anything on the schedule with reference to the debt limit. As the gentleman knows, the debt limit was extended until May 19. That is now 3 weeks past, and we have not dealt with the debt limit.

Can the gentleman tell me whether there is any plan to deal with the debt limit extension, which the gentleman and I agree must be done if we're not going to destabilize the economy and grow the economy?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

To his first point about jobs bills, Mr. Speaker, we have remained committed in the House, as the majority, to doing all we can to help every American in terms of a brighter future, and that is a path to a better job, better career.

We brought forward the SKILLS Act, something that is a bipartisan commitment and should have been a lot more so on this floor in trying to streamline workforce training programs to help those who are unemployed.

We want to help the unemployed get into a job. The Federal workforce training program is a mess. There are 50 programs. It is very difficult for unemployed people to get the training and skills they need to get a job. Unfortunately, that wasn't met with a lot of bipartisan reception.

Secondly, we just voted on the Keystone XL pipeline bill, a known proposal to create tens of thousands of jobs, much less contribute to America's energy security and independence, as well as competitiveness, which means more jobs and more capital flowing into America.

We also passed, without any bipartisan support, the Working Families Flexibility Act, looking to those struggling moms and dads who are working, the fact that 50 percent of our workforce comes from dual-income households, many of them with kids.

□ 1130

The Working Families Flexibility Act, it addressed the very struggles that working families have in trying to make their life work. We couldn't get bipartisan support on that. And then I would say to the gentleman, we remain committed to making the future brighter through offering more opportunity to all people.

Our solutions, that come from conservatives in the House majority, we believe our solutions can work for everyone. The gentleman knows—he and I have met on his Make It In America agenda—there are things that we have in common, but, unfortunately, we can't see a way to having bipartisan votes. So I remain committed to working with the gentleman on his agenda, and I know the spirit in which he approaches his obligations to his constituents and his caucus, and know that we hopefully can get back on track towards that end.

Now, towards the question, secondly, about budget levels and writing the bills, I would say to the gentleman that we have drafted the appropriations bills, marked them up, along with his caucus, and I would say that they reflect our priorities. Obviously, our priorities are going to differ from the Members on his side. The trick is to try and see where we can work towards a commonality.

And lastly, to the debt limit, yes, we remain very concerned about that. Hopefully, we can all work together and come up with a way that we can adopt a plan that will manage down the debt and deficit and allow us to reach a balance in the Federal level within 10 years, enacting the necessary reforms to the programs that we know are disproportionately causing the deficit without disproportionately continuing to hit the discretionary side, when we know the mandatory side provides most of the impetus for growth.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I would say that he mentioned two bills with reference to jobs—the SKILLS Act. Unfortunately, the SKILLS Act suffered from the same thing that the Homeland Security Act just today suffered from, as the gentleman knows. Contrary to what we could have done on a bipartisan basis in the SKILLS Act, diversity, a small number was inserted into that bill, reducing diversity visas to this country, which was highly offensive to many, many Americans who saw that as a direct attack on their ability to get family members to come to this country, particularly from Africa and the Caribbean. It was well known on your side that if that was put in, it was going to

undermine our ability to have a bipartisan agreement.

The same thing occurred with Homeland Security. The gentleman knew full well that the inclusion of the King amendment, which we felt was a very negative amendment and put Dreamers in particular at risk, but whether or not that was the case, it undermines very, very substantially—excuse me, I was incorrect. Staff corrects me, it was the STEM bill that I was talking about. You did not mention that bill. But the point is the same: in moving ahead on a bipartisan fashion, the committee did come out with a bipartisan bill on Homeland Security, you're absolutely correct. And Mr. PRICE, the ranking member, was prepared to vote for that. He was going to urge the caucus to vote for it, and we were going to vote for it until, with very few exceptions, your caucus, your side of the aisle, voted overwhelmingly to put in a piece, an amendment, which you knew would undermine the bipartisanship that had been arrived at by the committee. That's unfortunate.

The gentleman, ironically from our perspective, I tell my friend with great respect, we think that the Family Flexibility Act was the Family Income Reduction Act. We think what it said to an awful lot of working people: you're not going to get paid overtime. If your colleague will work for free and get comp time at some point in time that the employer decides, we're not going to pay overtime. So you're right, we respectfully disagree. As I said, we think that was the Family Income Reduction Act. Families are already struggling. Middle-income families' income has been stuck in the mud, and we think that exacerbated it further. And, very frankly, as the gentleman knows, that was a bill that was offered some years ago with very substantial opposition and didn't become law, as this one is not going to become law.

But in any event, let me close with this question. There are three bills which are being marked up. Maybe Ag was marked up or is going to be marked up soon. Does the gentleman expect that all 12 appropriations bills will be brought to the floor? He talks about priorities. Our priorities are different, although ironically, the gentleman has expressed in his memos and in his agenda that he has announced a desire to focus research on biomedical research to keep Americans healthier, children and others. Ironically, the 302(b) that he talked about earlier suggests, to be exact, a 26.5 percent cut in the bill that funds NIH. That's going to result in a very substantial reduction in basic biomedical research at NIH, and the leaders at NIH have made that very clear that not only that bill but the present sequester is undermining their ability to conduct biomedical research. I know the gentleman feels strongly about that, as I do. Let me ask him: Do you think that bill will be brought to the floor? It was not brought even to the full committee last

year, much less to the floor. Therefore, no one had the opportunity to have a vote on those priorities. Can the gentleman tell me whether he thinks those nine remaining bills will be brought to the floor?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, it is our intent to continue to work through the appropriations process and bring all the bills to the floor, that's correct.

I would say furthermore to the gentleman, as far as the impact of the sequester and 302(b)s on a specific bill versus a piece of that bill, meaning the NIH research piece, as the gentleman knows, legislating, especially in times of fiscal stress, is about prioritizing.

The gentleman correctly states that I'm very much in favor of making a priority out of Federal research and development. I'm convinced that basic research is needed to allow us to continue to advance the breakthroughs in science that not only help heal people and cure disease, but ultimately can help us bring down health care costs, which is the number one issue that's aggravating our deficit.

So I'm glad to hear the gentleman shares that priority. I know he does. But it doesn't mean necessarily that because we are going to commit ourselves to balancing this budget that we cannot share that priority. I hope the gentleman can share with us the import of that priority and support what it is that we're trying to do in the area of research, making sure that we can reduce other lesser priorities in spending.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. I look forward to seeing the Labor-Health bill on the floor and seeing how he comes to those priorities because I think it is very important.

Before I close—and I think he has left the floor—but I do want to mention that today is the day on which JOHN DINGELL of Michigan becomes the longest-serving Member of Congress in the history of the Congress, since 1789. He is one of the great legislators with whom many of us have served, and I know that next week we will be having an opportunity on the floor to have all Members, or many Members, participate in recognizing his service.

My staff tells me maybe we're going to do it tomorrow and not next week, but most Members will be here next week, and I expect that they'll be saying something at that time as well.

□ 1140

I know the majority leader joins me in congratulating our colleague and our friend, JOHN DINGELL, on his extraordinary service to not only the Congress of the United States, but to the American people.

Mr. CANTOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CANTOR. I would just join the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, in congratulating Mr. DINGELL for an incredible,

first of all, milestone, and know he will continue in that service to the people of the great State of Michigan.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 10, 2013

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 3 p.m. on Monday, June 10, 2013.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. RES. 43

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.J. Res. 43. My name was incorrectly added to the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

THE FARM BILL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about a bill that's going to be on the House floor here in a couple of weeks. It should be certainly of interest to every man, woman, and child in this country because we all shake hands with a farmer at least three times a day—breakfast, lunch, and dinner.

And also it's relevant to my home State, the Keystone State of Pennsylvania, as agriculture is the number one industry in Pennsylvania. Some folks would be surprised to hear that.

But the fact is we'll have the farm bill before us. I'm proud to be a member of the Agriculture Committee. We have worked long and hard on this farm bill. We've made some great improvements.

We've eliminated many of the subsidies that have kind of clouded the farm bill, in my opinion, for decades; and we've moved towards a more free-market, risk-management approach, protecting our farmers, providing them some access to crop insurance and a dairy margin insurance to protect against the weather.

Agriculture is probably one of the most vulnerable parts, vulnerable industries, when it comes to all extremes of weather.

The farm bill also, I'm proud to say, ensures that every man, woman, and child in this country will have access to nutrition, every income-eligible man, woman, and child, because it also, the House version, ensures some reforms to stop the fraud and abuse that has run rampant with the farm bill.

So I encourage my colleagues to support the farm bill when it comes to the floor in the weeks ahead.

EQUAL PAY ACT ANNIVERSARY

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to join many of my colleagues who came to the floor yesterday to recognize that this coming Monday, June 10, is the 50th anniversary of the Equal Pay Act being signed into law.

With that said, even after 50 years, we're still waging the same battle for women. The historic anniversary is a reminder that there's much work to be done to close the wage gap.

Equal pay for equal work is about fairness for women and families and dollars and common sense. For working mothers who have to put food on the table, and the retired women whose income is tied to their former salary, the wage gap means real dollars.

In south Florida, if the wage gap were eliminated, a working woman would have enough money for 51 more weeks of food, 3 months of mortgage and utility payments, or 5 months of rent, or more than 1,600 additional gallons of gas.

Mr. Speaker, whether you serve customers in a local retail store, or argue cases before the highest court, you have a right to be treated with fairness and dignity.

THEY WERE SOLDIERS ONCE— JUNE 6, 1944

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the seas were high and seasickness was rampant. The sky was gloomy and dark, and the rain was blindingly hard. The sun was hidden from the beaches below as 63,000 GIs, with thousands of our allies, stormed landing sites called Utah, Omaha, Gold, and Juno.

The average age of the American soldier was 20; 2,500 of them died on the first day. It was June 6, 1944. It was D-day in World War II. It was a noble cause: free Europe from the Nazis.

But today, the bootprints, the red crimson beaches of blood of the U.S. soldier are gone. The sea is calm, peaceful, as if it never happened.

But at the top of the cliffs of Normandy, France, 9,387 white glistening crosses and Stars of David of the American fallen shine as an eternal memory that here on this spot the Americans fought and gave all.

They came. They died. They liberated. We remember they were soldiers once, for the worst casualty of war is to be forgotten.

And that's just the way it is.

SUPPORTING YOUNG DREAMERS

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of young DREAMers: young people brought as children without proper documentation to this country; young people willing to work hard to share in the American Dream; young people who have so much to offer America.

Today, 220 House Republicans said "no" to their dream by voting to terminate the program that allows them to stay legally. These Republicans, by their votes, said "no" to an essential element of comprehensive immigration reform at the very time the Senate is about to take up that measure.

To those Republicans who say, "No, we can't," we need more and more Americans who insist, "Yes, we can." When we harness the energy of these youth, when we reform our immigration laws in a comprehensive way, we will create an America as good as their dream.

NATIONAL CANCER SURVIVOR DAY

(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, on Sunday, many families across Minnesota and across the country took the time to recognize National Cancer Survivor Day.

Last year, more than 28,000 Minnesotans were diagnosed with cancer. And while there's hardly anyone who doesn't know a loved one or friend who has suffered from cancer, the good news is that 13.7 million Americans have won their battle against this terrible disease.

One great Twin Cities organization working to ensure that those struggling with cancer do not face it alone is the new Gilda's Club that opened up in Minnetonka, Minnesota, recently.

The American Cancer Society is now setting aggressive goals for the reduction of cancer. Prevention and early detection are key to reaching these goals.

Thanks to advances in medical innovation, it's estimated that over the next 10 years, millions more Americans will have a chance at life after cancer.

Mr. Speaker, let's celebrate with those who have won their fight, as they offer hope that all cancer patients may someday be able to proudly say that they too are cancer survivors.

□ 1150

2013 GRADUATES

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Some years ago, many of us heard of a tsunami. As we approach this weekend of congratulating our wonderful graduates, we