

is a strong possibility that North Korea kidnapped the American": Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its ongoing concern about the disappearance of David Louis Sneddon in Yunnan Province, People's Republic of China, in August, 2004;

(2) encourages the Department of State and the intelligence community to jointly continue investigations and to consider all plausible explanations for David's disappearance, including the possibility of abduction by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea;

(3) urges the Department of State and the intelligence community to coordinate investigations with the Governments of the People's Republic of China, Japan, and South Korea and solicit information from appropriate regional affairs and law enforcement experts on plausible explanations for David's disappearance;

(4) encourages the Department of State to work with foreign governments known to have diplomatic influence with the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea;

(5) encourages the intelligence community to assess the possibility of the involvement of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in David Sneddon's disappearance and to possibly seek his recovery; and

(6) requests that the Department of State and the intelligence community continue to work with and inform Congress and the family of David Sneddon on efforts to possibly recover David and to resolve his disappearance.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the attached letters between myself and the Chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence regarding House Concurrent Resolution 891, expressing concern over the disappearance of David Sneddon, and for other purposes.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,

Washington, DC, September 27, 2016.

Hon. ED ROYCE,

Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: On September 26, 2016, H. Res. 891, "Expressing concern over the disappearance of David Sneddon, and for other purposes," was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition, to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

In order to expedite the House's consideration of the resolution, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence will forego consideration of the measure. This courtesy is, however, conditioned on our mutual understanding and agreement that it will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Permanent Select Committee with respect to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matter contained in the resolution or any similar measure.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding and would request that you include a copy of this letter in any committee report for the resolution and in the Congressional Record during its floor consideration. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DEVIN NUNES,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,  
Washington, DC, September 27, 2016.

Hon. DEVIN NUNES,

Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H. Res. 891, a resolution expressing concern over the disappearance of David Sneddon, and for other purposes, and for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of that resolution.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your Committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this measure or similar legislation in the future.

I will seek to place our letters on H. Res. 891 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with your Committee as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,  
Chairman.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to submit statements or extraneous materials for the RECORD on House Resolution 891.

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

There was no objection.

#### REGULATORY RELIEF FOR SMALL BUSINESSES, SCHOOLS, AND NONPROFITS ACT

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 897, I call up the bill (H.R. 6094) to provide for a 6-month delay in the effective date of a rule of the Department of Labor relating to income thresholds for determining overtime pay for executive, administrative, professional, outside sales, and computer employees, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 897, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6094

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Regulatory Relief for Small Businesses, Schools, and Nonprofits Act".

#### SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE OF RULE.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Notwithstanding the effective date set forth in the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to exemptions regarding the rates of pay for executive, administrative, professional, outside sales, and computer employees (81 Fed. Reg. 32552 (May 23, 2016)), such rule shall not take effect until June 1, 2017.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to provide authority for the rule described in subsection (a), nor any part thereof, that is not otherwise provided by law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 6094.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 6094, the Regulatory Relief for Small Businesses, Schools, and Nonprofits Act. I am proud to introduce this legislation to provide small businesses, colleges, universities, and nonprofit organizations much needed relief from a fundamentally flawed rule that will do more harm than good. It is unfortunate this legislation is necessary in the first place.

For over 2 years, Republicans have urged the Department to update our Nation's overtime rules responsibly. These rules serve as important protections for American workers, but the existing regulatory structure is extremely outdated and complex. The Department should have used this opportunity to modernize overtime rules for the 21st century workforce.

They should have listened to the countless small-business owners, heads of nonprofit organizations, State and local leaders, and college and university administrators who warned that an extreme and partisan rule would lead to harmful consequences. But the Department failed to take a balanced approach and refused to listen. Instead, they stuck by a Washington-knows-best mentality and finalized a rule that was exactly what so many hardworking men and women had feared.

The rule doubles the salary threshold for overtime eligibility and requires further automatic increases every 3 years. And then, to make matters worse, the Department even kept in place the same old regulatory maze that has existed for decades.

As the administration pats itself on the back and rushes to implement a rule in just a few short months, those who will face the real world consequences are scrambling to meet the unrealistic December 1 deadline.

Ernie Macewen, a South Rockwood small-business owner in my district,

said he already opted to hire one less employee this year in anticipation of the rule. He said he has heard from other small-business owners who don't even know the rule exists.

Karen Richard, who owns Culver's restaurants in Ann Arbor and Jackson, is worried the rule will limit opportunities for the young people she employs.

Adrian College is trying to make tough decisions that could impact tuition and services for students, and the time crunch is making the process even more challenging.

Bethany Christian Services in Grand Rapids is concerned the rule will undermine support for children in need.

These stories aren't unique to Michigan. These are the types of stories that are unfolding across the country, yet the administration continues to quickly move toward the December 1 implementation date in total disregard for the challenges facing the small businesses, schools, and nonprofit organizations serving our communities.

Mr. Speaker, the administration should abandon this rule before it limits opportunities for workers, hurts young people striving for an affordable education, burdens hardworking small-business owners, and jeopardizes vital services for vulnerable Americans.

It is time to go back to the drawing board and work toward the balanced, responsible approach we have been fighting for from the start.

Time is running out. The administration and Members of Congress should do the right thing and provide more time to those struggling to implement this rule before an arbitrary and unrealistic deadline. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation and to help deliver the relief small businesses, schools, and nonprofits in each and every one of our districts so desperately need.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to H.R. 6094, the inappropriately named Regulatory Relief for Small Businesses, Schools, and Nonprofits Act.

First of all, it is not limited to those. It is for all employers. It would delay the implementation of the overtime rule for 6 months. The rule is currently slated to go into effect on December 1, and working families can't wait another 6 months for a long-overdue adjustment in the overtime rule.

We ought to talk a little bit about what we are talking about. If today you are earning \$10 an hour, if you work more than 40 hours a week, you get time-and-a-half for every hour worked over 40. And if they change that to the same amount, instead of \$10 an hour, \$20,000 a year, you still get time-and-a-half for overtime after 40 hours because your salary is under the approximately \$23,000 threshold.

□ 1830

If you make \$15 an hour, you get time-and-a-half for over 40 hours; but if they change that and call it \$30,000 a year, the hours you work over 40 you not only don't get time-and-a-half, you don't get paid at all. You just worked extra hours because you are over the threshold.

Now, when the threshold was established many years ago, 60 percent of salaried workers were covered by the overtime rule. They were under the threshold and got overtime. But because it wasn't adjusted for inflation, it is now only about 7 percent of salaried workers who get overtime protection. The Department of Labor overtime rule will increase that threshold up to about \$47,000, and this would cover about only 35 percent of salaried workers, but this would still enable millions of Americans to be compensated for work over 40 hours.

Mr. Speaker, the 40-hour workweek used to be the standard workweek, but with this new rule, more workers will benefit from the overtime rule and be able to get time-and-a-half for hours worked over 40 hours. We have heard this is too quick. When the last adjustment was made, under a Republican President, only 4 months were provided to adjust. This rule allowed 6 months. Furthermore, the administration has been working on this for 2 years, so employers have known it was coming.

Now, we will hear exaggerated reports about the impact on universities. Studies have shown that only a few people will be actually affected by the rule, and of those, only a few people will actually routinely work overtime. So the total of those affected and routinely work overtime is about 1 percent of the university employees. Their salary may go up a little bit or they may be only worked 40 hours, in which case there is no adjustment needed. Either way, you are only talking about a small portion of the salary of 1 percent. That is not going to bankrupt universities.

The nonprofits, the same thing, about 1 percent of the employees both routinely work overtime and are affected. Their salary may or may not go up, depending on how you respond because a lot of times you will just make sure that people don't work more than 40 hours a week. They can go home to their families rather than be worked hour after hour after hour.

We have also heard an exaggeration about how it will affect jobs, people will have to lay people off. Actually, one study showed that you will actually create jobs, about 100,000 jobs over the economy, because if an employer has 120 hours that need to be worked, and he is working two people 60 hours a week without paying for the extra hours, with this rule, he may be paying them time-and-a-half, and it may make more sense to hire a third person; so three people work 40 hours a week. That would create, as I said, about 100,000 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would unnecessarily delay fair pay to millions of workers. The President, thankfully, has said that if this bill ever sees his desk, he will veto it. We can remove that uncertainty just by defeating the bill here and now.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, a man who we will all miss next year, the wisdom, the leadership, the success that he has brought to this committee, a man who understands that we work together, but sometimes we press forward to do the right thing.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his tremendous leadership on this issue and so many more.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 6094.

In 2014, the Department of Labor began an effort to update Federal overtime rules. There would have been strong bipartisan support for that effort if the Department had pursued a responsible approach. In fact, we have spent years engaging in this issue because we believe Federal overtime rules need to be modernized, both to strengthen protections for workers and to provide more clarity and certainty for employers.

Unfortunately, the Department took a different approach and finalized an extreme rule that will hurt those it is supposed to help. As we have heard from witnesses at hearings and constituents back home, the rule will leave individuals with less flexibility at work and fewer opportunities to further their careers or pursue jobs they want or truly need. We have also learned that the rule will make college less affordable and make it more difficult for charitable organizations to serve people in need.

The purpose of the legislation we are considering today is to provide some relief—even if temporary—to those who will be harmed the most: men and women working hard to grow their own businesses and employees trying to provide a better life for their families, students pursuing the dream of a higher education, and countless Americans relying on nonprofits for help and support.

It took the Obama administration more than 2 years—27 months—to complete this rule, but they have given the American people just 6 months to make the difficult choices necessary to implement it. According to one report, almost half—49 percent—of small businesses aren't even aware the new rule exists. Imagine how many schools and nonprofits are in the same position.

This legislation will give these men and women more time to implement the rule and help mitigate its impact on students, workers, and vulnerable individuals. But the clock is ticking. Important decisions about payroll and

staffing have to be made and quickly. If we fail to act now, it may be too late.

I want to thank Mr. WALBERG for introducing this important legislation and for his continued leadership in championing efforts to responsibly—update Federal overtime rules. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to acknowledge the retirement of the Chair. I have only been ranking member for this Congress, but we have been able to work together constructively for elementary and secondary education, juvenile justice, career and technical education, Older Americans Act, several higher education bills, all working constructively together. I want to thank the gentleman for his cooperative spirit. We agree on a lot and we are able to work forward. We disagree, as we are on this bill, but we are able to do that in a dignified way and still be able to accomplish a great deal during this Congress. I want to congratulate him on a great career.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member SCOTT.

As ranking member of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections on the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, I rise to voice my strong opposition to H.R. 6094, which would delay the overtime rule. It is not fair that the men and women teetering on the brink of poverty, people making \$23,660 a year, are asked to work 50, 60, or 70 hours a week with no promise of extra pay. It is not fair that millions of mothers and fathers who are forced to work long hours each week find it almost impossible to give their children the time and attention they deserve, yet they are still deprived of the overtime pay that could lead to the economic security of their families.

The Department's overtime rule will extend long-awaited wage protections to nearly 4.2 million Americans, including 331,000 Floridians. I applaud the Department and the administration for their continued commitment to combating the wage stagnation that has left far too many Floridians working more hours for less pay. My hardworking constituents and Americans across this country deserve a fair day's pay for a fair day's work.

This overtime rule makes us one step closer to this goal. Small-business owners, nonprofits, and higher education institutions have options for complying with this rule, which would not impose any additional cost. Let's make that clear. H.R. 6094 will take \$600 million out of the pockets of 4.2 million American workers who would have gained overtime protections on December 1. This is \$600 million they will never see. That means, for example,

that workers will have less money to spend on their families and their futures.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, we are required to serve the will of the people, and millions of working class people want and need this rule now. Polls show that 76 percent of voters say they support the rule. We must do what is best for the American people by ensuring that all Americans are paid a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. I remain steadfast in my commitment to strengthening the wage and hour protections that Americans deserve. It is critical that the overtime rule goes into effect without any changes on December 1, 2016.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, and my good friend.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

I rise today in support of H.R. 6094, the Regulatory Relief for Small Businesses, Schools, and Nonprofits Act, a much-needed piece of legislation that will delay the Department of Labor's misguided proposed overtime rule.

The annual wage in my home State of Tennessee is \$41,300. In my district, the median household income is even lower, \$39,000. The Department's proposed threshold for overtime is \$47,000. That means that well over half the households in my district could be impacted by this ruling.

My question to the Department of Labor is: If over half the workers in an area will be affected by a regulation, where will the money come from?

The government might be able to print money, but if a local mom-and-pop business back home in my district started doing that, it is a felony, and the Secret Service won't be stopping by just to say hello.

The answer is fairly obvious to anyone who has run a business or had to meet a payroll. To comply with the regulation, fewer full-time employees will be hired, and workers will be strictly limited in their hours. While the regulation may give a few employees a pay raise, for many other employees it will result in fewer opportunities and unemployment.

We all want to see wages go up and the economy recover like it has in the past, but that happens by decreasing the number of oppressive regulations to stimulate job creation and business growth, not by adding yet another layer of regulation that could put small companies and nonprofits across my district out of business or cause them to cut back workers' hours and change salaried employees to hourly.

Additionally, if this rule is finalized, the colleges in my district will be af-

ected to the tune of between \$1 million and \$9 million annually, which will only end up raising the price of education, which is already too high.

I want to say in closing that I am an Eagle Scout and very proud to be one. As you may know, the motto of the Scouts is: Be Prepared.

Unfortunately, for groups like the Boy Scouts of America that rely on donations, there is no way that they could be prepared to pay all their employees \$47,476 or more and continue operating. This proposed rule will do nothing but hurt an already ailing economy and force groups like the Boy Scouts to cut back on their operation that helps kids, rich and poor, come together and learn skills they need to be a productive member of society when they grow up.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and a hardworking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from Virginia, the ranking member, Mr. SCOTT, for his leadership on this issue.

I am here to express my strong opposition to H.R. 6094. Prior to the Department of Labor taking action this year, the rules governing overtime were woefully out of date. In 1975, 60 percent of salaried workers had access to overtime protections. Four decades later, that number was just 8 percent. The result is that millions of American workers were denied a fair day's pay for a fair day's work for far too long.

On numerous occasions, my colleagues across the aisle have conceded that the threshold should be increased, but they say that this increase is too much too soon.

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, an incremental change would have been appropriate three decades ago. Now we need bold action to restore overtime protections for middle class workers.

□ 1845

I find it ironic that this bill is called the Regulatory Relief for Small Businesses, Schools, and Nonprofits Act. After decades of long hours and low pay, it is working families that need relief. This bill takes money out of the pockets of middle class Americans right before the holiday season. In reality, this bill should be called the Grinch Act.

The overtime rule will ensure that 4.2 million Americans will have access to overtime protections. An additional 8.9 million workers will see their overtime protections strengthened. These middle class workers will either get an increase in pay or more time to spend with their families or both. This is plainly one of the most significant steps we can take to support the middle class.

I am not blind to the concerns of the business communities. I have heard from small businesses, institutions of higher education, and nonprofit organizations in my own district who are worried about the impact this rule will have on their bottom lines; but the truth is, while this rule is a big deal for workers, it will not have a significant consequence for businesses. The Department of Labor estimates that the total cost of the rule will amount to less than one-tenth of 1 percent of total U.S. payroll costs. I repeat that: less than one-tenth of 1 percent of total U.S. payroll costs.

Among workers affected by the rule, only one in five regularly work overtime. At universities and colleges, employees whose primary duties are teaching, lecturing, or instructing are exempt from overtime coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Only 3.4 percent of all employees in colleges, universities, and junior colleges will be affected by this rule. Only 0.5 percent of those workers usually work overtime.

And who are these workers? They are the people peeling potatoes in the dining hall, they are the landscapers cutting grass in the quad, and they are the sporting equipment managers who work in multimillion-dollar athletic facilities, but can barely afford to support their families. They deserve to be paid for the hours they work.

Employers have inexpensive options for complying with this rule. For example, they can work with their teams to ensure that their employees are only working 40 hours a week, preventing overwork, as the Fair Labor Standards Act intended.

Yes, we have heard concerns about the overtime rule from the business community, but we have also heard their support. Ranking Member SCOTT and Chairman KLINE received a letter from the American Sustainable Business Council urging Congress to support a full implementation deadline of December 1, 2016. These businesses believe that any delay would be unduly burdensome, as businesses have been preparing for the rule to go into effect this year.

We have also received support from the nonprofits. I will include in the RECORD two letters to the Department of Labor offering support for the rule during the rulemaking process: one with nearly two dozen nonprofits, and another letter with roughly 140 organizations supporting the final rule.

SEPTEMBER 4, 2015.

Re Comments in Support of DOL's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Defining and Delimiting the Exemptions for Executive, Administrative, Professional, Outside Sales and Computer Employees under the Fair Labor Standards Act, RIN 1235-AA11.

MARY ZIEGLER,

*Director, Division of Regulations, Legislation and Interpretation, Wage and Hour Division, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MS. ZIEGLER: The undersigned are all non-profit organizations that provide direct

services to low-income, marginalized, under-represented, or otherwise disadvantaged communities of people. We all labor under tight budgets as well as a demand for our services that far outstrips what we could ever hope to provide.

We are writing in full support of DOL's efforts to update the Executive, Administrative and Professional (EAP) exemptions to overtime coverage. These are rules which will greatly benefit the vulnerable communities we all strive to serve. Once they are in effect, our clients will see one of three results, all of which are overwhelmingly positive: (1) many will work fewer hours for no less pay, either affording them more time with their families and children, or freeing them up to find a second paying job, so that they can better make ends meet; (2) others will receive more compensation in their current jobs, in the form of overtime pay; and (3) the many unemployed and under-employed people we serve will have new opportunities for jobs or extra hours at their current jobs once the extra hours now worked for free, are spread out among other workers.

While we recognize that our organizations may well have to reclassify some of our own workforce, we welcome the challenge. Just as we do not want our clients to labor under abusive situations, so too must we consider how to best and most humanely use our own human resources. Our management teams welcome the opportunity this will provide to examine the work we are doing, how we are doing it, and look for efficiencies where we can, prioritize our work better, and ensure that our own staff have the same overtime protections that we want for our clients. The justice we seek for our clients in the world must also exist within our own organizations.

The proposed updates to the EAP exemptions are long over-due and we applaud the Department of Labor for taking the necessary steps to make the overtime laws of this country meaningful again.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments.

Sincerely,

CASA  
The Arc of Northern Virginia  
Casa Latina  
Center for Worker Justice  
Community Service Society  
Council on American-Islamic Relations  
Employment Justice Center  
First Shift Justice Project  
Florida Immigrant Coalition  
Maryland Legal Aid  
Massachusetts Coalition for Occupational Safety and Health (MassCOSH)  
Massachusetts Immigrant and Refugee Advocacy Coalition  
North Carolina Justice Center  
Northwest Arkansas Workers' Justice Center  
Public Justice Center  
Restaurant Opportunities Centers United  
Root & Rebound: Reentry Advocates  
Rubicon Programs  
Safer Foundation  
Urban Justice Center  
Worker Justice Center of New York  
YWCA USA.

ECONOMIC POLICY INSTITUTE,  
*Washington, DC.*

NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR'S NEW OVERTIME REGULATIONS

We, the undersigned nonprofit organizations, write in support of the Department of Labor's new overtime regulations. The updated overtime rule is a great victory for working people across the United States.

In its recently announced final regulation, the Department of Labor raised the salary

threshold below which most workers are eligible for overtime pay from \$23,660 to \$47,476. This change will create hundreds of thousands of jobs, extend overtime protections to millions of workers, reduce excessive hours of unpaid work by underpaid employees, and increase salaries for employees earning near the new threshold. In particular, this rule represents an important step toward fairer pay for women and people of color, who are overrepresented in lower-paying jobs and are often required to work additional hours without compensation.

We recognize that many nonprofit organizations will have to think through and solve interesting problems and will face challenges as we make the changes needed to comply with the new regulations. These important changes will not necessarily be easy. Nonetheless, we embrace this opportunity to restore the overtime pay that lower-paid workers toiling more than 40 hours a week are entitled to.

For many nonprofits, including those of us that provide human services or advocate for workers' rights, poverty reduction, or economic and social justice, this is a critical opportunity to improve the working conditions and the economic lives of the people we serve. At the same time, our own workers and the families they support also deserve fair compensation and greater economic security.

As nonprofit organizations more broadly, we are dedicated to improving the public good. It is time to revisit the idea that working for the public good should somehow mean requiring the lowest-paid among us to support these efforts by working long hours, many of which are unpaid.

All of the undersigned nonprofit organizations are committed to complying with the new overtime regulations. We commend the Department of Labor for this significant reform, which will create better jobs and working conditions for millions of working people throughout the country. We support this historic social justice reform.

Signed,

21st Century School Fund; 9to5, National Association of Working Women; 9to5 California; 9to5 Colorado; 9to5 Georgia; 9to5 Wisconsin; A Better Balance; ActBlue; Advocates for Youth; African American Ministers In Action; Agenda Project Action Fund; Alaska People's Action; American Association of University Women; American Family Voices; American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME); American Federation of Teachers; Americans for Democratic Action (ADA); Anti-Poverty Network of New Jersey.

Ariva; Asian Counseling and Referral Service; Atlanta Women for Equality; Avodah; The Battle of Homestead Foundation; Benedictine Sisters of Baltimore; Bend the Arc Jewish Action; Black Children's Institute of Tennessee; Brevard NOW; Bus Federation; Campaign for America's Future; CASA; Catalyst Miami; Center for American Progress; Center for Community Change; Center for Economic and Policy Research; Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP); Center for Popular Democracy; Center for Women Policy Studies; Center for WorkLife Law; Center on Policy Initiatives.

The Century Foundation; Children's Law Center (District of Columbia); Class Action; Clergy and Laity United for Economic Justice (CLUE); Clerics of St. Viator (Viatorians); ClimateTruth.org; Coalition on Human Needs; Colorado Fiscal Institute; Colorado Organization for Latina Opportunity and Reproductive Rights (COLOR); Community, Faith and Labor Coalition; Community Forum for Economic Justice; Connecticut

Citizen Action Group (CCAG); Courage Campaign; Delaware Alliance for Community Advancement; Democratic Socialists of America; Democratic Women's Club of Florida; Democracy for America; Demos.

Economic Opportunity Institute; Economic Policy Institute; Elizabeth Coalition to House the Homeless; Emerge Colorado; End Hunger CT; Fair Budget Coalition; Fair World Project; Family Values @ Work; First Shift Justice Project; FRESC: Good Jobs, Strong Communities; Generation Progress; God's Will In Action; Gospel Justice Committee; Greater New York Labor-Religion Coalition; Greater Orlando NOW; HEAL; Human Services Council of New York; Illinois Economic Policy Institute.

Indiana Community Action Association; Indiana Institute for Working Families; Innovation Ohio Education Fund; Institute for Science and Human Values, Inc; Interfaith Worker Justice; Interfaith Center for Worker Justice of San Diego County; Interfaith Coalition for Worker Justice; International Brotherhood of Teamsters; Iowa Coalition Against Domestic Violence; Jobs With Justice; Keystone Research Center; Latino Commission on AIDS; Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; Legal Aid Service of Broward County; Legal Aid Society of the District of Columbia; Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy (LAANE); Medical Mission Sisters; MomsRising; MoveOn.org.

NAACP; NARAL Pro-Choice Colorado; National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity; National Association of Social Workers; National Black Justice Coalition; National Center for Lesbian Rights; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Council of La Raza (NCLR); National Employment Law Project (NELP); National Employment Lawyers Association; National Low Income Housing Coalition; National Partnership for Women & Families; National Resource Center on Domestic Violence; National Women's Law Center; NETWORK LOBBY; New Jersey Policy Perspective; New Jersey Work Environment Council; Noorvik Boys & Girls Club Alaska; North Carolina Justice Center; One Wisconsin Now; Organize Now; PathStone Corporation; PathWays PA.

People's Action; Pennsylvania Council of Churches; Princeton Community Housing; ProgressOhio; Progressive Change Campaign Committee; Public Health Advocates; Public Justice Center; Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law; Service Employees International Union (SEIU); Sierra Club; Sisters of the Presentation; Social Security Works; South Carolina Community Loan Fund; Southeast Ministry DC; Teens, Training, & Taxes; Toledo Area Jobs with Justice & Interfaith Worker Justice Coalition; The Union of Concerned Scientists; UltraViolet.

United Auto Workers (UAW); United States Student Association; United Steelworkers; URGE: Unite for Reproductive & Gender Equity; Voices for Progress; Washington Community Action Network; Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights and Urban Affairs; Washington State Labor Council, AFL-CIO; Westland Ecumenical Community Food Pantry; West Virginia Center on Budget and Policy; Wisconsin Council on Children & Families; Wisconsin Faith Voices for Justice Workers' Dignity Project; Women AdvanCe; Women Employed; Women's Law Project; Working America; Working Partnerships USA; YWCA USA.

Mr. TAKANO. Finally, I want to raise objection to the way that this legislation is being considered. H.R. 6094 was brought to the floor as an emergency measure, bypassing regular order.

Mr. Speaker, an emergency is the epidemic of gun violence that kills 91

Americans every day. An emergency is averting a damaging shutdown and funding the Federal Government. Taking \$600 million out of the pockets of hardworking Americans and preventing them from spending time with their families is not an emergency, and that is what H.R. 6094 would do.

This legislation and the way it is being considered is a message to middle class families that they are not a priority for this Congress. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

I would just respond to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California, that I appreciate the passion that he displays. None of us want to be grinchers. My concern, however, is that at Christmastime it won't be the fact that they would get more money as a result of this. The fact is many will lose their jobs. There could be nothing worse at Christmastime than to lose jobs that they have had.

I would also suggest that the reports that were listed are similar reports and probably from similar researchers that told us if we liked our insurance, we could keep it; if we liked our doctor, we could keep him or her.

We are talking about an issue here that relates to people who are salaried. Most of the references that were made of employees by my colleague are people that aren't salaried. We are not talking about them. We are talking about people that are building a resume, an opportunity for flexibility, to meet the needs of their families, to have continued opportunity to grow in their work relationships and responsibilities. Some, as we heard in committee, come to us having started on the grill, went to assistant manager, and ended up owning corporations and leading them.

So I think we need to watch those studies, as well, and what they purport and where they come from.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a good friend and a gentleman who understands it from another perspective.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the chairman for yielding time, and I stand in support of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, south Louisiana recently experienced historic flooding that damaged 12,000 businesses, leaving them struggling to survive. Recuperation is one thing, but survival is at stake right now for these businesses.

The Department of Labor's overtime rule would effectively force a choice for these flood-affected employers: either delay the much-needed recovery efforts or rapidly deplete limited funds they have available for recovering, paying for higher labor costs, as dictated by this new rule.

The consequences of this rule are real. They are having a real impact, a detrimental impact. That is why just last week, my home State of Louisiana joined 20 other States in filing a lawsuit challenging this rule.

This rule will force many businesses to unfairly and substantially increase their employment costs. This rule will lead to higher unemployment, in many instances. Small businesses will be really affected in a big way by this, at a time when labor participation is at an all-time low in the workforce—at least, something we haven't seen since the seventies.

We should be encouraging growth. I don't know why our colleagues don't understand the need for economic growth and progrowth policies. We should be encouraging growth of small business and development in the workplace. This rule, instead, would hinder opportunities for employees to move up the career ladder.

That is why I support this bill, the Regulatory Relief for Small Businesses, Schools, and Nonprofits Act. This is really important legislation that will delay the implementation of this ill-conceived, disastrous rule.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6094.

There has been a lot of talk about what small businesses think about this law. We put it in the name of the bill. Well, let me give you a perspective of a small-business owner for 29 years.

I am, this week—maybe not right now; they might have left—paying overtime to one of my employees. They are working extra hours because we are extra busy at this time of year.

You know what that means when I pay them extra money? That means I am making more money because we have got more hours that we are billing out. All I am doing is sharing it with the employees who, otherwise, are spending less time with their families. That is why we pay overtime pay. It is a pretty basic concept.

The problem is, if you delay this rule for 6 months, you will deny Americans \$600 million in pay during that time. There will be 4.2 million Americans newly eligible for overtime pay, under the proposed rule. Another 8.9 million working Americans will have their overtime protections strengthened under this rule.

Let's make sure people really understand what it is really about. The current level that is in place for overtime is \$23,400. The Federal poverty line for a family of four, Mr. Speaker, is \$24,300. We are asking people to work overtime—extra hours—for free who are living below the Federal poverty line at the current level. That makes absolutely no sense whatsoever. As an employer, I would feel terrible that I have an employee putting 60 hours a week in and living below the Federal poverty line.

So the problem is there are some employers and some business models that

simply aren't sufficient because they are taking advantage of the current overtime rule because it is so antiquated—it is from 2004—and that is simply why we have to have it increased.

Only 7 percent of the full-time salary workforce right now is under that rule. If you go back to 1975, that was at 60 percent. Even with this rule, we are only bringing that up to a third of full-time salaried workers. It is long overdue.

So what does this bill do? This would delay it for 6 months. Let's be honest. This isn't about delaying it for 6 months. This is about trying to kill the bill outright.

This is about trying not to have an increase in overtime pay. It was very clear from the hearings that a lot of these businesses make money off of their current model. We have seen that in the economy. Wages have generally been flat; although, recently, we have seen a little uptick. Corporate profits have soared. CEO profits have soared. The stock market has soared. The only thing left behind are wages.

This is one of those things to deal with it for someone who could be living on the Federal poverty line, giving free hours to an employer who, I would argue, needs a better business model.

What will happen if this rule goes into effect? One of three things:

First, you will see people working fewer hours for no less pay and able to spend more time with their family or time to get a second job if they need additional money to support their family;

Second, they will receive more compensation in their current jobs in the form of overtime pay;

Third, many unemployed or underemployed people will see new opportunities for jobs or extra hours at their current jobs once those extra hours are no longer worked for free and, instead, spread out among workers.

It is a scare tactic to say that people are going to be fired and lose work before the holidays. I am an employer. I am happy. I make money this week because I am paying someone overtime. I know I am making even more money for my business.

I learned this once when I talked to a very successful businessowner in Wisconsin about taxes. He said, I don't mind paying taxes. If I am making money, I pay taxes. If I am not making money, I am not paying.

That is the way it should be. That is how I look at this. I want to share it with my employees because, if they are making the sacrifice away from their families, that is why we have overtime pay in place. That is why we have this rule in place.

This delay is a bad idea.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Wisconsin an additional 10 seconds.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters from organization that support the overtime rule.

AFSCME,

Washington, DC, September 26, 2016.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.6 million members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I want to express our strong support for the Department of Labor's (DOL) new overtime rule set for implementation on December 1, and urge you to oppose any efforts to overturn, weaken or delay it. In particular, we are strongly opposed to the Regulatory Relief for Small Businesses, Schools, and Nonprofits Act (H.R. 6094), and we urge you to vote no when this bill comes to the House floor for a vote.

This new rule is an overdue and historic update that would raise the salary threshold below which most workers are eligible for overtime pay from \$23,660 to \$47,486. It's a recognition of our country's forward-moving economy and is supported by the overwhelming majority of Americans who believe that too many workers are working too many hours for too little pay—a major step in addressing stagnant incomes and wage inequality. It will benefit 12.5 million people—including 4.2 million parents who together have 7.3 million children under the age of 18.

H.R. 6094 would hurt many hardworking Americans that the updated rule is intended to help, and needlessly delay implementation of the overtime rule. The stated reason for the delay is to lessen the impact on small businesses, nonprofits, and colleges and universities. However, opposition to the overtime rule as it applies to nonprofits and universities is vastly overstated. Many employees of nonprofits who perform charitable operations are not engaged in "commercial sales" or "business transactions" that lead to "enterprise" coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA). For universities, the majority of their workers are already exempt from FLSA overtime coverage, including professors, instructors, coaches, counselors, and most teaching assistants. Also, before the DOL's overtime rule was made final, many businesses, including small businesses, had forced low-level salaried employees to work long hours for no extra compensation. Employees who work in small businesses deserve the same protection as those who work for medium-sized and large businesses. The updated salary level is meant to do one thing—prevent employers from denying a 40-hour workweek and overtime pay to workers.

Americans who are employed in these sectors should not be exploited by employers and work excessive hours, or be denied time with their families. They are no less deserving of protections from working long hours with no pay than any other workers. Experts insist this rule is a critical opportunity to create better jobs and improve the economic lives of low-wage working people.

Updating the FLSA rules requiring overtime pay will provide one of the best economic boosts for working families in many years. H.R. 6094 is a direct attack on American families and workers, which would hinder job creation, weaken protections for millions of workers, and deny millions of workers a fair day's pay for a hard day's work.

AFSCME urges you to support the DOL's new overtime rule, and to oppose H.R. 6094 and other efforts to delay, weaken or repeal the rule.

Sincerely,

SCOTT FREY,  
Director of Federal Government Affairs.

THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON  
CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS,

Washington, DC, September 27, 2016.

OPPOSE H.R. 6094: THE REGULATORY RELIEF FOR SMALL BUSINESSES, SCHOOLS, AND NON-PROFITS ACT

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, a coalition charged by its diverse membership of more than 200 organizations to promote and protect the rights of all persons in the United States, we urge you to oppose H.R. 6094, the Regulatory Relief for Small Businesses, Schools, and Nonprofits Act. This bill would delay the implementation of the Department of Labor's new overtime protections by six months, forcing millions of workers and their families to wait another half year before they become eligible for overtime pay.

The Leadership Conference strongly supports the new overtime rules, which are scheduled to take effect on December 1, 2016. Following a lengthy comment period, the final rule, released in May, was preceded by months of careful consideration by the Department of Labor, which incorporated extensive economic analysis and the feedback from 270,000 letters of comment.

The rule raises the overtime salary threshold from \$23,660 to \$47,476, meaning that more employees putting in long hours will finally get the pay they deserve for their hard work. The Department of Labor estimates that 4.2 million workers currently considered exempt will gain the right to overtime pay, and the Economic Policy Institute projects that 12.5 million workers in total will benefit from the new overtime protections. Women and people of color will benefit significantly as more women, African American and Hispanic salaried managerial and professional workers fall at the lower end of the salary scale.

This month, data from the U.S. Census Bureau showed a substantial increase in income for American households, breaking a long-running pattern of stagnation. It is critical that we build on the progress made in the economic recovery by ensuring that middle-class and working families get a raise, as planned, on December 1 when the new overtime protections take effect.

For these reasons, we urge you to oppose H.R. 6094, which would unnecessarily delay by six months the new overtime rules and the increased income they would bring to working families. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

WADE HENDERSON,  
President & CEO.  
NANCY ZIRKIN,  
Executive Vice President.

SEPTEMBER 27, 2016.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: I am writing to urge you to support the U.S. Department of Labor's overtime regulation and oppose the Regulatory Relief for Small Businesses, Schools, and Nonprofits Act (H.R. 6094), which would delay its implementation. The new overtime rule that is scheduled to take effect on December 1 would finally end the days when people who work long hours for poverty wages are not required to receive overtime pay. By updating wage and hour protections that have been allowed to erode for decades, the new rule will make a tremendous difference for millions of working women and their families.

The National Partnership for Women & Families is a nonprofit, nonpartisan advocacy group dedicated to promoting fairness

in the workplace, reproductive health and rights, access to quality health care and policies that help women and men meet the dual demands of work and family. For four decades, we have fought for every major policy advance that has helped women and families.

Right now in our country, only hourly workers and salaried workers making less than \$23,660 per year—which is below the poverty line for a family of four—qualify for overtime pay when they work more than 40 hours per week. It has been three decades since the regulations that govern overtime pay in our country have been updated in a meaningful way. In its final regulation, the Department of Labor raised the salary threshold below which most workers are eligible for overtime pay from \$23,660 to \$47,476.

The rule will extend overtime eligibility and protections to millions of women and help them support themselves and their families. The rule will provide or strengthen overtime protections under the Fair Labor Standards Act for as many as 12.5 million salaried workers, 6.4 million of whom are women, boosting economic security for working families across the country. Outdated overtime rules contribute to unfair pay, which has harmful consequences—including for the two-thirds of mothers who are breadwinners or co-breadwinners for their families. In particular, this rule represents an important step toward fairer pay for women and people of color, who are over-represented in lower-paying jobs and are often required to work additional hours without compensation.

Expanding overtime protections will guarantee employees fairer wages and hours. Under the current low and outdated threshold, a promotion to “shift supervisor” for a salary of just \$24,000 a year could cost a woman her overtime pay. The new rule will help to keep millions of workers from being denied the pay they rightfully deserve and their families desperately need. Employers who have been relying on their employees’ free labor now will have to acknowledge the value of the 40-hour workweek by either limiting workers to 40-hour workweeks, thus giving them more time with their families, or compensating them for the hours they work.

This overtime rule is long overdue. It will help end blatant worker exploitation and help restore basic fairness to our nation’s workplaces. It is a historic advance for fair pay. It must not be diminished or delayed. Please support the overtime regulation and vote no when the Regulatory Relief for Small Businesses, Schools, and Nonprofits Act (H.R. 6094) comes to the floor. Working families cannot wait any longer.

Sincerely,

DEBRA L. NESS,  
*President,*

*National Partnership for Women & Families.*

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the chairman of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for his leadership on this issue. I am a cosponsor, and I strongly support passage of this legislation.

The Department of Labor’s overtime rule is yet another one-size-fits-all mandate out of Washington that will have severe negative impacts on small businesses and their employees.

Countless small employers, including small businesses, nonprofits, and coun-

ties, simply do not have the profit margins or budget flexibility to increase the salaries of workers who are currently exempt to the new salary level.

Not only is the 100 percent salary level increase too high, but the compliance timeline is far too short. With the December 1 deadline looming, small businesses are scrambling to figure out how the rule will impact them and what they need to do to comply to stay out of trouble with this Federal Government.

According to a survey by Paychex, 49 percent of businessowners aren’t even aware of the final overtime rule, which is rapidly breathing down their necks.

Over the past year, the Committee on Small Business has heard from countless small businesses that share their concerns about the overtime rule.

□ 1900

Many small businesses currently give their employees flexible schedules, pay increases when they can afford it, and offer career advancement opportunities because employees are the key to their successes. They want to treat their employees well. They don’t need the Federal Government telling them to do that.

The new labor rule would limit the ability of small businesses to provide these benefits, which would have a devastating impact on employee morale. Our committee members, and other officials, including the Chief Counsel for Advocacy at the Small Business Administration, joined small businesses in urging the Department of Labor to change course.

In fact, the Chief Counsel for Advocacy sent the Department of Labor a letter that described numerous problems with the rule and recommended that small businesses be given at least a year or 18 months to comply. Instead, the Department of Labor finalized the rule without addressing small business concerns and made the compliance deadline December 1, providing barely 6 months to comply, when they said that they ought to have at least a year or 18 months.

H.R. 6094, this bill, is critical because it will provide small businesses with 6 more months to figure out how the rule affects them, how to deal with it, and what changes they need to make to stay out of trouble with the Labor Department.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for small businesses and support this bill.

I would, again, thank Congressman WALBERG for his leadership on this.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), the ranking member of the Investigations, Oversight, and Regulations Subcommittee of the Small Business Committee.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in support of the Department of Labor’s overtime rule that will go into effect on December 1, 2016. This

rule will protect 4.2 million workers who are newly eligible for overtime pay and strengthen protections for 8.9 million workers nationwide. Such a change not only puts more money in workers’ pockets, it also strengthens our economy by driving consumer spending.

H.R. 6094 is an attempt to delay the implementation of the overtime rule, taking \$600 million out of the pockets of 4.2 million American workers who would have gained overtime protection on December 1. In North Carolina, 425,000 workers will benefit from the new rule.

I acknowledge the concerns of my colleagues regarding the impact this rule may have on small businesses, universities, and nonprofits. Only 3.4 percent of employees at colleges and universities and junior colleges will be affected by this rule. Of those groups, only one-half percent of employees will be both affected by the rule and regularly work overtime.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. ADAMS. Preserving the right to overtime pay is crucial at the time when lower- and middle-income family wages are stagnant. I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 6094 and support working families.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), a distinguished member from Pennsylvania.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 6094, the Regulatory Relief for Small Businesses, Schools, and Nonprofits Act introduced by my colleague, Mr. WALBERG. As an original cosponsor of this measure, I am fully supportive of its goal—to put the brakes on the Department of Labor’s final overtime rule and continue to shield workers, small businesses, nonprofits, and educational institutions from its potentially devastating effects.

Under the final rule from the Department of Labor, companies and organizations will be required to pay overtime to employees who make less than \$47,476, more than double the current salary threshold. While there is little doubt that the current overtime rules are in need of modernization, the Department’s drastic approach will do more harm than good, marginalizing economic growth, diminishing access to valuable services provided by nonprofits, and discouraging upward mobility in the workplace.

Mr. Speaker, in the midst of an economy that is still struggling, we simply cannot allow for the enactment of ill-advised policies that make it harder for hardworking Americans to make ends meet. For that reason, I am proud to support this measure, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking member of the Small Business Committee.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. With the minimum wage failing to provide a living wage, Americans are working more hours than ever. Full-time employees are working an average of 47 hours a week. Nearly 40 percent report logging 50 hours or more.

Yet, only 7 percent of salaried workers qualified for overtime last year, down from 62 percent 40 years ago. Updating the rule to restore the purpose of the Fair Labor Standards Act was long overdue.

In New York State, an additional 23 percent of the salaried workforce, nearly 1 million employees, will directly benefit from the new regulations. At a time when lower- and middle-income wages remain stagnant, these changes will be particularly helpful to American families.

Our colleagues on the other side go on about the negative impact on small businesses. Yet, the data shows that this rule will increase payroll less than one-tenth of 1 percent. Furthermore, this money will go directly in the pockets of the middle and working class, who will spend it at their local small businesses. It is not going to diminish job creation in this country. It will increase employment opportunities in this country when those workers will go and spend their money in the local businesses.

They are not going to go and get a loan to find—to buy another home. They will not buy a second home. They will spend it in the local economy.

So, in turn, this provides an economic boost that will create over 120,000 new jobs. This is a win-win regulation.

Let's be clear, no one is asking to be unjustly enriched, only to be fairly compensated for a hard day's work. These ideals are advanced by the DOL's overtime rule.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Yet, despite this benefit for millions of Americans, this legislation will delay the rule until June 2017, when I am sure there will be attempts to eliminate this rule completely. I cannot and will not support this attack on workers.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this letter from the American Sustainable Business Council in support of the overtime regulations.

AMERICAN SUSTAINABLE BUSINESS  
COUNCIL,  
July 12, 2016.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,  
Chairman, Education and the Workforce Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT,  
Ranking Member, Education and the Workforce Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN KLINE AND RANKING MEMBER SCOTT: On behalf of the businesses represented by the American Sustainable Business Council's, ASBC, network, I write in support of the Department of Labor's recently released overtime rule, and to oppose a Congressional Review Act, CRA, action to roll it back.

ASBC advocates for policy change and market solutions for building a vibrant, sustainable economy. Through its national member network, ASBC represents more than 200,000 business owners, executives and investors from a wide range of industries.

The rule creates certainty and predictability for business owners. Since the announcement of the draft rule in July 2015 and the release of the final rule this spring, businesses have been planning for its implementation on December 1, 2016. In fact, payroll operations companies have been marketing solutions to help employers handle the transition.

Invoking a CRA or other legislative action delaying the overtime rule will create unnecessary and disruptive uncertainty for business owners. Business owners, by nature, are creative at problem solving. When rules are established, they make the necessary decisions to comply. However, when the rules are in flux, business owners react to the uncertainty by holding back on investments in growth and expansion.

When employers set fairer, clearer wages, they earn dividends with happier, more productive employees. That's good news for a businesses' bottom line, and for growing the nation's middle class. High road businesses understand that compensating their employees for extra time spent on the job builds a better work culture.

The American economy is fundamentally a domestic, consumer-driven economy, unlike some countries where growth is fueled by exports and business-to-business spending. The biggest long term threat to our economy is the hollowing out of the middle class, which is losing its capacity for discretionary spending—responsible for about 70 percent of our gross domestic product.

The new overtime rule closes a loophole which has allowed for hourly workers to be deprived of pay by inappropriately classifying them as exempt. Employees are consumers; if they are not earning sufficient wages, demand will remain stagnant. Closing this loophole will help restore consumer spending and give the economy a needed boost.

The overtime rule has been under consideration for some time and businesses have weighed in through the public comment process. Most businesses are moving forward to meet the December deadline for compliance. Congress should not take action to stop the progress the business community is making.

Sincerely,

BRYAN MCGANNON,  
Policy Director.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of this legislation to require

a 6-month delay in the Department of Labor's new overtime rule. This is an ill-advised regulation that will result in hardworking Americans losing their jobs and less economic growth.

Don't take my word for it. Let's look at what some actual business leaders and organizations had to say about the change.

Richard, a businessman in Birmingham, says that he "will cut back on employee hours as much as possible since raising their compensation is not my option."

Ability Alliance of West Alabama, which provides assistance to more than 600 intellectually disabled individuals wrote that "the untenable financial pressure resulting from the proposed changes would force us into disastrous service reductions and program closures."

Greg from Vinemont, Alabama, is much more direct. He writes that he "will have to lay people off to meet the overtime demands."

First Heritage Credit, LLC wrote to the Department of Labor that "increased costs cannot simply be passed on, and the proposed rule will mean fewer branch openings, fewer new hires, and fewer lending options to the communities we serve."

Our Nation's education institutions will be hit especially hard by the change. A representative from the University of Alabama wrote that "the proposed regulation puts more pressure on the educational system as a whole. Institutions will either reduce the level of services and programs or will be required to maintain services and programs with inadequate staffing. Regardless, the quality of education will suffer."

All told, this change will cost the University of Alabama system \$17 million in just the first year.

These are just a few stories about the reality of the overtime change. These are real people, real families who will suffer.

I think this change should be reworked altogether, but, if that is not an option, we should at least delay this rule in order to provide relief to these businesses and organizations.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), the co-chair of the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the ranking member for the time and for his advocacy for working people.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD two articles which talk about how the overtime rule is likely to add 100,000 jobs to the economy; one from Goldman Sachs, and the other from the National Retail Federation.

[From the National Retail Federation, Sept. 28, 2016]

HOW EXPANDING OVERTIME COULD AFFECT  
RETAILERS

The Department of Labor has proposed a major change in federal regulations governing overtime pay that could have a significant impact on the retail industry.

Under current rules, workers making up to \$455 a week are automatically entitled to overtime if they work more than 40 hours a week. Managers and professionals who make more can be declared exempt, but only if they meet certain conditions such as having supervision of other workers as their primary duty. Under the proposed changes, the wage threshold would be increased to \$970 a week, and the administration is asking whether additional restrictions should be placed on non-supervisory duties managers can perform and still be considered exempt.

To better understand the effects of the proposal, NRF commissioned the research firm Oxford Economics to conduct a study. While raising the threshold would mandate overtime pay for many workers, the analysis found that most employees would not actually see a change in net pay. Instead, many employees would see their hours reduced so that overtime would not be worked, while others would see their base wages, benefits or bonus pay decreased in order to offset the added payroll expense.

The study also found that updating payroll systems, establishing ways to track employee hours and other administrative expenses would cost the restaurant and retail industries alone an estimated \$745 million even if workers saw no additional take-home pay.

(The original study was prepared before the Labor Department proposal was released, and was conducted with projected wage thresholds that might have been proposed. An update has been prepared based on the actual proposal.)

[From Business Insider.com, Sept. 27, 2016]

GOLDMAN SACHS: NEW OBAMA RULE ON OVERTIME LIKELY TO ADD 100,000 JOBS TO ECONOMY

(By Lucy Nicholson, REUTERS)

A new rule from the Obama administration—which will increase the fraction of workers entitled to time-and-a-half overtime pay—is likely to increase total employment in the US in 2017 by about 100,000 jobs, according to Goldman Sachs.

The idea is this: Companies whose workers are covered by the rule will try to avoid paying overtime, and they'll hire additional workers to do this. The point is to keep from asking their existing employees to work more than 40 hours a week.

The rule change affects salaried "executive, administrative and professional" workers, who can currently be exempt from overtime pay if they make as little as \$23,660 a year.

Following implementation of the rule (expected in December) the overtime exemption will apply only to salaried workers making at least \$47,476—making 4.2 million additional Americans eligible for time-and-a-half.

Of those, in any given week about 1 million actually work more than 40 hours.

There are four ways employers may respond to this rule change:

Simply making the overtime payments.

Reducing employees' base pay, in an effort to leave their total compensation unchanged after the new overtime payments—though this can be complicated, especially because the employers don't always know in advance how much overtime each employee will work.

Increasing employees' base pay to exceed the new threshold so they remain exempt from overtime payments. Goldman thinks this is most likely for employees who already earn a salary very close to \$47,476.

Employing more workers and have them work fewer hours, so they do not run afoul of the 40-hour limit.

By examining employer behavior from the last time the overtime threshold was changed, in 2004, Goldman economist Alec Phillips developed a "central" estimate that 100,000 additional jobs will be created in 2017 as employers choose the third option—not a huge amount in an economy creating between 2 and 3 million jobs a year, but not trivial either.

It's important to note that employers who respond to the new overtime pay rule by reducing overtime hours will not be "cheating" or skirting the intent of the rule. The point of the rule is to ensure that lower-income salaried workers get compensated if they have to work extra hours, allowing those workers to collect their salaries without working uncompensated overtime is a meaningful gain for those workers.

The new time-and-a-half payments would also increase some workers' hourly pay, but not for enough workers to show up in the statistics of average hourly earnings, according to the Goldman analysis—so don't expect this rule to drive a boost in wages that can be felt at the economy-wide level.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, one wonders if there could possibly ever have been any small businesses only a few years ago. At its peak, 62 percent of workers were eligible for overtime pay. Today, only 7 percent are eligible. What did they do then? They hired people.

This idea that making it fair for working people who work overtime is somehow going to bring doom and gloom and destruction on small businesses is absolutely nonsense.

It is typical. We hear it all the time. Anything we are going to do for working people just can't possibly be done, or little people themselves will be hurt. This is a constant refrain.

If big, big, big agriculture wants something, they say, oh, we are here for the family farm.

If big, big banks want something, they say, oh, we are here for the community banks.

And if big, big, big businesses want something, and they don't want to pay their overtime, they say, oh, what about the small businesses.

In fact, this bill named for small businesses, folks out there listening should know that the title of this legislation is misleading. The legislation delays the rule for all employers, including small businesses.

But here's the fact. Walmart, are they—do they benefit from the fact that this overtime rule hasn't kept pace?

McDonald's, Burger King, all types of huge businesses which absolutely have the capacity to pay people fairly simply haven't done so.

It is interesting to me that our Republican friends have had the gavels in their hands since 2010 now. They haven't stepped up to improve and update this particular overtime rule.

The administration has done what they have failed to do. And now what do they have to say about it? Oh, it can't possibly happen, can't possibly work, and it is going to make everything worse.

How discouraging it must be to an American worker today. This Congress

won't look at increasing the Federal minimum wage of \$7.25. And the tip wage of \$2.13, a national disgrace, they won't do that. They don't take that up.

They are constantly attacking the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which has brought consumers over \$12 billion. And they are constantly trying to cut taxes for the rich, and they don't want to invest in anything for the working people. Yet, they always justify everything they are doing by saying, oh, it would hurt the working people themselves.

This is ridiculous. This argument has no merit. It has to be rejected.

Over the past 35 years, we have failed to meaningfully update our overtime pay regulations. Now is the right time.

As I said, at its peak, 62 percent of workers were eligible for overtime pay. Today, only 7 percent are eligible because we have let the working people down. We have delayed action to help working families long enough, and we can't ask them to wait any longer. I urge a very strong "no."

□ 1915

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ELLISON. I want to say this. It is about real people. One of those real people is Jodi T. from Minneapolis. She said:

I work more than 40 hours a week regularly, and this will make a great deal of difference for me and my family. Lately, I find that businesses will eliminate positions and put more work on existing staff regardless of whether they can handle it within the time and the workday. If they pay overtime, they will bear some of the real costs of these decisions.

Vote "no" on this bill. It is a bad thing.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Augusta, Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Regulatory Relief for Small Businesses, Schools, and Nonprofits Act. This legislation works to delay implementation of the Department of Labor's new overtime rule for 6 months.

Without this legislation, the rule goes into effect on December 1, leaving employers scrambling to comply with the new rule and jeopardizing employees' paychecks right before the holiday season—a very bad time.

As a small-business owner who has employed thousands of people, I know the challenges that the business community will face: moving salaried employees to hourly; trouble recruiting qualified, new hires to accept an hourly position; current employees' time being spent monitoring the time clock; and, ultimately, the potential for hours to be cut and paychecks to dwindle.

This is devastating to employees who have worked hard to earn a salaried position. They have earned this position

to be salaried, and then to move to hourly? Many Americans will soon realize they have fewer job prospects, less flexibility in the workplace, and less opportunity to move up the economic ladder. In other words, those who can least afford it will be hit the hardest: small businesses, nonprofits, and educational institutions.

I could stand here before this body, just as Congressman BYRNE did, and tell you stories of all the small businesses in my district and employees that have come to me to warn me of the struggles other employees and families will face because of this overtime rule.

The President is enacting this rule a mere month before he is out of office to try and score cheap political points when he knows he won't be here to clean up the mess. I have to say: I am ashamed, Mr. President. We need to take a step back and hit the pause button.

Unsurprisingly, the administration has no plans to change the rule, so an extra 6-month grace period is crucial to the well-being of our schools, small businesses, and nonprofits.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this legislation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind people that, of the people affected and the people that routinely work overtime, complying with the rule will add less than one-tenth of 1 percent to U.S. payrolls. The costs to nonprofits and to higher education, way under 1 percent. And the time has been sufficient. The last time this rule was changed, they got significantly less time to comply, and that rule was even more complex than this one.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), my friend and colleague on the committee.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, as we look at this bill, what is it about? It is saying that you have got to pay overtime to somebody who is making more than \$47,000 a year. What will that mean? It will mean that employers will say: You had better get out of here; we can't have you working more than 40 hours a week. That is what is going to happen.

I am reminded of a buddy of mine back home in my district. His daughter had a new job working for salary. He told her: Always make sure you are the first person to show up in the morning and the last person to go home at night, and you will advance in that company. She was the first person to show up in the morning and the last person to go home at night, and she is having a very successful career by doing so.

What this bill does is it is kind of an odd thing. It makes it against the law to work hard. Think about that gal

now. Now she won't be able to be the first person to show up in the morning and the last person to go home at night because her boss is going to say: Get out of here.

It is part of a pattern we are, sadly, seeing from this administration of discouraging hard work. Just like ObamaCare, if you work more hours, then you wind up losing your ObamaCare subsidy. You had better not work hard. There is a plethora of welfare programs around here. I don't care if it is the earned income tax credit, food stamps, low-income housing, whatever; if you work hard, then you will lose your subsidy. We are doing all we can in this country to penalize the hardworking.

Furthermore, think just on a day-to-day basis what it means to you as an employee who has worked for salary. Let's say you have to work on a project. It gets near 5 o'clock, and you are not satisfied with your work product. What are you supposed to do? Turn in a bad work product to your boss, or hang around another hour and do a good job? This, in essence, removes the choice from you: I have got to turn in a bad work product because my boss is going to kick me out of here at the end of 8 hours.

So my final plea is this. Come, Republicans; come, Democrats, race to the Chamber and vote for the bill, H.R. 6094, and stand up for the hardworking of our society.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman for his advocacy on behalf of all working families in this country—not just today, but throughout his entire career.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill and in support of the updated overtime rule that will combat the exploitation of workers across America and put more money in their pockets.

In 1938, Congress came together to pass the Fair Labor Standards Act, a bill that revolutionized opportunity for Americans by ensuring they were fairly compensated for their work and they would work in safe working conditions. One of the provisions in that piece of legislation was the creation of a 40-hour workweek. In addition, this legislation required employers to compensate employees at time and a half for hours worked beyond a 40-hour workweek. It was a compromise.

They went on to say that there is an exemption for protection of those workers who were considered white-collar employees. As a result of their salary, their benefits, and their high level of work within an organization, they were exempt.

Unfortunately, the wage level which determines who is exempt from these worker protections has been updated only once—only once—in the last 40 years. That is where the problem lies.

The last time it was updated was in 2004, under Republican President Bush—a Republican President.

Today, the threshold wherein an employee is exempt is \$23,660. What this means is somebody making \$24,000 a year is routinely required to work 45, 55, 65 hours a week with not just compensation for the overtime, but they are not needed to be paid at all because they are considered exempt employees. In other words, a family of four could be living under the poverty line and still be considered to earn too much money to be considered for overtime protections.

Mr. Speaker, I support these rules because I know, when American families succeed, our country as a whole succeeds, including the entire business community. This is a partnership working together. This rule simply means updating our laws surrounding worker exploitation by simply adjusting that floor to keep up with inflation.

This is not a Democratic or a Republican bill. This is a worker and business bill.

Twelve years before the success of the Fair Labor Standards Act, Henry Ford created the 40-hour workweek. Mr. Speaker, 117 years ago, Peter J. Maguire, the founder of Labor Day, went on to talk about just creating a 6-day workweek.

This is very simple. The experiment with a \$5 minimum wage, which today would be \$15 an hour with inflation realized, Ford realized that, when his workers could afford to buy the cars they were making and to drive them, his business, his employees, and the economy would do better.

Mr. Speaker, American workers have waited long enough to get a fair day's day for a fair day's work that they certainly deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose this bill.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER.)

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6094, the Regulatory Relief for Small Businesses, Schools, and Nonprofits Act, a bill I am proud to cosponsor.

This important bill would provide a measure of relief not only for the thousands of small businesses and charitable institutions that would be negatively impacted by the Department of Labor's overtime rule, but also the countless workers who depend on entry- and mid-level employment opportunities.

This rule hurt everyday Americans, raising the cost of living while reducing wages and incomes. Many of the individuals affected by this rule will be forced into part-time employment or be transitioned to jobs with lower hourly wages, no benefits, and no overtime at all.

I have heard from a number of people in my district concerned about the impacts this onerous rule will have for

them. A bank in my district will have to transition 13 of their salaried tellers on staff to hourly wage workers in order to assume the \$129,000 in compliance costs they anticipate from this rule. Schools have expressed concerns that they will be forced to cut staff and limit the educational services of extracurricular activities they provide for our students.

I have heard from faith-based and charitable institutions, too. These institutions often operate with fixed operating budgets and serve the most vulnerable in our society, yet this rule will impose similar financial and staffing burdens on them. A senior care group in my district, for example, has told me this rule will likely lead to a reduction in hiring, meaning fewer seniors will be able to get care.

Mr. Speaker, for the countless families, small businesses, and communities that I serve, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill and delay this onerous rule.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), a good friend, who has a special take on this.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6094, the Regulatory Relief for Small Businesses, Schools, and Nonprofits Act.

We are at a crossroads in our country as we are still struggling to build up our economy after the last recession. Since then, businessowners have struggled to not only grow their companies, but also to provide for their employees.

As a small-business owner, I had both the company's and my employees' best interest in mind, as my employees were like a second family to me. I would have wanted nothing more than to ensure they are getting what they need and that they are fully compensated for all of their work. But this rule doesn't do that.

On the surface, this administration is painting this rule as a step forward for American workers, but it is not. Everyone from universities to nonprofits will feel the weight of this rule as they seek to rearrange schedules and reclassify employees so as to prevent compounding negative effects on their organizations.

Universities and colleges will see a sharp jump in payrolls as they have to grapple with how to manage their existing personnel while trying to keep their institution on an upward trajectory. Tuitions will increase. Nonprofit organizations will have to reclassify workers as their annual budgets are stretched to the brink, resulting in a drop in services to the people who need it most.

The Department of Labor spent the last 27 months working on this rule. Since its implementation, they have given businesses a 6-month window to implement it.

I have heard from countless companies, nonprofits, universities, and chambers of commerce who are extremely worried about the impact this will have on their operations. While this rule was intended to ensure employees see an increase in benefits, it will have the direct opposite effect.

This bill would delay the rule for 6 months to allow for a longer look at its effects. It gives Congress more time to find a legislative solution. Mr. Speaker, I have always wanted the best for my employees, and this rule simply doesn't do that.

I applaud Congressman WALBERG, Chairman KLINE, and the Education and the Workforce Committee staff for their hard work in pulling this together.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the 40-hour workweek used to mean something. It was installed many years ago so that people wouldn't have to work 6 and 7 days a week, 10 or more hours a day. They could work 5 days a week, 8 hours, and have an opportunity to go home. Now the 40-hour workweek only applies to 7 percent of salaried workers, and they can be forced to work 45, 50, 60 hours, with no additional pay.

We have heard the impact on universities. I think the gentleman from Alabama said that it would cost the Alabama system \$17 million. Well, their budget is \$2.4 billion; \$24 million would be 1 percent.

□ 1930

If his number is right—\$17 million—that is still way under 1 percent of their expenditures. But there are a lot of ways to comply with this rule without any cost at all. You can let people go home after 40 hours, or you can honestly restate their salary. If it is \$30,000 and a lot of overtime, call it \$20,000 and they have got to make \$10,000 overtime. They will get the same amount at the end of the year at no cost to the employer, but an honest way to assess the salary. It wouldn't cost anything. So there are ways of complying with this honestly that make the 40-hour workweek mean something.

The new rule only covers about a third of the salaried workers. It is a good rule. It should not be delayed. In fact, it is not being delayed. This is the first step in trying to defeat the rule. This bill should be defeated. Let the people get their salaries on December 1.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

In closing, I want to remind my colleagues why this legislation is so important.

We all agree our Nation's overtime rules need to be modernized and worker protection should be strengthened. That is not what we are debating today.

Small businesses, nonprofits, and colleges and universities play a critical role in our communities. Right now, they are struggling to implement a fundamentally flawed rule under an unrealistic deadline, and many don't even know about the rule yet. At the very least, they deserve more time. More time would allow small businesses, nonprofits, and colleges and universities to make significant changes and mitigate the impact on workers, students, and individuals in need—for the positive, for the good.

I urge my colleagues to provide that time, even if they stand by the Department's overtime rule. A vote in support of the Regulatory Relief for Small Businesses, Schools, and Nonprofits Act isn't just commonsense; it is the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, this is what we are intending to do. We are intending to do the best for our citizens, our employees, and our employers. Shouldn't it be worth an additional 24 weeks to make sure that this is implemented to the positive?

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 897, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

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

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. 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.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5578. An act to establish certain rights for sexual assault survivors, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent Resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 5325.

#### 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.