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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC, January 3, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable Harold Rogers to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

Paul D. Ryan,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

TWENTY-FIFTH AMENDMENT
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Blumenauer) for 5 minutes.

Mr. Blumenauer. Mr. Speaker, like many people, I have noticed renewed interest in the 25th Amendment, as we have seen erratic behavior out of the White House, an inability of Donald Trump to even tell whether it rained on him during his inaugural speech, and repeating false statements that are demonstrably wrong.

Last Friday, the mechanism to deal with Presidential incapacity, the 25th Amendment, celebrated its 50th anniversary. I became intrigued with its history and application because it is clear, whether with Donald Trump or a future President, this mechanism is very important. Accidents can happen: President Reagan suffered from early onset Alzheimer’s that concerned his staff. President Wilson was incapacitated by a stroke, and his wife, Edith, effectively governed the United States for nearly 2 years.

It is only a matter of time before we face these challenges again. As I examined the amendment, it became clear that, in the case of mental or emotional incapacity, there is a glaring flaw. For a mentally unstable, paranoid, or delusional President, the 25th Amendment has no guarantee of its application. In fact, it is likely that it would fail.

As written, the 25th Amendment requires the Vice President and a majority of the Cabinet to concur that the President is no longer capable of exercising authority. There are other safeguards. It would take time to process. Ultimately, two-thirds of both Houses of Congress must agree.

But look at the current Cabinet. Even if one thinks that a group with no meaningful government experience, all approved in a heightened partisan context, most of whom don’t even know the President personally, could objectively exercise the power should the President become mentally incapacitated, the larger question is whether they would ever be allowed to do so.

A President who is paranoid or delusional is very unlikely to tolerate dissent within the ranks. He or she could simply fire any Cabinet member who would stand up to them.

That is why we need to exercise the other part of the 25th Amendment that allows Congress to designate another body, instead of the Cabinet. Who could exercise that authority with the confidence of the American public and with the knowledge of what it takes to understand the personal and political stresses of the Presidency?

I submit that the best failsafe to a President who is emotionally unstable would be to impanel our previous Presidents and Vice Presidents to make that determination.

Think about how it would work. Currently, there are 10 bipartisan former distinguished Americans who, in most cases, enjoy even greater public support than when they left office. Most importantly, there is no group of people better suited to evaluate the evidence and the dynamics at work for the good of the country and the President who needs help.

Now, we have made real progress with mental illness. We have made it easier to get care. We are taking away the stigma for the one in five Americans who suffer from mental health issues. We find people to be more open and candid and accepting of themselves and others. We are making real strides in terms of treatment and acceptance.

But all of this requires access to help; and this drama should not play out with somebody whose fingers are on the nuclear buttons and whose every pronouncement can unsettle diplomatic conditions, affect war and peace, and the global economy.

Having Congress establish this panel of former Presidents and Vice Presidents from both parties as a guardian of former Presidents and Vice Presidents to understand the personal and political stresses of the Presidency?

We never know when catastrophe might strike. There is no good time to fix this problem. In today’s world of alternative facts and fake news, in a sea of bitter partisan controversy, we need to have a mechanism that can be reliable, command public confidence, and be above politics.

It is hard to think of a group that would collectively have more support and credibility than the distinguished
Americans who have been in that position and, regardless of partisan differences, whose allegiance to America is unquestioned.

We need to start now to protect the integrity of the most powerful position on the planet.

BLACK LUNG BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my home State of West Virginia has almost 20,000 coal miners. Tens of thousands more worked in the mines and are now enjoying a well-deserved retirement.

They proudly mined the coal that powers our Nation, and it puts food on their table. These miners worked hard each and every day, and we owe them a debt of gratitude.

Our Nation made them a promise to take care of them if they developed black lung disease. And for decades now, the Federal government has guaranteed black lung benefits, and the so-called Byrd amendment 7 years ago reiterated that commitment to our miners.

As we draft healthcare reform here in Congress, I urge my colleagues to maintain these essential black lung benefits for our miners and their families.

I have introduced legislation to affirm our commitment to protecting the Byrd amendment and these critical black lung benefits. I introduced it last Congress, too, and I am committed to continuing to fight for it because we cannot let our miners down.

While mine safety continues to improve, we must guarantee that our miners have the benefits they need in case they are diagnosed with black lung disease. These benefits provide critical support for our retired miners and their families. For some disabled miners, it may be the only income they and their families rely on these benefits.

This is a promise we made to them, and it is a promise that we must keep. Just as we have relied on our miners to mine the coal that built the skyscrapers and won world wars, our miners should be able to rely on us.

I urge my colleagues to support the protection of black lung benefits and to honor the hard work of our miners.

A GLACIER OF RUSSIAN INTERFERENCE

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, we are in a constitutional crisis. Make no mistake about it. Yes, the National Security Adviser Michael Flynn resigned. Yes, he should have resigned, but he is just the tip of the iceberg. A glacier of Russian interference is plaguing our country right now.

In his resignation letter, General Flynn wrote: “I have always performed my duties with the utmost of integrity and honesty to those I have served, to include the President of the United States.”

I believe General Flynn. I believe he did precisely what the President of the United States asked him to do. General Flynn is a military man. He is accustomed to the chain of command. He did not do anything that he was not asked to do. He was not a rogue agent, but had the complete knowledge and cooperation of his Commander in Chief.

We have all heard Donald Trump boast of how smart he is and how he calls his own shots. Why then should we believe that, when it comes to national security, he prefers to be kept in the dark? A President can’t be both in charge and out of the loop.

The only way we can ever hope to know the truth is if there is a thorough investigation. I believe it should be an independent investigation, an independent commission. But if we are going to go down the route of having it be a congressional investigation, then it needs to be a comprehensive investigation and one that has the resources to do the job.

I am calling on Chairman Nunes of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to schedule hearings immediately.

We heard 14 hours of testimony from Secretary Clinton about her emails. I think we can agree that foreign infiltration of our government at the highest level is at least as important as using a private email server, especially, I might add, when President Trump and his team used unsecured cell phones during their North Korea strategy session at Mar-a-Lago in a dining room with many other guests.

Today, an Active Duty, four-star general said publicly that “our government continues to be in unbelievable turmoil” and that he hopes “they sort it out soon, because we’re a nation at war.”

He continues: “As a commander, I’m concerned our government be as stable as possible.”

It is critical that Congress takes heed of this unprecedented public warning and act.

I am well aware this is a partisan institution. I also know that there have been times in our proud history in the United States Congress when Members have pushed partisanship aside in search of the truth. The Warren Commission, following the assassination of President Kennedy, is one example. The 9/11 Commission after the terrorist attacks in 2001 is another.

In the Senate, the need to hear three Republicans have directly called for investigations into this matter and several more have acknowledged that these questions must be answered. I wonder, will one House Republican Member come forward and say we must investigate?

Colleagues, I urge you to think this through. Vladimir Putin ordered agents to meddle in our election. Did he do it out of love for Mr. Trump? I doubt it. More likely, he did it so he could do to a democracy what we and our allies did to communism, send it to the ash heap of history. If America’s elections can be hacked, what chance is there for budding democracies to make it?

Don’t believe me? Look at what Putin has done in just 3 weeks of this new administration. He had government agents poisoned. He sent a political rival to prison for $12 million to Jean-Marie Le Pen, the far-right candidate for the President of France. His latest move was to launch a cruise missile that is in direct defiance of treaties.

Putin’s Russia is playing chicken with President Trump, and what is our President’s response? A tweet complaining about leaks within his administration and, according to the latest reports, pressuring the Prime Minister of Japan to forge closer relations with Russia.

What does Putin have on President Trump? What does President Trump owe Putin?

We will not know until we exercise our Constitution’s power to probe. As Mr. Speaker, I am committed to the oversight of our government at the highest levels. I am committed to American democracy. I am committed to the truth.

CALIFORNIA’S MARCH TO THE EXTREME LEFT

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most troubling aspects of California’s lurch to the left are the rise of two doctrines unknown in this country since the last gasp of the Southern Confederacy.

The first is the doctrine of nullification, the notion that States may defy Federal laws that their leaders simply don’t like. The most outspoken advocate of this doctrine was John C. Calhoun, who, in referencing our Nation’s most revered document, the Declaration of Independence, observed that our Nation had been founded on—his words—“self-evident lies.”

The doctrine of nullification has been revived in the sanctuary cities movement, and has now reared its head as State legislation. Our Constitution clearly gives Congress the sole prerogative to make immigration law, and it commands the President to faithfully execute these laws. Our President is now doing so, yet California’s legislators have passed legislation that would assert an independent power to defy them. And this is not just happening in California.
Mr. Speaker. States ought to be jealous guardians of their organic powers and the prerogatives against unwanted encroachments by the Federal Government. But the Supremacy Clause binds the States to our Federal laws. This is the very core of constitutional Federalism in Article VI:

“This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and of all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.”

If a State, in rightfully guarding its powers, believes that a Federal law unconstitutionally infringes on those powers, the Constitution provides that the courts shall resolve such disputes. But asserting the power to nullify a Federal law, a law that is clearly within the enumerated powers of the Congress and clearly under the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution, that crosses a very bright line that no State has breached since the first State seceded in 1861.

Which brings us to the second, even more disturbing development in California’s march to the extreme left. There is no single act which more ultimately and categorically rejects our Constitution, our country, and all that they stand for, than a proposal to secede from the Union that has preserved our liberties for nearly two and a half centuries. It is logically impossible to supplant the Constitution, and yet, maintain loyalty to the Union from which you propose to secede.

Secession is the ultimate act of disloyalty today, no less than during the days of the Confederacy. Yet, in California, a formal secession movement is now circulating petitions for signature to place exactly such a proposal on the ballot.

It should come as no surprise that one of its leading proponents is an American expatriate now living in Russia who declared he “could no longer live under an American flag.” It should not even come as a surprise that the movement is cheered on by California’s increasingly radical left.

But what came as a stunning surprise is that 32 percent of Californians support this measure, according to a recent poll. Let me repeat that. One in three, according to this poll, want to repudiate our Federal Union and its Constitution.

We can only hope that the polling is wrong, or that the disaffected Californians who answered the poll in this fashion did so with reckless abandon that calm reflection will cure. But it is impossible to avoid the implication that so many people in my afflicted State hold so little loyalty to our country that they would support a measure that willfully rends it asunder.

These movements, nullification and secession, cross from lawful dissent into lawless rebellion. In these turbulent times, our greatest strengths are our rule of law, our constitutional institutions, and the loyalty of Americans to their priceless legacy of freedom and justice and the Union that preserves those things.

Every person who takes the oath of office under our Constitution swears an oath to support and defend the Constitution. These modern resurrections of the long-buried doctrines of nullification and secession strike at the heart of our Constitution. These movements of the left would undermine the very foundation of our American civilization. They ought to be condemned in the strongest possible terms and opposed by every American of goodwill who remains loyal to our free government.

RUSSIA’S AGGRESSIVE INTENT

The Speaker pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, as we are sitting here in this Chamber, right off the coast of Grotton, Connecticut, 30 miles from the Grotton Navy Sub Base, which is the oldest submarine base in America, there is a Russian spy ship, the Viktor Leonov, that is loitering—as was reported this morning from the Navy and news sources—off the coast, again, within the bare minimum of international waters.

I can attest to the fact that—having just flown down from Connecticut a few days ago—anyone who would allow that ship to enter the window of the United States was not to be trusted, and shows any resolve that we can trust, and shows any respect for Putin’s leadership—needs to take all necessary steps to respond to it both in the short-term and, obviously, as we take up defense policy and defense budgets, which is that the resurgence of the Russian Navy is a game-changing in terms of the demands on our fleet.

That is something that, again, on the Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee, which I am the ranking member, we are working hard in terms of implementing the Obama administration’s boost to Navy shipbuilding and increasing the fleet size.

Again, we need to really, as I said, just disavow ourselves of any naïve assumption that somehow the Putin government is somehow something that we can trust, and shows any respect for international norms or international law.

Again, to the folks back home, I want you to know that we are monitoring this situation with our Navy team down here in Washington and I have total confidence that we are on top of this situation.

It is a reminder that the Russian Government and the investment that they have put into their Navy fleet is not a friendly gesture in terms of creating a system of global peace and security; and this administration needs to wake up and recognize that and move on to a bipartisan effort to respond to this threat.

They can do that by, again, disclosing all the background regarding General Flynn’s interaction with the Russian Government and it is part and parcel of all those incidents which I listed in terms of aggressive actions that are happening in real time as we are here in Washington, D.C., today.

TITLE X GRANT ALLOCATIONS

The Speaker pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from...
Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this morning to talk about a piece of legislation that is going to be before us this week, and we are bringing it forward through the Congressional Review Act.

In our office, we have had so many people ask: What is a Congressional Review Act, and how is it that you can recall these rules?

This allows Congress to exercise their authority over the agencies and the administration and the executive branch interaction where they make rules. Many times they do these rules, as this previous administration did, at the last minute, as they are heading out the door, trying to put their thumb and their imprint on actions and prohibit Congress or prohibit the States from taking an action.

So as we meet in this Chamber this week, we are going to take up H.J. Res. 43. H.J. Res. 43 is a resolution which will disapprove of one of these last-minute rule changes that President Obama made as he was exiting his office. This one deals with title X funds and the grant allocations that come through title X funds.

Now, title X funds were put in place to serve women and their healthcare needs, underserved women in underserved areas, and to make certain that there were provisions so that they could get family planning funds to providers that offer access to preventive screenings, to annual immunizations, those checkups that they need to have each year. Many times these funds have been used by individuals who will say: We do women’s health and we also do abortion services.

Now, what the rule would have done was to block the States and to take away their ability to go in and ask: Who is going to have access to these funds, and are we going to disallow them to go to entities that provide abortion services?

So H.J. Res. 43 repeals the previous administration’s rule and it restores and gives back to the States the flexibility that they want and desire to have to distribute these title X grants under the parameters for which this program was designed.

States should be able to offer family planning funds to providers that offer a full and complete range of healthcare services for women, but do not participate in elective abortions.

Title X funds, outside of the Affordable Care Act, were intended to help keep patients healthy and to help them on the road to a better quality of life and better health outcomes, not to take away life.

H.J. Res. 43 also redirects title X grant funds to other clinics comprised of local health departments, hospitals, and federally qualified health centers that seek to protect life and offer healthcare services to women.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 43, which repeals the previous administrative efforts which undermine State laws and restores to the States the title X grant program for its original purpose.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o’clock and 30 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

As You make available to Your people the grace and knowledge to meet the needs of the day, we pray that Your spirit will be upon the Members of this people’s House, giving them the richness of Your wisdom.

May the power of Your truth and our faith in Your providence give them all the confidence they must have to do the work required for service to our Nation.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Speaker. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day’s proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Speaker. Will the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

RECOGNIZING AMERICAN HEART MONTH

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation celebrates American Heart Month, I want to highlight the groups and individuals working to ensure that south Florida is filled with healthy hearts.

Organizations like the Ft. Lauderdale-Miami chapter of the American Heart Association work tirelessly every day to raise awareness and support patients, as well as caregivers. These members will be hosting the Miami Heart and Stroke Ball to help fund lifesaving research and prevention programs in our community.

I would also like to recognize the medical researchers, the doctors, and the nurses at the Miami Cardiac and Vascular Institute and so many other medical centers that are working to pioneer innovative treatments that save lives in south Florida every day.

This American Heart Month, let us unite as a community to promote exercise, healthy eating habits, and frequent checkups to ensure that south Florida is heart-healthy throughout the entire year.

WHERE IS THE HEARING

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of troubling events in the Trump White House, I have one simple question: Where is the hearing?

In less than a month, we have heard nothing about the credibility and security of our democracy endangered by a descent into scandal, distrust, and an authoritative environment. What are we going to do about it?

I serve as the top Democrat on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee’s IT subcommittee, yet I have heard nothing about a hearing to investigate Russia’s cyber attacks on our elections. Where is the hearing?

Officials are hawking the First Daughter’s private clothing line from the White House. Where is the hearing? I sit on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and we have not had a discussion on Russia’s potential blackmailing of our President or former NSA Director Flynn. Where is the hearing?

The President’s tweets show an utter lack of respect for our free press and independent judicial system, hallmarks of our democracy. Where are the hearings?

Russia, election hacking, unconstitution-based Muslim bans, gag orders on public servants, unfinished and unfilled ethics paperwork, politically motivated witch hunts against scientists and reporters, blackmail from a foreign government, and the list goes on and on. All of these deserve answers so, once again, I ask, where is the hearing?

The people of Illinois and the American people deserve to know. They deserve a hearing.
MILITARY FOOD INSECURITY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the House Agriculture Committee has been focused on the issue of food insecurity and the programs that serve those in need beyond personal resources, family support, and community programs.

Many are surprised to learn that 22,000 Active Duty military families receive supplemental nutritional assistance from SNAP. Food insecurity for the families of these American heroes can be triggered by low pay among lower-ranking enlisted, high military spouse unemployment, larger household sizes, and unexpected financial emergencies.

We lifted one barrier to SNAP assistance for military families by disbanding the Department of Defense-administered Family Subsistence Supplemental Allowance, or FSSA. It was determined that the FSSA benefit was duplicative, underutilized, hard to qualify for, and less valuable than SNAP, with as few as 100 military families utilizing FSSA.

Another significant barrier that prevents some military families from qualifying for SNAP is the fact that their off-base housing allowance counts as income when computing eligibility. It is my hope we remedy this.

Mr. Speaker, as we prepare for reauthorization of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, we must remember the needs of America’s finest and their families, our American military. After all, nutrition matters.

AFFIRMING THE UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to affirm the great work of the United States Environmental Protection Agency.

In my home community of Buffalo, New York, we have seen the EPA’s effectiveness firsthand. Thirty years ago, the Buffalo River was declared biologically dead and ecologically destroyed because of industrial dumping of toxic waste directly into the river bed. Today, the Buffalo River has been remediated and continues to show vast improvements.

TO THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT: IT’S TIME

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, it is a bitter reality that universal human rights are under daily assault around the world.

I rise today joining in celebration and in mourning with Chinese democracy activist Zhu Yufu. This past week, he turned 64, but he marked the occasion in prison.

Zhu Yufu has devoted his life to promoting democracy and human rights, to the ire of Chinese authorities. In 2012, he was condemned to 7 years imprisonment on unjust charges. Since then, his health has deteriorated, made worse by denial of medical care and inhumane treatment. His family fears for his life.

The poem that led to Yufu’s imprisonment is called “It’s Time.” I completely agree. It is time for the Chinese government to provide Zhu Yufu with proper medical treatment and humane care. More than that, it is time for the Chinese Government to release Zhu Yufu and political prisoners like him who are unjustly detained. It is time for the Chinese Government to recognize and support freedom of speech, assembly, thought, and belief.

PUT AMERICA FIRST INSTEAD OF THE KREMLIN

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, for the sake of our country, I was relieved that General Michael Flynn resigned from his post as National Security Adviser. Not only did he mislead the Vice President and the public on his secret conversations with the Russian government, he may have also violated Federal law.

But what is just as concerning is that the Trump administration was aware of General Flynn’s misconduct weeks ago and did nothing about it. The American people deserve to know what President Trump knew, and when he knew it.

And let me be clear: General Flynn’s resignation is not the end of the Trump administration’s shady ties to Russia. We still don’t know President Trump’s financial interests in Russia because he refuses to release his tax returns.

We still don’t know the extent of Russia’s disturbing interference in our election because our calls for an investigation have been stonewalled.

And we just learned that the Trump campaign was in regular conversation with Russian intelligence officials.

President Trump’s coziness with Vladimir Putin is an urgent matter of national security.

It is time that the Trump administration truly put America first, rather than the Kremlin.

AMERICAN HEART MONTH

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

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize American Heart Month and to encourage each of us to support one another to be proactive in preventative heart care.

I would like to thank President Trump for honoring the tradition of dedicating February as American Heart Month so that we may continue our fight against heart disease and heart defects as a nation.

Heart disease is the leading cause of death in the United States. Every year, one in four deaths is caused by heart disease, and approximately 40,000 babies are born in the U.S. with a congenital heart defect, including myself.

The good news is that heart disease can often be detected earlier and even prevented when we make healthy choices, manage our health conditions, and keep up with our annual physicals.

Communities, health professionals, and families can work together to create opportunities for people to make healthier life choices and to lessen the stigma and fear of simply going to the doctor.

As this is American Heart Month, I encourage all Americans to use this month to raise awareness about heart disease and heart defects, and how we can prevent, treat, and cope with them, both at home and throughout our communities.

Through the support of my family and friends, the guidance of my doctors, and the grace of God, I am blessed to be standing here to support those across our Nation who are affected in some way by heart disease and heart defects.

My prayers and thoughts go out to every one of you.

I ask my colleagues to join me in promoting American Heart Month so that we can all help save precious lives.

WE OWE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE THE ABSOLUTE TRUTH

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, National Security Adviser Michael Flynn’s resignation is no substitute for answers to the serious questions that remain over President Trump’s question of Russia’s connections to Russia, to Vladimir Putin.

Federal investigators believe that Flynn, who held secret communications with Russia’s Ambassador, could have been compromised, or even the subject of blackmail. The Justice Department disclosed this danger to the White House weeks ago, yet the President allowed Mr. Flynn to continue in his position as National Security Adviser, after having that information disclosed to them.

This conduct could only be the tip of the iceberg. There are serious, unanswered questions that remain, and our
national security is at stake. Americans deserve answers.

Did the President or others know or direct Flynn’s secret communications with Russia?

Why did the White House sit on its hands for weeks, even after being told its National Security Adviser could have been compromised?

Were Trump campaign officials colluding with Russians?

These are questions that the American people deserve answers to. We need a bipartisan, independent commission to examine these questions. The credibility of our government is at stake. Congress must act.

VOTERS TRUST TRUMP, NOT THE MEDIA

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, despite the saturation of negative media coverage of President Trump, the people have spoken. A recent poll found that President Trump is thought more trustworthy than the news media.

The administration is considered truthful by 49 percent of registered voters, but the media is less trusted than the administration, with only 39 percent finding it honest. So President Trump is more credible than the liberal national media.

That is no surprise. If the media wants to increase their credibility, they should report the news fairly, objectively, and without malice.

INHUMANE HUNTING TECHNIQUES ON WILDLIFE REFUGES IN ALASKA

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, so far, in 2017, Donald Trump and the Republicans have targeted women, immigrants, and health care. Now they are setting their sights on bear cubs, wolves, and coyotes.

Republicans, in cahoots with the gun lobby and with trophy hunters, want to eliminate a rule that currently prohibits hunters from using brutal means to kill our majestic animals in Alaska’s 16 wildlife refuges.

This rule prevents smirking and trapping bears, including cubs, hunting wolves in their dens, and shooting bears from helicopters, among other methods.

Now those opposed to the rule say that it hurts Alaska’s economy, but there is no evidence of that. In fact, big game hunting represents only 2 percent of wildlife-related recreation on our national wildlife refuges.

Meanwhile, the National Park Service has estimated that wildlife watchers, those who go to see wildlife, not to shoot them, contribute $1 billion to the State’s economy.

I ask you: Is a trophy on the wall really worth it? So please vote “no” on H.J. Res. 69 introduced by our colleague, Mr. YOUNG.

GENERAL MICHAEL FLYNN’S RESIGNATION

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call for a nonpartisan, independent commission to immediately and thoroughly examine the influence in the 2016 election and at the Trump White House of the Russian Government. This House should have begun this critical oversight work immediately and served as a check on the White House to protect the American people, but it has failed to do so.

The resignation of General Michael Flynn has raised far more questions than it answered, and it is not acceptable to simply sit on our hands or to say that somehow the only problem is the leaks that exposed this misconduct and not the misconduct itself. That won’t cut it.

The American people deserve to know the full picture of Russia’s involvement in the election of General Flynn’s communication with Russian officials, and why President Trump took no action for weeks after learning of General Flynn’s misconduct.

Unfortunately, this administration’s idea of transparency is conducting sensitive national security discussions in the middle of a crowded Mar-a-Lago dining room in full view of his wealthy patrons. The American people deserve better. They deserve an independent, nonpartisan commission, and it is time for this House to do its job.

POTENTIAL CRIMES AND COVERUPS

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

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, Donald Trump poses the greatest Presidential threat to our democracy since Richard Nixon. It is about the potential crimes and the potential coverup. Seventeen different intelligence agencies have concluded that the Russians interfered with the election in order to help Donald Trump. Top Trump cronies like Carter Page, Paul Manafort, and Michael Flynn all had regular communications with high-level Russian intelligence agents at the same time they were engaging in hacking.

The National Security Adviser resigned in disgrace because of illegal communication with the Russian Ambassador. The President refuses to denounce Vladimir Putin and continues to try to make Russia great again.

Connect the dots. It is time for House Republicans to do their job and put country ahead of party. Join us in a bipartisan investigation of the White House. What did the President know, and when did he know it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Chair would remind Members to avoid improper references to the President.

TAKING CARE OF OUR VETERANS

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the many veterans and the work that Congress is doing to support and represent them on the House floor this week. These are the heroes who keep us safe and secure each and every day.

This week, this body passed a few important bills to streamline access to care for veterans as it provides new and better opportunities for veteran-owned businesses and veterans seeking employment.

Last month, the unemployment rate for Iraq and Afghanistan veterans increased to 6.3 percent, marking the fourth time in the last 7 months that group’s percentage has been higher than the overall veteran unemployment rate. That means that about 211,000 Iraq and Afghanistan veterans are still looking for work. That is 211,000 too many.

That is why one of the bills we passed this week establishes a Federal program recognizing private businesses that employ veterans and engage in community service to help our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, helping our Nation’s veterans who have sacrificed so much for us is a critical priority and remains one of the most important objectives of this Congress. I will continue to use my time and effort to fight for every opportunity to support them when they return home to give them the hero’s welcome they deserve.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

WASHINGTON, DC, February 15, 2017.

Hon. Paul D. Ryan,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,

Dear Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 15, 2017, at 9:19 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 255.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 321.

With best wishes, I am Sincerely,

Karen L. Haas.
PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 43, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF FINAL RULE BY SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 69, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF FINAL RULE OF DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM FEBRUARY 17, 2017, THROUGH FEBRUARY 24, 2017

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 123 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 123

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 43) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule submitted by Secretary of Health and Human Services relating to compliance with title X requirements by project participants and the joint resolution of the Committee on Natural Resources, for H.J. Res. 69, the standard procedure for such resolutions, since the sole purpose of each is to remove a harmful regulation from the Federal Register.

The rule allows for 1 hour of debate, equally divided between the majority and the minority leader or their designees, for H.J. Res. 43, and 1 hour of debate, equally divided between the majority and the ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources, for H.J. Res. 69. On each resolution contained in the rule, the minority is afforded the customary motion to recommit.

H.J. Res. 43 is a joint resolution which would repeal the Obama administration’s midnight rule that takes away States’ ability to direct funding within their own borders to certain healthcare providers that conform to the States’ values.

In her final days in office, Secretary Mathews Burwell pushed forward a rule that would require States to fund, with public dollars, facilities that perform abortions, potentially against the will of the people of that given State. This flies in the face of the 10th Amendment which grants to States the authority to make such decisions within their borders and to prioritize which healthcare providers should receive funding based on the greatest need in their own communities.

Those of us who care about the carefully crafted Federal system which our Founding Fathers set up, which allows different States to operate differently based upon their own values and priorities, recognize the Obama rule for what it is: a power grab by the Federal Government. This is why the House will take up this resolution today—to prevent the administration’s midnight rule that would repeal the Obama administration’s midnight rule that takes away States’ ability to direct funding within their own borders to certain healthcare providers that conform to the States’ values.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to highlight the growing number of executive orders issued by President Trump and the silence from our House majority.

President Trump has signed 12 executive orders in the first 5 weeks in office. Many, like the border wall, the Muslim ban, and the ACA sabotage order, are highly misguided and exceed the intent of the law.

Congress has a constitutional duty to oversee and investigate the actions of the Executives. To date the House majority has said little and taken no action to oversee the Trump administration’s abuse of power through executive orders.

When President Obama sat in the White House, the House majority called his administration every name under the sun. Agencies were closely scrutinized. Federal officials were regularly subject to hostile questioning.

Where is the oversight, Mr. Speaker? Where is the criticism? What happened to limiting executive power?

I hope my colleagues in the majority will uphold Congress’ constitutional duties and vigorously scrutinize President Trump’s actions and mounting abuse of power.

February 15, 2017
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CONGRESS NEEDS TO SCRUTINIZE THE NEW ADMINISTRATION’S EXECUTIVE ORDERS

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I highlight the growing number of executive orders issued by President Trump and the silence from our House majority.

President Trump has signed 12 executive orders in the first 5 weeks in office. Many, like the border wall, the Muslim ban, and the ACA sabotage order, are highly misguided and exceed the intent of the law.

Congress has a constitutional duty to oversee and investigate the actions of the Executives. To date the House majority has said little and taken no action to oversee the Trump administration’s abuse of power through executive orders.

When President Obama sat in the White House, the House majority called his administration every name under the sun. Agencies were closely scrutinized. Federal officials were regularly subject to hostile questioning.

Where is the oversight, Mr. Speaker? Where is the criticism? What happened to limiting executive power?

I hope my colleagues in the majority will uphold Congress’ constitutional duties and vigorously scrutinize President Trump’s actions and mounting abuse of power.

Providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 43, providing for congressional disapproval of final rule by Secretary of Health and Human Services; providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 69, providing for congressional disapproval of final rule of Department of the Interior; and providing for proceedings during the period from February 17, 2017, through February 24, 2017.
The Congressional Review Act is an important tool in maintaining accountability at the Federal level. Its necessity has never been more apparent than over the past few weeks where this Congress has needed to step in and remove partisan and unjustifiably unchecked regulations put in place by President Obama and his team just as they were walking out the door.

House Republicans today will stand up for the rights of our constituents again by eliminating out-of-control Federal bureaucracy. I urge my colleagues to support today’s rule and the two underlying Congressional Review Act resolutions.

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

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

Before I start, I include in the RECORD a letter from over 20 healthcare provider organizations regarding the danger of cutting certain providers off from title X funding because they also provide abortion with private funds.

February 3, 2017.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL, Senate Majority Leader, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER, Senate Minority Leader, Washington, DC.

Hon. PAUL RYAN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI, Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Leader McConnell, Speaker Ryan, Leader Schumer and Leader Pelosi:

As organizations representing health care and public health professionals and the people they serve across the country, we strongly oppose any effort to prevent Planned Parenthood from participating in federal health programs, including Medicaid and the Title X family planning program.

Any proposal to exclude Planned Parenthood from participating in federal health programs, including Medicaid and the Title X family planning program, is shortsighted on the part of those seeking to curtail women’s access to essential health care services, including family planning, well-woman exams, breast and cervical cancer screenings, and HIV testing and counseling. At a time when there is much uncertainty about the future of affordable health care in our country, it is dangerous to curtail access to the life-saving preventive care that Planned Parenthood provides to some of our nation’s most vulnerable patients.

Planned Parenthood health centers play a crucial role in improving the health and lives of people across the country. In fact, 25 million women, men and young people rely on Planned Parenthood for health care every year. For many women, Planned Parenthood is their only source of care—offering basic preventive services that are fundamental to women’s and men’s well-being. More than 50% of Planned Parenthood health centers are in areas with health professional shortages, rural or medically underserved areas. In 2015 Planned Parenthood participating health centers provided nearly 400,000 cervical cancer screenings and more than 360,000 breast exams. Additionally, Planned Parenthood provides contraceptive services for over 2 million patients and more than 4 million tests and treatments for sexually transmitted infections, including HIV. These services improve women’s health, prevent an estimated 579,000 unintended pregnancies, and decrease infant mortality.

Policy and budget cuts to Planned Parenthood from public health funding would hurt millions of patients and undermine access to comprehensive health care across the country. Limiting access to Planned Parenthood’s approximately 650 health care centers across the country would prevent patients from having access to basic preventive health care services. Approximately 60 percent of Planned Parenthood patients access care through Medicaid and Title X, in addition to other essential programs, including maternal and child health programs and Centers for Disease and Prevention (CDC) breast and cervical cancer screening programs. Planned Parenthood is the only provider participating in Title X, and more than 50 percent of Planned Parenthood health centers are located in a medically underserved or health professional shortage area. Because federal law already requires health care providers to demonstrate that no federal funds are used for abortion, prohibiting funding for preventive care at Planned Parenthood health centers will only devastate access to these life-saving services.

In addition to limiting patients access to health care, defunding Planned Parenthood is not cost effective. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that approximately 390,000 women would lose access and up to 650,000 patients could face reduced access to preventive health care within a year should Congress act to block all Medicaid patients from receiving care at Planned Parenthood health centers. The CBO also projects that excluding Planned Parenthood from participating in Medicaid reimbursement through the Medicaid program would result in a net cost to taxpayers of $130 million over 10 years because of the increase in unintended pregnancies without the contraceptive care provided by Planned Parenthood. Other publicly funded health centers would not be able to compensate for the loss of affordable family planning and reproductive health care services provided by Planned Parenthood.

Every day, we see the harmful impact that unforeseen cuts to health care have on women and communities across the country, and we therefore strongly support policies that improve access to affordable, quality health care. At a time when Planned Parenthood public health funds only serve to cut millions off from critical preventive care, and we strongly oppose any effort to do so. We also recognize this as part of a broader effort to undermine access to safe, legal abortion and curtail access to other reproductive health care by limiting the ability of abortion providers to participate in public health programs.

Sincerely,

American Academy of Nursing, American Academy of Pediatrics, American College of Nurse-Midwives, American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, American Medical Student Association, American Medical Women’s Association (AMWA), American Nurses Association, American Psychological Association, American Public Health Association, American Society for Reproductive Medicine, Association of Reproductive Health Professionals, Doctors for America, GLMA: Health Professionals Advancing the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act (H.R. 7) through the House, effectively banning private insurance companies from covering comprehensive reproductive health services.

Now, with their most recent effort to weaken the Title X national family planning program through the Congressional Review Act, Republicans have demonstrated that they will stop at nothing to limit women’s access to vital health care. Sadly, this includes contraception and family planning services that all women need.

For more than 40 years, Title X has served as a cornerstone of safety-net care. As the only dedicated source of federal funding for family planning, Title X reaches a diverse network of providers to deliver high-quality, low-priced, long-term care to the nation’s millions of uninsured, low-income, and young patients seeking contraception and quality health care. In 2015 alone, Title X-funded clinics helped prevent approximately 904,000 unintended pregnancies, 326,000 abortions, and 439,000 unplanned births. In addition to direct clinical care, Title X also supports critical infrastructure needs for health centers, including new medical equipment and staff training that are not reimbursable through Medicaid and other public health insurance. This infrastructure is vital to ensuring safe, quality care at health centers which serve and provide basic health services to high-needs populations.

Throughout both Democratic and Republican administrations, Title X has been interpreted to prohibit state actions that would force or pressure or encourage providers participating in a Title X project based on factors unrelated to a provider’s qualification to perform the required services. The network includes providers from state, county, and local health departments as well as hospitals, family planning councils, Planned Parenthood affiliates, federally qualified health centers, and private non-profit organizations. In fact, in instances when states have passed laws to
Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the majority is in the midst of an unprecedented and relentless assault on women’s health—and many other regulations while we are at it—that are being overturned every day here.

Although it pledged to govern by prioritizing jobs and the economy, the majority is, instead, escalating its war on women with dangerous continuation of its never-ending crusade against access to health care for women.

The majority started the 115th Congress by moving quickly to rescind the Affordable Care Act, a law that finally barred insurance companies from treating women as being a preexisting condition. Without this law, women once again would pay a higher rate for coverage than men.

Think about that for a moment. If everybody doesn’t know it, before this law, single women paid from 10 to 57 percent more than men for their health insurance in States that allowed gender rating. I wonder if this majority understands it is time for the government to end this, but it costs American women nearly a billion dollars every year. But Republicans are rushing to repeal the Affordable Care Act without anything to take its place.

The majority has passed H.R. 7, a sweeping bill that would go beyond even the Hyde amendment, a 40-year provision that has been around for four decades too long.

This legislation wouldn’t just make this amendment permanent; it would also place unprecedented limits on women’s access to reproductive health services even if they wanted to pay out of their own pockets to access constitutionally protected abortion services.

These moves by the majority, along with the President signing a dramatic expansion of the global gag rule immediately after taking office, have brought millions of people pouring into the streets in protest.

During the National Women’s March, millions of people marched all across the country and even around the globe to defend women’s rights. These marches were likely the largest day of protests in American history. More than half a million people took to the streets right here in the Nation’s Capitol. They were peaceful, without a single arrest reported anywhere in the country.

Far from respecting those rights, the majority is today considering a measure that marks an entirely new front in their war against women’s rights. This is the most serious threat facing women so far this Congress, and it is only February.

Programs supported by title X help prevent unplanned pregnancies, improve access to comprehensive reproductive healthcare services like contraception, cancer screening, and STD testing to the men and women who need them most.

It is outrageous that the majority is trying to allow State legislatures to pick and choose who can provide this essential care with Federal money. That is one of the worst things in the world. The luck of the draw of where you live will determine whether or not you have access that is entitled to all people from the Federal money. This would threaten health centers from coast to coast.

Mr. Speaker, we are facing the same problem today we faced for a very long time: men in blue suits and red ties determined what we should do when it comes to their own health. They believe the majority of persons—women—in the United States are incapable of making their own decisions.

Do you think that about your own mother, or your wife?

Because Washington, D.C., is controlled by this Republican majority, the stakes for women are higher today than they have been in generations, as we turn over laws passed by the elected government of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, Republican leaders in Congress turn a deaf ear to the majority of Americans who oppose this dramatic government intervention into women’s health care. They, unfortunately, have the votes to pass it, but they will have to reckon with the overwhelming majority of the public who understands it is time for the government to get out of the business of taking away women’s healthcare rights.

Mr. Speaker, let me take a personal moment to speak about the departure of a long-time member of my staff on the Rules Committee. I have always believed that this committee is like family and that we have one of the most respected staffs on Capitol Hill. Adam Berg, the deputy staff director and counsel on the Democratic staff personifies this.

After a decade of working for the Rules Committee, Adam is beginning a new chapter on a different committee in the House of Representatives. His knowledge and guidance these last years have been immeasurable.

During his time here, he has married his wife, Erika, who is beautiful and talented, and became a father to his daughter, Ariel, who was singing songs with her mother at the age of 3 months. That is a precious child.

Adam has played a key role as this committee brought landmark legislation to the floor of the House, including Dodd-Frank, the Affordable Care Act, and legislation to raise the Federal minimum wage.
The committee wouldn’t have been as
effective without Adam’s counsel, and
he will be greatly missed. I wish him
nothing but the best in his new endeav-
or.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I re-
serve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield
2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Con-
necticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in
strong opposition to this rule, which
would enable States to discriminate
against healthcare providers and deny
women access to critical healthcare
services.

This rule would put the only Federal
program exclusively dedicated to fam-
ily planning and reproductive health
services in jeopardy. It reverses the
Health and Human Services title X rule
prohibiting discrimination against title
X healthcare providers. It would have
devastating healthcare con-
sequences.

In 2015, 88 percent of patients at title
X clinics received subsidized or no-
charge care, and many of these clinics
provide primary health care in addition
to family planning services. They help
upend public health networks in com-
unities across the country.

Supporters of this amendment claim
that other health providers can absorb
the clients who would lose access to
their title X clinics. This is false. Com-

munity healthcare centers have said
that they do not have the capacity, and
they are often not located near these
patients.

We need to protect these healthcare
providers. We need to uphold our re-

sponsibility to the American people to
provide critical services to those who
need them. I cannot and will not sup-
port this rule or this resolution. It is
detrimental to women’s health in this
country.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield
myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to point out
that H.J. Res. 43 would repeal the
Obama administration’s rule and allow
States to prioritize family planning funds
to healthcare clinics that offer a full range
of healthcare services, including family
planning, but do not participate in
abortion.

States should be able to choose to
prioritize family planning funds to
health clinics that offer a full range of
healthcare services, including family
planning, but do not participate in
abortion.

States can fully support family plan-
ing and other health services without
funding abortion providers like
Planned Parenthood. Planned Paren-
thood only comprises 13 percent of ap-
proximately 4,100 title X service sites.

Redirecting funds away from abor-
tion providers does not reduce funds for
the title X program. When States set
criteria that eliminates abortion pro-
viders from title X distributions, those
funds are then directed to other clinics.

Eighty-seven percent of current title
X service sites are comprised of local
health departments, local hospitals,
and Federally qualified health centers.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield
myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think I need to make
this point one more time. I really be-

lieve that everybody in this House un-
derstands what this rule means. This
money is used for abortions. It never
has been, never will. There is maticu-

lous care taken by Planned Parenthood
to separate those funds. They have
never been questioned in any way by
HHS as to how those funds are being
used.

I am sick and tired of everybody say-
ing you can’t give anything to Planned
Parenthood. The money that goes to
Planned Parenthood from this Federal
Government goes to reimburse for serv-
ices rendered for the things I had
talked about before: cervical cancer
tests, cancer tests of all sorts, and
health care that they cannot get any-
where else, such as screening for STDS.

That is totally false.

Yet, that fable that Federal money is
used for abortions if you fund Planned
Parenthood is totally false. I think it
is time that grownups that can read in
the House of Representatives do away
with that notion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the
gentleman from California (Mr. CÁ RN

ES).

Mr. CARDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise
today to speak against this rule and
H.J. Res. 69, which we will be debating
tomorrow.

Last year, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
Service updated its regulations for na-
tional wildlife refuges in Alaska to pro-
hibit the cruellest killing methods of
wolves, grizzly bears, and other native
mammals in Alaska.

The rule FWS put forward makes
sense. It even makes clear that it does
not apply to subsistence hunting or re-

strict the taking of wildlife for public
safety purposes or in defense of prop-
erty. Yet, here we are, just 6 months
later, and Republicans are pushing
through this resolution to overturn the
rule and make egregious and cruel
hunting methods common practice in

Alaska.

They are inhumane methods, such as
denning of wolves and their pups, using
airplanes to scout and shoot grizzly
bears, and trapping grizzly bears with
steel-jawed traps. These cruel methods
should never be allowed anywhere. This
resolution is irresponsible and inhu-

mane.

As with other Congressional Review
Act resolutions, H.J. Res. 69 will have a
chilling effect. This and future admin-
istrations would be prohibited from
ever issuing a similar rule, making in-
humane and reprehensible hunting
methods the law of the land.

This resolution handcuffs our Federal
wildlife managers from protecting our
refuges, our national resources, and
our wildlife. We must ensure that our
children and grandchildren will some-
day enjoy the majestic national beauty
of the native mammals in Alaska and
across our great Nation.

I urge my colleagues to reject this
rule and also vote ‘no’ on H.J. Res. 69.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield
myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I reference a letter that
was sent to Speaker PAUL RYAN and
Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY by
a number of sports-related organizations.

They say: ‘‘We write representing or-

ganizations that collectively include
millions of wildlife conservationists
. . . wildlife enthusiasts, and wildlife
scientists, in strong support of H.J.
Res. 49 from Cong. YOUNG of Alaska.
. . . Our community exhausted all Ex-
ecutive Branch appeals and remedies
urging the FWS to slow down the pro-
posed Rule, and revise it to reflect a

proposed Rule, and revise it to reflect a

sympathetic approach to the needs of
the State of Alaska and the FWS; all to

no end. It is time for Congress to nullify
this final rule.’’

They go on to say: ‘‘This final rule

boldly preempts the authority of the Fish
and Wildlife Service to manage wild-
life for both recreational and subsistence
hunting on NWRs, which authority of the state is
affirmed by Congress in the Alaska
Statehood Act, the Alaska National Inter-
ests Land Conservation Act, and the
National Wildlife Refuge System Im-
provement Act. The FWS final rule was

promised on a meeting as a priority the
FWS policy on Biological Integrity, Di-

versity, and Environmental Health. . . .
Many members of our organizations
enjoy Alaska’s bounty of fish and wild-
life resources and their habitats for
unrivaled hunting, fishing and outdoor

experiences. The sustainable manage-
ment of these natural needs to be led by
the State working in co-

operation with the FWS. We urge that
you favorably consider H.J. Res. 49
which will restore the jurisdictional
state-federal relationship as Congress
has previously directed.’’

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of
my time.
Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak against restricting the family planning services that are provided by title X.

Just prior to signing title X into law, back in 1970, President Richard Nixon recognized the essential family planning services for women’s health. He then sent a message to Congress telling them, “no American woman should be denied access to family planning assistance because of her economic condition.” Last year, Mr. Speaker, President Obama signed into law that sentiment by making family planning services a part of basic health care, regardless of where one lives. Although Presidents Nixon and Obama couldn’t be more divided in their policies, even they were united behind title X. I believe this is understandable, considering how title X ensures basic preventive health care and family planning services for 4 million low-income people every year.

In my district, title X family planning services saves an average of $7 on Medicaid-related costs for every dollar of Federal investment. That means that clinics in my district, like Mar Monte, are able to help more women and men receive a full range of healthcare services.

Rather than restricting family planning clinics, we should be promoting, we should be protecting, and we should be preserving access to those vital services, especially for those families that need them.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the record a letter written to the Honorable Sylvia Mathews Burwell signed by 110 Members of the House and Senate to express strong opposition to the Department of Health and Human Services’ September 7, 2016, notice of proposed rulemaking titled “Compliance with Title X Requirements by Project Recipients in Selecting Subrecipients.”

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

Honorable Sylvia Mathews Burwell,
Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Secretary Burwell,

We write to express our strong opposition to the Department of Health and Human Services’ September 7, 2016, notice of proposed rulemaking titled “Compliance with Title X Requirements by Project Recipients in Selecting Subrecipients.” Although we appreciate the Department’s intent to follow proper regulatory process pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act, HHS’s purpose for engaging in the rulemaking appears on its face to be an attempt to subvert the will of elected representatives.

More broadly, the new regulations appear to be poorly constructed and are likely to be fundamentally flawed. Although the Administration has not provided all the information that the committee seeks, it is clear that the rulemaking lacks both the rigor and the transparency that the committee and the American people deserve.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we are deeply concerned by reports from our intelligence community regarding the foreign interference in our most recent election. The fears have been only compounded by the troubling revelations published in The New York Times last night that members of the Trump campaign had been in frequent contact with Russian intelligence officials during that campaign.

Mr. Speaker, the future of our democracy is at stake. We are seeing the

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the balance of my time to close.
same kinds of things that have happened all over Europe, as governments have been changing away from democracies. It is at stake here, and it is time this Republican-controlled Congress does its job and gets to the bottom of the letter.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative Swalwell’s and Representative Cummings’ bill which would create a bipartisan commission to investigate foreign interference in our 2016 election.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. Slaughter. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of meeting hundreds of constituents who traveled from Rochester, New York, to Washington, D.C., for the Women’s March on Washington. Some of them came with three generations, and it was most impressive, but it is troubling to me that we are still fighting battles that were fought and won generations ago.

The unprecedented marches and rallies that have been happening are necessarily because of efforts like this. We must continually chip away at women’s healthcare rights. The sad reality is that politicians have always worked to put up new roadblocks between women and their health care. It has always been my personal belief that when faced with a decision that needs to be made about a pregnancy, a woman should consult whomever she chooses—certainly her husband, her spiritual advisor, her medical adviser, but no one wants to wait in the room until a congressman votes there to make the final decision. We are going way beyond our depth to try to make that decision for persons. The government should not be in the business of doing that. The majority has made attacking women’s constitutional rights the first order of business this year, working alongside our new President, and it is shameful.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, the other measure before us today would repeal the Alaska wildlife refuge, which protects the interests of all Americans in national wildlife refuges while banning some of the most inhumane tactics for killing, like killing black bears from an airplane and killing coyote pups in their dens. We should be listening to scientists who study and understand these species, not an ideological minority that sees every animal with teeth as a threat to civilization and a potential addition to their trophy hunting collection.

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

Mr. Burgess. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. Foxx).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, in a time when so many Americans are looking for ideas and policies we can unite around, one point of agreement stands out among Americans that they do not want their taxpayer dollars being used to fund abortions. A Marist poll released in January revealed that 61 percent of Americans feel this way.

States that have expanded the freedom to direct funds away from abortion providers, such as the Nation’s largest abortion provider, Planned Parenthood, and there are many reasons States may wish to do so. The most important reason, one that we should all carefully consider, is that abortion is not health care. Abortion takes the lives of unborn children and hurts women. Many States have recognized title X funds away from abortion as a threat to civilization and a potentiality that sees every animal with teeth as a threat to civilization and a potentiality that sees every animal with teeth. We should be listening to the American people in the waning hours of the Obama administration. The rules the House will be voting to repeal today would infringe upon states’ rights to govern themselves within their own borders and would impose new Federal requirements and oversight in contravention of the 10th Amendment. This is why removing this regulation is critical. It is critical to maintaining the proper State-Federal balance that our Founding Fathers so carefully crafted in our Constitution.

I thank Representative Diane Black and Representative Don Young for their work on these pieces of legislation to protect states’ rights. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the rule and “yes” on the two underlying resolutions.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 123 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

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

4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 356) to establish the National Commission on Foreign Interference in United States Elections and Political Campaigns. The Speaker shall, pursuant to rule XVII, determine that all printed copies of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. After general debate the bill shall be considered as amended under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the two parties shall have a right to report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be ordered to be taken on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instruction. The Committee of the Whole shall resolve and report that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the reading by the Clerk of the previous day, report by the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 356.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic majority to offer ideas and policies we can unite around.

Mr. Clarence Cannon’s Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House be determined by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker’s ruling of January 13, 1929, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition.” In order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a point of inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the recognition.” The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on the whole bill (H.R. 1) has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leader’s Manual Manual. Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 133). Here’s how the
Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule... When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

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

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

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 8, as follows:

yea nay total
190 8 190

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 93.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time of any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 188, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 94] YEAS—233

NAYS—190

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. ROONEY, DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 93.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 188, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 94] YEAS—233

NAYS—190

Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 188, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 94] YEAS—233

NAYS—190

Ms. SLAGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 188, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 94] YEAS—233

NAYS—190

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 188, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 94] YEAS—233

NAYS—190

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 188, not voting 10, as follows:
So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

_H. Res. 127_

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

1. Committee on Ethics—Mr. Cohen.
2. Committee on Oversight and Government Reform—Mr. Sarbanes.
3. Committee on Small Business—Mr. Schneider.

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### DISAPPROVING RULE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF LABOR RELATING TO DRUG TESTING OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION APPLICANTS

Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 99, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 42) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to drug testing of unemployment compensation applicants, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 99, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

_H. J. Res. 42_

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the joint resolution entitled "Department of Labor—Occupations for Drug Testing of Unemployment Compensation Applicants" (published in the Federal Register, on December 18, 2016) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to Federal-State Unemployment Compensation Programs; Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 Provision on Establishing Appropriate Occupations for Drug Testing of Unemployment Compensation Applicants" (published at 81 Fed. Reg. 50298 (August 1, 2016)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. J. Res. 42, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Next Wednesday, February 22, will mark 5 years since the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act was signed into law. This 2012 law has made important reforms in the unemployment insurance system, improvements that were specifically designed to help more out-of-work Americans successfully return to the workforce.
of-work Americans to be ready to pass that drug test, take that new job, and get back on the path to earning their own success.

My home State of Texas was one of the first to step up when this provision was added to the 2012 law. They even changed their own laws to get ready. But before this provision could be implemented by States, the law required the Department of Labor to issue a regulation defining those occupations that regularly conduct drug testing, to be sure this rule was consistent with real-world expectations from employers.

In a 2012 hearing of the Committee on Ways and Means’ Human Resources Subcommittee, an official from the Department of Labor assured us the rule could be drafted quickly and according to congressional intent. Well, despite those assurances, months went by with no action from the Obama administration.

During that time, the Ways and Means Committee held another hearing on this issue and sent a letter to the Department of Labor in anticipation of the regulation. We urged them to craft the rule broadly, which was consistent with what we were hearing from businesses.

In October of 2014, more than 2 years after the law was passed, the Department issued its proposed rule. Counter to our recommendations, the draft rule was incredibly narrow. So narrow, in fact, that States like Texas would be severely limited in their ability to successfully implement an unemployment insurance drug testing program.

Again, the Ways and Means Committee made our concerns known to the Obama administration by submitting a public comment on the draft rule, calling for significant revisions. We made clear that the proposed rule did not faithfully adhere to the intent of Congress, and these same concerns were echoed in other public comment from prominent stakeholders.

Two more years went by. Meanwhile, Congress continued to press the administration to revise the rule so it followed the intent of the bipartisan law. That brings us to August of last year, when, at long last, the Department of Labor published its final rule. And just like the proposed rule 2 years earlier, it ignored the intent of Congress. It disregarded most of the comments and the concerns of other public comment from prominent stakeholders.

The final rule directly undermined the ability of States to implement this important bipartisan reform that would help unemployed workers in their quest to find a good-paying new job.

So on his way out of office, former President Obama flat out refused to implement the law he signed in 2012. Instead, he directed the Department of Labor to issue a regulation that effectively blocks States from taking action.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are sick of Washington not keeping its promises. They are sick of unaccountable Federal bureaucrats abusing their authority to undercut the will of Congress and the American people. And this eleventh-hour regulation by the Obama Department of Labor is a prime example of just that.

The debate we are having today is not about the merits of drug testing unemployed insurance applicants. That is now for the States to decide because, in 2012, Congress passed a law providing them—not the Federal Government—with the ability to do so. This debate is really about placing a check and balance on blatant overreach that all but prohibits States from moving forward with this reform.

More importantly, it is about ensuring that the will and the intent of this body is upheld.

In closing, I thank the House for its consideration of H.J. Res. 42. I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting this important bipartisan reform that would help unemployed workers in their hometowns.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. Smith) be permitted to control the remainder of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
authorizing drug testing to the point that a state is, for all practical purposes, prevented from adopting a meaningful drug testing program for unemployment compensation purposes. These regulations are an exhibit of executive overreach where the United States Department of Labor effectively seeks to block the implementation of an Act of Congress.

I thank you for your efforts to restore to the states their right to enact drug testing requirements for unemployment compensation recipients. Sincerely,

Pete Ricketts,
Governor.


Hon. Kevin Brady,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. Richard Neal,
Ranking Member, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY AND RANKING MEMBER NEAL: I am writing on behalf of UWC—Strategic Services on Unemployment and Workers’ Compensation (UWC) in support of Resolution H.J. Res 42 that would disallow the final regulations posted by the United States Department of Labor on August 5, 2016.

UWC is a national association representing businesses and business organizations in their ability to work, available to work, and actively seeking work. The additional authority provided in Section 2105 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 and unduly restrict state agencies choosing to test applicants for the use of controlled substances.

Drug testing is a critical requirement of employment in many industries and generally in determining whether a prospective employee will be able to perform the responsibilities of work for which the individual has applied. The results of drug tests are also indications of whether an individual is able to work and be eligible to be paid unemployment compensation. It is a federal statutory requirement of administrative grants to states that as a condition of being paid unemployment compensation for a week or weeks an individual must be able to work, available to work, and actively seeking work.

The regulations adopted in final form not only severely limited the circumstances under which a state may conduct a drug test, but also unduly limited the types of tests that a state may conduct to the point that a state is, for all practical purposes, prevented from adopting a meaningful drug testing program for unemployment compensation purposes. These regulations are an exhibit of executive overreach where the United States Department of Labor effectively seeks to block the implementation of an Act of Congress. I thank you for your efforts to restore to the states their right to enact drug testing requirements for unemployment compensation recipients. Sincerely,

Pete Ricketts,
Governor.


Hon. Kevin Brady,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. Richard Neal,
Ranking Member, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY AND RANKING MEMBER NEAL: I am writing on behalf of UWC—Strategic Services on Unemployment and Workers’ Compensation (UWC) in support of Resolution H.J. Res 42 that would disallow the final regulations posted by the United States Department of Labor on August 5, 2016.

UWC is a national association representing businesses and business organizations in their ability to work, available to work, and actively seeking work. The additional authority provided in Section 2105 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 and unduly restrict state agencies choosing to test applicants for the use of controlled substances.

Drug testing is a critical requirement of employment in many industries and generally in determining whether a prospective employee will be able to perform the responsibilities of work for which the individual has applied. The results of drug tests are also indications of whether an individual is able to work and be eligible to be paid unemployment compensation. It is a federal statutory requirement of administrative grants to states that as a condition of being paid unemployment compensation for a week or weeks an individual must be able to work, available to work, and actively seeking work. The additional authority provided in Section 2105 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 permitted states to test for controlled substances consistent with the ability to work and available to work requirements that were also included in the act.

The regulations adopted by the United States Department of Labor were so narrowly drawn as to severely limit states from electing to provide for drug testing of applicants. By limiting the time within which a test may be conducted to the period between the date of application and the date at which the applicant began to claim a week of unemployment compensation, such a test would be less likely to connect a positive drug test with a subsequent week of unemployment compensation that could be claimed up to 52 weeks after the date of initial application.

The effect of such an interpretation is to render a test useless for weeks claimed many weeks after the individual became unemployed when the period of unemployment compensation as they are permitted to conduct. . . .

The regulations adopted in final form not only severely limited the circumstances under which a state may conduct a drug test, but also unduly limited the types of tests that a state may conduct to the point that a state is, for all practical purposes, prevented from adopting a meaningful drug testing program for unemployment compensation purposes. These regulations are an exhibit of executive overreach where the United States Department of Labor effectively seeks to block the implementation of an Act of Congress.

I thank you for your efforts to restore to the states their right to enact drug testing requirements for unemployment compensation recipients. Sincerely,

Pete Ricketts,
Governor.
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DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY AND RANKING MEMBER NEAL: I am writing on behalf of UWC—Strategic Services on Unemployment and Workers’ Compensation (UWC) in support of Resolution H.J. Res 42 that would disallow the final regulations posted by the United States Department of Labor on August 5, 2016.

UWC is a national association representing businesses and business organizations in their ability to work, available to work, and actively seeking work. The additional authority provided in Section 2105 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 and unduly restrict state agencies choosing to test applicants for the use of controlled substances.

Drug testing is a critical requirement of employment in many industries and generally in determining whether a prospective employee will be able to perform the responsibilities of work for which the individual has applied. The results of drug tests are also indications of whether an individual is able to work and be eligible to be paid unemployment compensation. It is a federal statutory requirement of administrative grants to states that as a condition of being paid unemployment compensation for a week or weeks an individual must be able to work, available to work, and actively seeking work. The additional authority provided in Section 2105 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 permitted states to test for controlled substances consistent with the ability to work and available to work requirements that were also included in the act.

The regulations adopted by the United States Department of Labor were so narrowly drawn as to severely limit states from electing to provide for drug testing of applicants. By limiting the time within which a test may be conducted to the period between the date of application and the date at which the applicant began to claim a week of unemployment compensation, such a test would be less likely to connect a positive drug test with a subsequent week of unemployment compensation that could be claimed up to 52 weeks after the date of initial application.

The effect of such an interpretation is to render a test useless for weeks claimed many weeks after the individual became unemployed when the period of unemployment compensation as they are permitted to conduct. . . .
Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman BRADY highlighted earlier, Members of this body have clearly stated their intent time and time again over the last few years through letters, hearings, public comments, and meetings. Yet, the Department of Labor has continued to push Congress’ concerns to the side and legislate from the executive branch.

Supporting this resolution means supporting the role of Congress to write laws and for them to be implemented as intended.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Workers collecting unemployment benefits earned their benefits by working hard. Workers only receive benefits if they are out of work through no fault of their own and are actively searching for new jobs.

There are considerable challenges facing our unemployment system. More than half of the State trust funds, including that in my home State, are insolvent and could only pay earned benefits for a short period of time if a recession hits. Only about one in four unemployed workers currently receives unemployment insurance benefits. Some States have cut benefits, increasing the chance that workers will exhaust benefits before finding jobs. H.J. Res. 42 does not address these challenges.

There are also real problems with drug use in this country and a severe shortage of treatment options for those who need them. If Congress wants to help workers, it needs to be more than just words.

Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 42. This resolution is the House to undo the wave of bureaucratic overreach from the Obama administration.

Five years ago, Congress passed a bipartisan law that included a common-sense provision giving the States flexibility to drug test some applicants for unemployment insurance. Instead of following the law Congress passed and allowing—not requiring—States to implement the policies right for their citizens, the Obama administration decided to tie States’ hands. It issued a regulation that left no flexibility for States, the opposite of the bipartisan law Congress passed.

Mr. Speaker, frankly, it is sad that we are even here today. This all could have been avoided if the Obama administration had simply followed the congressional intent, but yet here we are. I support this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), former chairman of this committee and, certainly, a former ranking member on this side.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, at the onset of the Great Recession, our unemployment insurance system was completely inadequate. Democrats took the lead, giving increasing Republican opposition, to improve the system and to provide unemployment benefits to Americans who lost their jobs through no fault of their own. The result was an emergency Federal unemployment compensation program which helped more than 24 million people.

Research from a broad array of experts shows these Federal UI benefits, in combination with State-provided benefits, saved more than 2 million jobs, prevented 1.4 million home foreclosures, and kept an estimated 5 million Americans out of poverty. In short, a strong unemployment insurance system helped prevent the Great Recession from turning into another Great Depression.

Today, our unemployment insurance system is again inadequate and totally unprepared to respond to a future recession; and once again, rather than stepping up with solutions, Republicans’ answer to working people is a cold shoulder. Instead of responding to the deterioration of our unemployment insurance system, Republicans today want to shame and blame Americans who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own, while also violating their constitutional rights.

Here are the real problems this legislation completely ignores:

Number one, only one out of every four jobless Americans now receives unemployment benefits, near a record all-time low.

Two, eight States have cut back on the maximum number of weeks of benefits available for unemployed workers, including my home State of Michigan.

Three, the value of UI benefits has declined over time, with 30 States now having maximum UI benefits that are less than half of the States’ average weekly wage.

Four, the triggers for the federally funded Extended Benefits program, EB, are extremely out of date, so they do not turn on when unemployment begins to rise significantly.

Five, our Nation’s UI system is underfunded, with only 18 States’ funds reaching a minimum level of adequate solvency, according to a 2016 DOL report.

Six, the Federal UI trust funds, which support extended benefits during downturns in the economy, have a deficit of over $8 billion, hurt by the majority’s decision to allow part of the revenue stream to those funds to expire in 2011.

Seven, our spending on workforce development as a percentage of GDP is now only one-seventh of its 1979 peak; and since 2010, Republicans in Congress have cut workforce education programs by $400 million. So we are doing less to help the unemployed while they look for work, and less to help them prepare for a new job.

Today’s bill ignores these problems completely and, instead, attempts to demean those needing help. In discouraging access to unemployment benefits, it reminds me of a massive problem we have uncovered in Michigan that involved at least 20,000—and perhaps many more—UI claimants being wrongly accused of fraud and ordered to pay huge penalties.

We should be moving today on ensuring our UI system is ready for the great challenge, not to mention helping Americans who are seeking work right now.
brought up this misguided bill, and I urge all Members to oppose it.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 42 to eliminate the Obama administration’s intentionally unfaithful execution of our laws.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, the previous administration knew exactly what it was doing when it wrote this regulation. President Obama signed off on the underlying law to allow States to drug test certain unemployment insurance recipients, then he worked to block its implementation. Today, we will vote to end President Obama’s obstruction.

Instead of faithfully executing the law, as our Constitution demands, the Obama administration effectively blocked States from making sure hard-working taxpayer dollars only go to deserving citizens.

The Congress spoke in 2012, before I arrived here, but here is what happened. Congress spoke, and the President signed a bill into law to give States an option—not a mandate, an option—to drug test.

I stand today to say let’s roll back and undo our previous President’s unfaithful execution of the law and allow States like Missouri to have the freedom to decide for themselves. This is not a mandate; this is simply about states’ rights.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this joint resolution.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), a tireless protector of the rights of individuals.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my strong opposition to H.J. Res. 42.

I think most Americans are tired of hearing about what President Obama did or didn’t do, while, at the same time, it seems like it has been years since we had his stable leadership and we have been proceeding under the chaos of the current administration. It seems like much longer than 25 days.

But I will tell you, the campaign is over. It was a long campaign. Throughout the entire campaign, the Republicans controlled both Houses of Congress and the Senate, and we had the President who was a Democrat. So the Republicans complained that they weren’t able to do anything and they needed a Republican President.

Now they have a Republican President, and what have they done during this last 25 days in terms of a jobs bill? Not one, not one job created in the last 25 days.

If the public goes back and looks over the calendar of proceedings for this body, they will find that it has simply been one unproductive bill after another. I rise today to change a regulation that was set during the Obama administration. That is all we have been doing over the last 3-plus weeks is trying to reverse regulations—not one affirmative bill that establishes one job.

So what are they doing? They are kind of dancing for the American people, while the House burns, while the President is conducting foreign policy at Mar-a-Lago, in the open air, to impress all of his well-heeled friends that have paid $100,000 and now have to pay $200,000 to join his club, while we should be overseeing the operations of the government, paying the States millions of dollars to reserve banquet facilities in that taxpayer-owned location.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Jody B. Hice of Georgia). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Those are the issues that the American people certainly would be interested in knowing, what is happening with their property.

But instead of creating a jobs bill, what we are doing here is pursue a measure that would repeal a Department of Labor rule that limits which unemployment compensation applicants can be tested for drugs.

Supporters of this resolution are suggesting that there is a nexus between losing your job and being unemployed and illicit drug abuse. However, there is no evidence that suggests higher drug use among unemployed workers compared to the general population; although it is true that it has been a time-honored tradition that when you lose your job, you go down to the local bar and drown in a glass of beer.

But nobody is talking about disabling alcohol abuse with this legislation—no alcohol testing, just drug testing.

Why? It is because they want to get at a certain group of people who they want to deprive of the ability to receive the unemployment compensation that they have paid in and earned.

It is penny-wise and pound-foolish to take away the financial security for people who have the least. That is the only thing they have, and you are going to take it away from them and make them pay for the drug test, too. It is ridiculous.

We should be considering legislation that would create jobs and address economic disparity. Instead, we are looking to roll back provisions that undergird the financial security of the most vulnerable among us. I would ask that my colleagues oppose this H.J. Res. 42 and get on with the business that matters most to the American people.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 42, and I thank Chairman SMITH for taking the lead in fighting for American workers with this commonsense piece of legislation.

I believe there has been a misconception about the intent of this CRA. Congress is not acting because we have a malicious intent to punish American workers. We are not even trying to disincentivize them from participating in the program.

My colleague, Mr. DAVIS, said we should strengthen our programs, and what we are attempting to do is exactly that: strengthen the system that is intended to help unemployed Americans and allow them to prepare to re-enter the workforce.

The 2012 Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act made commonsense reforms to the unemployment insurance system with the goal of assisting Americans in returning to gainful employment. Yes, this included allowing States, like my own of Florida, to determine whether or not they wanted to include drug screening and test unemployed insurance applicants. And, yes, the law specifically stated two conditions: if the applicant had lost their job due to drug use and if they were seeking a new job that regularly required new employees to pass a drug test.

Now, when the Department of Labor drafted the rule, they clearly went beyond the intent of Congress and tailored it too narrowly. This will only hurt prospective employees in the long term.

The rule covers occupations such as those that require the employees to carry firearms, flight crews, transportation, and the like.

The problem here is that employers in occupations outside of this narrow scope also regularly require drug testing of their employees.

So, under this rule, unemployed Americans who are using and looking for employment outside of the specific occupations outlined in the rule could potentially find employment in a different industry, be drug tested, and subsequently terminated.

How is this helping American workers? It doesn’t make sense to me, and it shouldn’t make sense to any of my colleagues either. This is a bad rule, and it needs to be repealed so the Department of Labor can go back to the drawing board and craft a rule that will actually strengthen the unemployment insurance, help the American worker, and ultimately strengthen the economy.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank Congressman DAVIS for yielding additional advocacy on behalf of the most vulnerable everywhere.

I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 42, which is really another baseless attack on the poor, on low-income individuals, and on the unemployed.

Drug testing unemployed individuals is downright wrong.

Let me be clear. This resolution is another way for Republicans to stop
workers from claiming their right to unemployment benefits. It also is a scare tactic that flies in the face of facts.

First, there is no evidence that people who receive public assistance use drugs any more frequently than those in the general population. Unemployment compensation, mind you, is not public assistance.

By unnecessarily drug testing jobless workers, we are throwing them out in the cold when they are simply trying to get back on their feet.

Mr. Speaker, workers receive unemployment benefits because they worked hard, they played by the rules, and they were laid off through no fault of their own.

More importantly, working people have earned their right to apply for these benefits. They pay into the program. Their constitutional rights should not be violated.

I also know that people want to work. People don’t want to be on unemployment insurance. They want to provide for themselves and their families.

Let me remind you, there is an opioid and heroin drug epidemic in this country, and it not only affects Democrats, this drug crisis is affecting Republicans, Independents—everyone. Yet, once again, you are throwing them out in the cold.

Instead of passing this appalling resolution—and this resolution is appalling—we should be expanding job training, work benefits for all, and provide resources for drug treatment. It is hard to believe that you want to punish people. That is what this resolution really does. It punishes people for working. That is really a shame and disgrace.

So I strongly oppose this bill. I urge my colleagues to vote “no,” and I also urge you to encourage people to work, to provide those job training resources and drug abuse resources for our mental health centers, for our drug counseling centers, and for everyone who needs treatment rather than drug testing to keep them from getting a job.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) who had an office next to mine for many years. I know she has tremendous commitment, energy, and fortitude.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman, and I thank the manager of this legislation. But my distinguished friend, Mr. Davis, and I have worked on societal issues dealing across the gamut, and the respect that he holds in the community across America that recognizes that second chances, unemployment compensation, summer jobs, and a whole manner of opportunities for individuals to restore their lives is the right way for America to go.

In the backdrop of an executive order that saw one of my constituents, a 16-year-old with proper papers coming in from Jordan, held for 50 hours at George Bush Intercontinental Airport, in defense of those employees that I respect, CBP, they had no information how he got in, but they took this young man. Lo and behold, he wound up in the holding cell speaking broken English, and that was the only bed they have.

Why am I mentioning this? I am mentioning this because sometimes government gets it wrong. They get it wrong. This disapproval is wrong.

What did happen was right, because what happened was that this rule didn’t just pop up in the administration, meaning the Obama administration. It came about through a compromise—an intelligent compromise—dealing with middle class tax relief and job creation. Because at that time, there were people who randomly wanted to drug test, but wise individuals said this, they said that you could allow or require if your job or you are a drug user, so we want to get you right; therefore, you could be tested.

Some people agree to disagree, but that is reasonable. Or that the job that you were looking for or had a job that required the kind of criteria and the kind of skills that drug use would impair or impact, that makes sense.

But now you are talking about someone at the lowest ebb of life, losing jobs through no fault of their own, giving States that may be sensitive to human needs or recklessly the ability to randomly test people because they lost their jobs, because they have been defeated.

Well, I know it is too late, but maybe we should amend for Congresspersons, Senators, and Governors who get un-elected. They lost a job; didn’t they? It doesn’t make sense.

I rushed to the floor. We are in the judiciary. We are taking the question of how we are going to utilize the oversight plan, whether we want to invest and fix for the American people this horrible scenario of the Russian involvement in the elections and the connection to the present administration.

We want to fix things, but what you are doing here is that you are casting a bad light on people who are in need. I just want to say States have the ability to administer drug testing, and this change would needlessly had lost your costs to the States. State unemployment programs already penalize job-related drug use.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Thisappropriation also explicitly deny benefits for any job loss connected with drug use or a failed drug test. In addition, six States—Arizona, Arkansas, Indiana, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Wisconsin—passed legislation equating a failed or refused preemployment drug screen for refusing suitable work. We are already condemning everybody. Other States have other programs. This is not one that falls under the 10th Amendment.

But the specialist drug testing of government-benefit recipients likely violates the Fourth Amendment, and it is cruel and inhuman treatment.

I urge all my colleagues to vote against this cruel and inhuman treatment of individuals who, through no fault of their own, are unemployed or they may be poor or they may be needing public assistance. Let America’s humanity shine. Vote “no” on the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I want to hopefully draw some attention to the fact that we have a problem on our hands. We have a problem with the Federal Government going too far, and we have a problem with the State Governments that poll policymakers at the Federal level wanting to help their own constituents, their own citizens in need. Right now the Federal Government stands in the way.

It is time for us as policymakers hopefully to act in a responsible fashion to assist States in their need and their desire to help their own citizens. States are better at that than is the Federal Government, and I hope that we can empower the States to help their own constituents.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as I prepare to close, let me just, first of all, thank the more than 40 organizations who have sent letters in opposition to this legislation, especially the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the African American Ministers in Action, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, many other people who sent letters because they have a will to help, not a will to hurt. They have a will to assist. They know that the individuals we are talking about have lost their jobs, their opportunity to work, and their connection, in many instances, with humanity.

I would urge that we do everything in our power to help them find their way back and not hurt them. Therefore, I would urge all of my colleagues to oppose this legislation and vote “no.”

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, since the law was enacted some 5 years ago, Members of this body have clearly stated their intent time and time again through letters, hearings, public comments, and meetings, and yet the previous Department of Labor continued to push Congress to the side and legislate from the executive branch.

Again, supporting this resolution means supporting the role of Congress
to write laws and for the laws to be implemented as intended.

I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 42, disapproving of the Department of Labor’s regulation of the drug testing on unemployment insurance applicants.

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

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

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution 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 joint resolution.

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. 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 post-poned.
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DISAPPROVING RULE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF LABOR RELATING TO SAVINGS ARRANGEMENTS ESTABLISHED BY STATES FOR NON-GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 116, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 66) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to savings arrangements established by States for non-governmental employees, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 116, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. Res. 66

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to “Savings Arrangements Established by States for Non-Governmental Employees” (published at 81 Fed. Reg. 59464 (August 30, 2016)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. BONAMICI) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. WICKLANDER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

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

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 66.

The Obama administration spent a lot of time and taxpayer dollars emphasizing the need to protect retirement savers, but as was often the case with the previous administration, their rhetoric rarely matched their actions.

For example, the Obama Department of Labor spent years advancing a flawed rule that will limit access to affordable retirement advice for low- and middle-income families. Despite repeated calls for a more responsible approach, the Department pushed forward with a partisan rule.

Then, late last year, the Department finalized two additional rules that will also negatively impact the retirement security of workers. The administration crafted a regulatory loophole that allows States to establish government-run IRAs by circumventing protections for workers and employers who have enjoyed for decades.

As was usually the case, the actions of the previous administration hurt the people who need help the most. First, this loophole would lead to fewer protections for retirement savers. Working families will have less information about how their retirement plans are managed, and they will have fewer options if those plans are not managed well. They will also have less control over the money they worked so hard to put away.

We need to honor hardworking taxpayers, Mr. Speaker, who save for their retirement. And the Federal Government do things to harm them.

The loophole also threatens to inflict significant harm on small business employees. It is already hard enough for many small businesses to provide their employees with retirement options, and this regulation only makes it less likely they will do so. In fact, many small businesses could actually be discouraged from offering 401(k)s or other private sector options. Others could cancel their retirement plans and dump their employees into government-run retirement plans.

Finally, the Obama administration’s regulatory action puts taxpayers at risk. We already know that many government-run pension plans for public employees are woefully underfunded. Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. We already know that many government-run pension plans for public employees are woefully underfunded. If government-run IRAs for private sector workers are as risky as these plans, who among us seriously believe hardworking taxpayers won’t be asked to foot the bill?

These may be unintended consequences, but they will be detrimental to workers, retirees, and small business all the same. So many hardworking men and women struggle to plan for the future and retire with financial security and peace of mind. The resolution under consideration today will close a loophole that threatens that security and peace of mind.

To be clear, these resolutions will not prevent States and cities from providing workers and retirees with new, innovative retirement options. These resolutions will simply ensure that all workers and retirees enjoy the same protections that have been guaranteed for decades.

I want to thank Representatives Waltman and Bongino for their leadership on this effort and working to protect the retirement security of hardworking men and women across the country. I urge my colleagues to support both resolutions.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 66.

Working families in my home State of Oregon and across the country deserve the opportunity to retire with security and dignity. Unfortunately, that is not a reality for far too many Americans who face a growing retirement security crisis. In fact, nearly 40 million private sector workers, including an estimated 1 million in Oregon, do not have access to retirement savings plans at their jobs.

The AARP and others have noted that people who do not save for retirement risk becoming dependent on social safety net programs that increase costs for taxpayers.

Ms. Speaker, Congress has not stepped up to address our country’s retirement security crisis. Several States, including my home State of Oregon, have developed and implemented innovative solutions that will help workers save for retirement.

Oregon’s program is set to launch in just 5 months. Workers who do not have access to a retirement plan through their employer will have access to a plan facilitated by the State.

It is not mandatory—workers can opt out—and there is minimal paperwork for employees. Oregon’s plan is portable, so workers can keep their retirement savings when they change jobs.

Consider Oregonian Penny Wicklander, who has worked hard but hasn’t had access to a good retirement plan. Penny manages an apartment complex for low-income seniors, and she saw the hardships that residents faced without retirement security. Some lived on $10 in the last 10 days of the month. She said, in support of Oregon’s plan:

No one wants to retire into poverty and rely on public services, but it’s hard to plan for the future when there are so many other financial challenges facing our families. We can’t leave behind retirement savings that makes it easy for everyone to save part of what they earn, regardless of where they work.

Bobbie Sotin, a home care worker in Oregon’s plan:

Working with seniors in poverty, many care providers see their own future every day. Often they realize they have to make the decision to live in poverty or keep working until they die. Even if it
mean $50 or $100 more per month, that kind of income would make a huge difference to each and every one of us.

Penny, Bobbie, and people across the country need access to retirement savings plans. Oregon and several other States are working to fill this need. Congress should be supporting them and encouraging retirement savings programs like Oregon’s and similar plans in California, Illinois, Connecticut, and Maryland. Instead, House Republicans are advancing a Congressional Review Act joint resolution of disapproval that would endanger these plans, discourage other States from taking action, and undermine states’ rights.

Specifically, this resolution would nullify an important Department of Labor rule that simply clarifies that these State-based savings plans do not run afoul of ERISA, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act. The safe harbor rule went into effect last October.

Now, my friends on the other side of the aisle may characterize this as “closing regulatory loopholes” and they may question whether more government is the answer, but that is not what this is about.

The National Conference of State Legislatures and the State treasurers of Oregon, Illinois, and California submitted letters in opposition to this resolution. The U.S. DOL said the rule provides flexibility to states, codifies clear protections for employers who facilitate retirement savings arrangements for their employees, and enables innovative solutions to addressing the growing retirement crisis facing this country.”

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD these letters and several other letters in opposition to this resolution.


Honor PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

Speaker Ryan: Earlier this week, Reps. Tim Walberg of Michigan, Tom MacArthur of New Jersey, and Rodney Frelinghuysen of New Jersey introduced two resolutions of disapproval (H.J. Res 66, H.J. Res 67) to roll-back key Department of Labor (US DOL) rules. These resolutions will limit our abilities as states to provide solutions to the growing retirement savings crisis, and could make it harder for small businesses to participate in state-run programs.

We are writing to ask that you defend our state’s rights by voting “No” on H.J. Res 66 and H.J. Res 67.

The purpose of this letter is to give clarity for states across the country to provide access to retirement savings options for millions of private-sector workers. California, Illinois, and Oregon have been working on the process of implementing legislatively approved state-administered plans that will enable nearly 8 million private-sector workers to save their own money for retirement.

As Treasurers, we chair the respective Boards governing our state plans and have been actively working with employers, employees, and their financial service organizations for the last two years.

The reality is, that without access to an easy and affordable savings vehicle, far too many workers will be left behind, falling into poverty and becoming overly reliant on Social Security or state and federal safety net programs.

The final rule from US DOL provides key protections for employers who facilitate enrollment for their employees—confirming a safe harbor from ERISA and protecting businesses from liability related to state plans—while maintaining key consumer protections for program participants. While this rule went into final, opponents are seeking to repeal or weaken the rule through the Congressional Review Act. We respectfully request that you oppose efforts to roll back the rule and vote ‘No’ on H.J. Res 66 and H.J. Res 67. The US DOL safe harbor provides flexibility to states, codifies clear protections for employers who facilitate retirement savings arrangements for their employees, and enables innovative solutions to addressing the growing retirement crisis facing this country.

We are happy to provide additional information. Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

JOHN CHIANG
California State Treasurer.

MICHAEL FERRIEN
Illinois State Treasurer.

TOBIAS READ
Oregon State Treasurer.

AARP,
February 8, 2017.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS:

On behalf of working Americans who struggle to save for their retirement, AARP urges you to vote against a Congressional Review Act resolution to overturn the Department of Labor’s final rule on “Savings Arrangements Established by States for Non-Governmental Employees.” AARP, with its nearly 36 million members and supporters across the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands, is a nonpartisan, nonprofit, nationwide organization that helps people turn their goals and dreams into real possibilities, strengthens communities and fights for the issues that matter most to families such as healthcare, employment and income security, retirement planning, affordable utilities and protection from financial abuse.

Today, 55 million working Americans do not have a way to save for retirement out of their regular paycheck. Despite decades of federal incentives, employer sponsorship of retirement savings plans has remained static. The lack of employer-sponsored savings plans has dire consequences on the retirement readiness of workers, because employees are 15 times more likely to save if they have access to a payroll deduction savings plan at work.

In response to the stubborn lack of growth in employer-sponsored retirement savings plans, numerous bills have removed regulatory and operational barriers for small businesses who want to offer a retirement savings vehicle to their workers. These bipartisan measures are known as Secure Choice or Work and Save.

In the last two years more than half the states considered a variety of options to provide employees with low-cost savings options, including Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

In 2016, the Department of Labor promulgated the final rule and provided guidance on how to enter into public-private partnerships aimed at increasing personal savings rates among small business employees. This rule makes it clear that any automatic IRA program established by a state must remove the operational burden of running a retirement savings plan from small businesses. In fact, it asserts that a small business owner’s only interaction with a Work and Save plan would be to select one and provide deductions for these individual savings plans.

A Congressional Review Act resolution to overturn this rulemaking will have a significant impact on millions of workers. The lack of employer-sponsored savings plans, known as 529 plans, were created twenty years ago, less than $2.5 billion had been saved for college plans. Today, individuals have put away more than $253.2 billion for college in 529 plans. Similarly, in the retirement context, states are acting as facilitators, aggregating small businesses to get the cost benefit of pooling.

All private financial firms can bid to invest the savings from employees. The only employers are trying to set up connection and forward materials to employees, a role employers already perform for unemployment insurance, workers’ compensation, and other similar programs.

Often, states are the pioneers of solutions. State governments more directly interact with both workers and employers, and state policymakers are aware that growth in the number of older Americans who do not have a secure retirement will be felt most acutely in states and states. In times of political change, states are often more willing and able to test creative solutions to improve the retirement security needs of their workforce and the public. As the demographics and demographics of each jurisdiction. The lack of options to save for retirement at work is a persistent demand in states to take action today. States desire flexibility to move forward with innovative reforms—Congress should not curtail state efforts to promote retirement savings. Americans need easy savings options. No one wants older Americans solely dependent on Social Security. Employer plans are not growing and states are being pushed to meet the needs of their citizens using private investment firms. Lack of access to workplace savings plans is especially acute for people of color—only 54 percent of African American employees and 38 percent of Latino employees work for an employer that sponsors a retirement plan, compared to 62 percent of White employees. Those who are at risk for retirement risk becoming dependent on social safety net programs, costing taxpayers down the line. In fact, states taking action today could save taxpayers as much as $4.8 billion in the next ten years. Congress should support these important state savings programs, not take steps to end them.

Sincerely,

NANCY A. LEAMOND,
Executive Vice President and Chief Advocacy Officer

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, LEGISLATIVE ALERT,

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE:


These resolutions of disapproval block Department of Labor (DoL) regulations that
CREATE SAFE HARBORS UNDER WHICH CERTAIN RETIREMENT SAVINGS ARRANGEMENTS ESTABLISHED BY STATES OR ELIGIBLE POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS FOR PRIVATE-SECTOR WORKERS WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED ERISA TRUSTS. THESE BENEFACTOR PLANS OF THEIRS WILL NOT BE RESISTED AS PLAN MAINTAIING THE LEGAL STATUS OF THE SECURITY OF ALL OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS AND AUTHORITY OFFICERS FROM THE FEDERAL LABOR LAW. THE DOL REGULATIONS PROVIDE A PATH AHEAD AND MUNICIPALITY TO CREATE AN EASIER WAY FOR THESE AMERICANS TO BEGIN BUILDING A RETirement NEST EGG THROUGH PAYROLL DEDUCTION CONTRIBUTIONS INTO THEIR OWN INDIVIDUAL ACCOUNTS. ACCOUNTS OF THESE AMERICANS WILL ENHANCE RETIREMENT SECURITY FOR THE MILLIONS OF WORKERS IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR.

THE RULE CLEARLY STATES THAT AN AUTOMATIC RETIREMENT PLAN THAT IS VOLUNTARY TO THE EMPLOYER BUT AUTOMATICALLY ENROLLED IN WILL ELIMINATE THE BURDEN OF ADMINISTRATION FOR SMALL BUSINESSES. MANY SMALL-BUSINESS OWNERS WHO ARE CONTACTED BY THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORTED SHYING AWAY FROM SPONSORING ANY RETIREMENT PLAN BECAUSE OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND FIDUCIARY RESPONSIBILITIES FOR SELECTING INVESTMENT FUNDS AND MANAGING PLAN ASSETS. UNLESS SOMETHING IS DONE TO IMPROVE THE RETIREMENT SECURITY OF THE PRIVATE WORKFORCE, THESE INDIVIDUALS WILL FALL INTO POVERTY IN RETIREMENT, AND PLACE EMOTIONAL STRESS ON THEIR FAMILIES AND FINANCIAL STRESS ON THEIR GOVERNMENT SPONSORS.

In response to this retirement savings gap, a large number of states have removed regulatory barriers for small businesses that want to offer a retirement savings vehicle to their employees. These bipartisan common-sense approaches are coalescing to establish retirement savings plans. In the last few years, about half of all states have considered ways to provide small employers and their employees with low-cost, professionally managed savings options. Several states have already enacted legislation and are preparing to implement their plans.

In 2016, the DOL promulgated an rule providing states and cities with guidance on how to enter into public-private partnerships, with the goal of increasing savings rates among employees of small businesses. The recent automatic IRA program established by a state or city must remove the burden of administering the retirement plan from small-business owners. Several states have already established one requirement: Small employers that do not offer any other retirement plan to their employees must offer a payroll deduction for employees who voluntarily choose to participate in the savings plan. The DOL rule eliminates much federal red tape, and gives state governments more incentives to innovate. This allows states and cities to provide a glide path for small employers to offer a retirement savings plan to their workers.

Again, the AFT urges Congress to support these state-sponsored, public-private retirement savings programs—collectively referred to as Secure Choice—by voting against Congressional Review Act resolutions H.J. Res. 66 and H.J. Res. 67.

Sincerely,

RANDI WEINGARTEN,
President.
its small business workers that state governments were left with no alternative but to provide an innovative solution for these retirees’ future. Congress should respect the state’s efforts to reduce a further financial burden on future taxpayers.

NCSL urges Congress to support state innovation regarding private retirement savings plans and automatic enrollment. The Congressional Review Act resolution to overturn the Department of Labor’s rule on “Savings Arrangements Established by States for Non-Governmental Employees” would impair States from ERISA.

Sincerely,

Senator Daniel T. Blue, Jr.
North Carolina, President, NCSL.

Senator Deb Peters,
South Dakota, President, NCSL.

RETIREMENT SAVINGS FAST FACTS

Three-quarters of private sector workers feel anxious about having enough money to live comfortably in retirement. Fifty-five million Americans work for employers that do not offer any form of a retirement savings plan.

80 percent of private sector workers between age 25 and 64 support state-facilitated plans designed to help them save their money for retirement.

State-facilitated retirement savings plans are designed to help close the gap between state-facilitated college savings plans and public pensions for government employees.

State-facilitated retirement savings plans would provide employees the options to decline participation; however, data suggests that employees with access to workplace retirement plans are 15 times more likely to save for retirement.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF LA RAZA

WASHINGTON, DC, FEBRUARY 10, 2017.

Hon. Virginia Foxx,
Chairwoman, House Committee on Education & Workforce, Washington, DC.

Hon. Bobby Scott,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Education & Workforce, Washington, DC.

Dear Chairman Foxx and Ranking Member Scott: On behalf of the National Council of La Raza (NCLR), the nation’s largest Latino civil rights and advocacy organization, I write to you to oppose H. J. Res 66 and H. J. Res 67, resolutions of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act (CRA), to block the Department of Labor (DOL) rules that allow states and cities to implement their own Individual Retirement Account (IRA) plans.

In the absence of congressional action to increase access to retirement plans, state plans have stepped up to innovate and fill that gap. H. J. Res 66 and H. J. Res 67 impede state and local innovation and entrepreneurialism to solve the retirement issue. If the DOL rules are abolished, it would have a serious adverse effect on the states and cities that are working to implement programs, including California, Connecticut, Illinois, Maryland, and Oregon, which have all passed legislation to set up these State IRA plans.

Rep. Tim Walberg’s (R-MI) H. J. Res 66 and Rep. Francis Rooney’s (R-FL) H. J. Res 67 would nullify the DOL rules that offered the clarification necessary to help states and cities implement their own auto-IRA plans consistent with The Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA), which would provide millions of workers access to a workplace retirement plan. If these retirement plans were to become subject to ERISA, they would not be able to move forward.

One of NCLR’s goals in 2017 is to ensure the successful implementation of the California Secure Choice Retirement Savings Program. In September 2016, California Governor Jerry Brown signed into law a bill that allows workers to access state-run IRAs, which will feature automatic enrollment for people working for employers with five or more employees. Just over 7.5 million Californian workers who do not currently have an employer-sponsored plan—half of whom are Latino—will benefit from this program.

LATINOS HAVE A STRONG DESIRE TO SAVE

NCLR has worked to improve opportunities for Hispanics in the United States for nearly 50 years. One of our core areas of work is economic security, which is contingent on an individual’s retirement readiness. While many Americans have difficulty saving for retirement, the issue is even more acute for communities of color. For example, 62% of Black and 69% of Hispanic households lack any assets in a retirement account. For those households, the median retirement savings are disproportionately low: four in five Latino households aged 25-64 have less than $10,000 in retirement savings, compared to $25,000 for White workers.

Prior to the DOL rule, limited access to traditional retirement savings products severely affected Latino workers’ ability to invest in their future. Conversely, the inflation of the federal or state level, to increase access to quality retirement savings plans are crucial to enhance Latino retirement readiness.

The difficulty in saving for retirement is the result of a variety of factors, including lack of availability of employer-sponsored retirement plans and lower rates of participation in those plans when they are offered. Workers of color have lower access to retirement savings vehicles compared to Whites: 38% of Latino employees aged 25-64 work for an employer that sponsors a retirement plan, compared to 53% of White workers. Of those workers who have access to an employer-sponsored plan, not all participate: only 29.7% of Latino workers who have an employer plan participate compared to 58.8% of White workers.

Low wages make investing for retirement especially challenging given that housing, health care, and education costs continue to rise while wages remain stagnant. 42% of all Latinos earn poverty-level wages, even with having the highest rate of labor force participation among all racial and ethnic groups. Despite earning low wages, numerous studies have shown that Hispanics value saving. A 2014 national Prudential survey of Latino consumers found that “the ‘saver’ mindset prevails” with Latinos. However, while 53% Latinos think that saving for retirement is a high priority, near-term financial needs often compete for limited resources.

Limited access to traditional retirement savings products severely affect Latino worker’s ability to invest in their future. Efforts to increase access to quality retirement savings plans are crucial to enhance Latino retirement readiness. In the absence of congressional action to increase access, state and city IRA plans are needed to close this gap. It is for the above reasons that NCLR urges you to oppose H. J. Res 66 and H. J. Res 67 and ensure that millions of workers have access to a workplace retirement plan.

Sincerely,

Eric Rodriguez,
Vice President, Office of Research, Advocacy, and Legislation.

Ms. Bonamici. In summary, proponents of this Congressional Review Act resolution are rushing to nullify a rule that will make it easier for people save for retirement. That is unacceptable. Every American should retire with dignity, and this resolution puts that fundamental American value at risk.

I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing H. J. Res. 66.

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

Ms. Foxx. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Walberg) be permitted to control the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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.J. Res. 66.

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, and I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 66, a resolution to protect retirement savers.

During the final days of the Obama administration—in fact, the final hours— the Department of Labor created a regulatory loophole that threatens the retirement security of working families. We are here today to use Congress’ authority under the Congressional Review Act to close that loophole by blocking a misguided regulation from taking effect.

The regulation paved the way for States to force certain employers to automatically enroll their employees into government IRAs. States would be allowed to skirt Federal law and deny workers important protections designed to safeguard their retirement savings.

The Obama administration’s action is somewhat perplexing. The Employee Retirement Income Security Act, ERISA, has enjoyed strong bipartisan support for decades. As President Ford said when he signed the law, the American people have “greater assurances that retirement dollars will be there when they are needed.” Yet, over 40 years later, the same administration that frequently touted the importance of consumer protections moved to exempt States from ERISA.

The question is why. To facilitate the creation of government-run plans that...
Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), the immediate past chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 66, a resolution that uses the Congressional Review Act to repeal the Department of Labor’s harmful so-called safe harbor rule. This rule allows States to automatically enroll employees in government-run IRAs without the important consumer protections provided by ERISA. This bureaucratic regulation restricts working families’ access to essential plan information required to make wise investments, while also increasing the risk for financial mismanagement of State-run IRAs which would ultimately fall on the backs of the taxpayers across the U.S.

Mr. Speaker, there is a retirement crisis occurring in this country. The Government Accountability Office reports that 29 percent of Americans age 55 and older have no retirement savings— and no traditional pension plan. Further, nearly 40 million working families also haven’t saved a dime for retirement. This is a serious problem, and we must work together across the aisle to pursue policies that make it easier, not harder, for families to save.

Unfortunately, the Obama administration’s answer to the retirement crisis was less consumer choice and more financial risk. This all started with the Department of Labor’s misguided decision to pursue a fiduciary rule which, if implemented, will be a disaster for low and middle class savers. The DOL published a rule that is nearly 1,000 pages in length, contains 320,000 words, and establishes a rule that is nearly 1,000 pages in length, contains 320,000 words, and contains a last-minute regulatory loophole that could discourage small businesses from offering retirement plans in the first place. As a result, many families could soon realize, if you like your 401(k) plan, you may not be able to keep it.

Because of this loophole, taxpayers also are at risk. Many of the States leading the charge on these government-run plans have a long history of mismanaging public employee pensions. Today there is an estimated $5 trillion in unfunded State pension promises—$5 trillion. That figure is completely unsustainable. It begs the question: Will taxpayers or retirement savers foot the bill if these government-run IRAs are similarly mismanaged?

However, we are not here today to debate the merits of State policy. To be clear, States should be free to experiment with new retirement options, and more options are certainly needed. It is up to the voters in each State to hold their elected officials accountable. The point of this debate is that States should not be exempt from a law that has, for decades, provided important protections for retirement savers. If States want to come up with new ways to help workers save for retirement, they can. But they should follow the law in the process.

The goal of this resolution is simple. It is to uphold protections Congress— including Members of both parties— have long afforded retirement savers. Today we can close a regulatory loophole that would be detrimental to the retirement security of hardworking Americans, and we can ensure retirement savers in every State continue to have the same protections under Federal law. I urge my colleagues to support strong protections for retirement savers by voting in favor of H.J. Res. 66.

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, our country is experiencing a retirement security crisis. Nearly 40 million private sector workers do not have access to a retirement savings plan at their jobs. The data and research also show that many middle- and low-income workers lack the ability to save enough on their own for retirement. Too many Americans lack access to retirement savings plans and too few are able to build a retirement nest egg on their own.

Unfortunately, Congress has not stepped up to meaningfully address our country’s retirement security challenges, but many States have stepped up and enacted innovative solutions to expand working people’s access to retirement savings. California passed a law establishing a program that is estimated to enable 6 million workers access to a retirement savings plan. In Illinois, more than a million people are expected to benefit from the State’s retirement savings program.

Six other States have enacted programs. Dozens more have considered proposals to study or implement State-based retirement plans. Several of these States have worked with the Obama administration’s Department of Labor on rules to ensure that their retirement savings initiatives did not inadvertently run afoul of ERISA, the Federal law establishing minimum standards for private sector pensions.

Last August, the Department of Labor finalized another rule that made certain cities and counties eligible for the same safe harbor protections. This rule only went into effect last month.

In December, the Department of Labor finalized another rule that made certain cities and counties eligible for the same safe harbor protections. This rule only went into effect last month.

Now, if there are legitimate concerns with the rules, the Trump administration has the administrative tools available to appropriately amend the final rules in the same fair, thoughtful, transparent manner in which they were promulgated. However, this CRA disapproval resolution, which was just introduced last week, will nullify the rule that puts a safe harbor in place to ensure the plans do not run afoul of ERISA. At the same time, under the CRA rules, it would make it impossible to enact a similar rule to protect these savings plans in the future without specific congressional approval.

This afternoon, the House will also consider a CRA disapproval resolution which would overturn the month-old rule aimed at helping certain cities and counties offer workplace retirement programs.

Mr. Speaker, Congress should not be in the business of destabilizing efforts that increase workers’ ability to save for retirement, and we should not be going out of our way to undermine states’ rights to implement their own innovative solutions. These two resolutions represent an attack on our Nation’s working families. Congress must stand up for working people who do not have access to retirement plans at their jobs. America’s working families deserve an opportunity to be able to save enough to retire with dignity and peace of mind.

I urge my colleagues to reject both of these CRA joint resolutions of disapproval.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), the immediate past chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions.
have worked tirelessly with my colleagues in the House to overturn these harmful regulations, and I look forward to continuing to work with the Trump administration to do just this. I agree with my colleagues across the aisle who say that we need to work together to encourage and create policies that encourage the American people to save for their retirement.

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the doctor for that Webster’s dictionary. That dictionary was published in Springfield, Massachusetts, and I am glad that the doctor from Tennessee sees it as the last word.

Mr. Speaker, let me rise in opposition to resolutions we are debating today that would block Department of Labor regulations on State-run retirement programs. Our country is in the midst of a retirement savings crisis, as duly noted. To address this issue, we should be working together to help people, not put these workers into a retirement savings plan. Half the people who get up to go to work every single day in America are not in a qualified savings plan for retirement.

This opportunity here is to begin a historic endeavor. In July of 2007, a decade ago, I introduced the Automatic IRA Act with my Republican Ways and Means colleague, Phil English. That same year, Senators Bingaman and Smith introduced a companion bill in the U.S. Senate. The Brookings Institution and The Heritage Foundation scholars jointly developed my auto IRA concept. So conservatives and liberals came together on a commonsense proposal to make it easier for working families to save.

However, fast forward to 2017. I can’t find a Republican to join me in sponsoring the auto IRA legislation. Remember, The Heritage Foundation worked with me to construct this initiative. If we can just keep it amongst ourselves here, being a Democrat from Massachusetts and having a plan that is endorsed by The Heritage Foundation is not one of our easier endeavors.

But between Brookings, a liberal think tank, and Heritage, a conservative think tank, we came up with a pretty good plan. Today American families struggle to prepare for retirement. To make matters worse, 55 million Americans work for employers who don’t offer a retirement plan. As I noted earlier, that is half the workers between 18 and 64.

Because of Congress’ failure to act on any legislation and address the retirement savings crisis, many States implemented their own auto IRA plans based upon the Neal-English bill. In fact, 30 States have moved to implement or are considering a State-facilitated retirement plan. Credit unions would love this, community bankers would love this, and insurance agents would like to sell these plans, but here we can’t find a Republican to sign on. So today they are trying to block the guidance that provides clarity and flexibility to States that want to launch their own initiative. This is troubling. If these resolutions become law, it would have a chilling effect on State efforts. The States are the laboratories of experimenting on these retirement plans because the Federal Government doesn’t want to. If Republicans are looking for a single national effort, let’s work together to develop a Federal auto IRA legislation piece that would work in the interim and work in the future and help people set up, Mr. Speaker, a responsible retirement savings plan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I guess the point that I would make again is not the fact that we are trying to stop States from doing this. In fact, this resolution does not cover all IRA plans. It just simply says we express our concern that States would be allowed as a result of what was put through in midnight fashion that exempted States from having to come under the same protections of ERISA that we would expect to be covered for all retirement plans. That is the challenge. We want to make sure that retirees’ incomes are protected in a secure, safe way, and that is the value of ERISA. This proposal or the rule that was put through did not cover that, and that is our concern, again, protecting retirees.

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), a senior member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, after the extraordinary events of this week, I certainly had hoped that the House would move forward with a swift investigation into White House dealings with Russia. But, not to be distracted, it looks like the majority would rather spend the day stripping retirement benefits from millions.

We have known for a long time that workers who have access to retirement plans through their workplace are more likely to save for retirement than those who don’t. It makes sense. Ch 1445

We also know that nearly half of middle class workers will fall into poverty when they retire.

Last year, the State of California did a great thing when it launched a program to provide 7 million Californians with the tools to save for retirement. The Secure Choice program lets workers who do not have a retirement plan through their employer contribute a share of their income to an IRA account. That’s exactly what Washington has not done for the rest of the State. Under this voluntary program—and I stress voluntary—countless Californians will get access to tax preferred retirement accounts for the very first time. That is extraordinary.

In August, the Department of Labor cleared the way for Secure Choice by ruling that States could move forward with their own programs to help workers save for retirement. Several other States are in the process of implementing similar laws, and dozens more are considering their options.

The resolution in question today would undo the DOL’s ruling. States in a legal gray area that could put these programs in jeopardy. So I ask, Mr. Speaker, is this really how we should be spending our time? DOL spent months reviewing public comments and carefully crafting this rule. The House will vote to repeal it without a single hearing. Really?

We should be doing everything we can to encourage savings across the board, certainly not voting to making savings harder for folks.

In States across the country, this effort has been bipartisan. I wonder if we would be considering this resolution if the rule in question had not been issued by a Democratic administration?

The word “irresponsible” does not even begin to do this for what would be justice in this area.

So I urge, Mr. Speaker, a “no” vote on this. Let’s move forward. Let’s allow more States to experiment so they can decide for themselves whether or not this is something that the folks in their State want to do.

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

I want to make note that, as we discuss this here today, there have been points made about businesses wanting to change this, they want to work with the States, and they are concerned about liabilities. Well, if that were the case, we wouldn’t have endorsements of this coming from the Chamber of Commerce, Air Conditioning Contractors of America, American Benefits Council, National Electrical Contractors Association, National Black Chamber of Commerce, and I could go on and on, businesses and the business associations and groups that deal with this and have concern about their employees, their retirees, having a good and safe mechanism by which to have their retirement savings protected, stopping our efforts to take back what took place under the cover of darkness, as it were, which took retiree savings off the benefit of ERISA. I just want that to be made clear.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, just to clarify, there was a comment made that these are government-run plans. Under these plans, the States establish the framework for deducting the contributions, but these will be managed by investment professionals, not by the State.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr.
Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We are certainly willing to work with the States and would concur that there ought to be a laboratory.

But again, our concern, and basically the only concern we have with ERISA is the protections that are there under ERISA. And why do we say that?

Well, we look at, for instance, Illinois’ unfunded liability. We are looking at $114.8 billion at the end of fiscal year 2016—a State plan managed by, yes, an outside manager—but $114.8 billion under. We look at California Public Employees’ Retirement System, CalPERS, which has a $229.2 billion shortfall in funding. Oregon’s unfunded actuarial liability of the Oregon Public Employees Retirement Fund, again, managed by someone for Oregon, of $21.8 billion. If we looked at it all put together, we have over $5 trillion unfunded liability plans managed by some outside source.

That is where our concern comes from—this rule was put through that takes people out of the protections of ERISA. So we are saying: Have at it. States? Under ERISA, according to the rules and the protections that are there. That is all we are asking. We want retirees’ savings to be protected for the purposes that they planned for and not come up short some day because of a lack of care and the coverage of ERISA on their plans.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I assure my colleague that, as someone with a consumer protection background, I would not be opposing this resolution if it had consumer protections. In fact, this rule applies when States have strict investor protections.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), ranking member of the Financial Services Committee. Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 66, which is just a continuation of the House Republicans’ attack on working families and their retirement security.

H.J. Res. 66 would dismantle the Department of Labor rule allowing for State-based retirement savings programs. This does nothing more than make it harder for this country’s roughly 40 million private sector workers who do not have a way to save for retirement directly out of their regular paycheck.

Under the current Department of Labor rule, State administered retirement programs can allow employees, who do not have access to a workplace savings plan, to establish an IRA through their paycheck deductions. In my State of California, we have the California Secure Choice retirement savings program through which the State is working to provide a savings option to roughly 6.8 million low- to middle-income workers.

Last Congress, House Republicans unanimously voted to undermine another Department of Labor rule designed to protect retirement security for working families. In that case, the rule was designed to make sure that the retirement investment advice that is in their best interest, referred to as the ‘fiduciary rule.’ Now congressional Republicans want to prevent workers from participating in voluntary savings programs.

The Department of Labor rule that the Republicans are now seeking to roll back provides clarity for States and employers so that California, and the several other States that have already enacted similar plans, can provide a simple savings tool for millions of working families.

Mr. Speaker, I just don’t understand the arguments that are being made against the average working person who would like to have retirement savings. I don’t know who is going to benefit if we do away with their ability to have a savings plan, even if they don’t have one under the job they work on. Who benefits? Is it Wall Street again? What is happening here, and why is it that we have H.J. Res. 66?

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, we are not opposing voluntary plans. We are not opposing States setting up plans that will encourage retirement. We are not opposing that. We are just saying we want to make sure they are protected under the same requirements of ERISA that all other plans are. We want to make sure that those dollars are there when the people need them. That is all we are saying. We are not opposed to voluntary or plans for retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), my colleague and good friend, the chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Tax Policy.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman WALBERG. There is an irony here, and it is an irony I think that is worth pointing out. This is, obviously, in the context, like the gentlewoman from California pointed out, of the fiduciary rule, which we are familiar with. That was an effort by the Obama administration to promulgate a new rule to create a new standard that would have an impact, Mr. Speaker, on investment advice.

It was clear that the net result of that was to do what? It would have crowded people out at the lower end of the economic spectrum, not give them access to the coverage or the advice that they needed, because the advice, Mr. Speaker, would have been too expensive, and it would have created the self-fulfilling prophecy, unfortunately, where wealthier people, who can afford it, are able to get good advice.

It was a terrible idea. We worked on a bipartisan basis. The administration
wouldn’t have any part of the bipartisan solution. They jammed the rule down. It was a bad idea.

Yet, the same administration, Mr. Speaker, is now saying to the entities that we really shouldn’t have confidence in, that States and localities on the ground have more capability. So think about it. Taking away flexibility from people who need help, locking them out, not intentionally, but locking them out, and yet giving more flexibility to the very entities that we have decided that they have not used that properly.

It is ironic. I mean, you can’t make this up, basically. We need to do what we can, and here is what we can do. We can support this resolution, H.J. Res 66 and 67—move its passage, reset this debate, and fundamentally have a new discussion about this, but we don’t have to yield to these poor plans from the Obama administration.

Ms. BONAMICI. May I inquire as to the remaining time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon, a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, my friends at SEIU said that you can’t make things up. Well, unfortunately, people are. First and foremost, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are conflating accounts that are in the name of individual savers who don’t have pension plans that would be set up under these proposals, with what has happened with State and local pension plans and, frankly, private pension plans that got over their skis, that overpromised, that added to things.

These are just the accounts that belong to individuals.

Now, the hypocrisy strikes me that my Republican friends want to strip away the protections of the Affordable Care Act and turn it back to the States. Let them do with it what they will for Medicaid, for other local health programs. They think that is a great idea. But when governments on the State level like mine spent years developing a proposal that is innovative, that would protect people, that would involve no public tax dollars but at least engage people in a low-cost, transparent savings plan like we all have as Federal employees, then they don’t want innovation, then they don’t trust the States, then they want extra regulations that the American economy has never been designed for programs like this.

I find it troubling that we would take a low-cost, high-impact program that has been developed in a number of States to help savers who have no program, that the private sector doesn’t think that the American economy can invest in—or it is not worth their while—and strip that away. I think there is a reason why some business organizations, like the Chamber and other financial groups, are worried about this because this is a low-cost, high-impact, transparent program that will deliver benefits directly to employees. That is what more people should have.

I think they are afraid of the model and they are willing to give the flexibility to the States in retirement that they are trying to do, throwing out the Affordable Care Act and having all sorts of innovation there.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD additional letters in opposition to this resolution.

Service Employees International Union,

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the two million members of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), I urge you to vote against H.J. Res 66 and H.J. Res 67, resolutions disapproving of the Department of Labor’s rules relating to retirement savings arrangements established by states and qualified state political subdivisions. The Department of Labor rules make it easier for small employers to offer their workers access to programs for retirement savings and achieve an essential component of the American dream.

There is a retirement savings crisis in our country. Fifty-five million workers do not have access to a retirement savings plan at work. As a result, nearly half of all workers have no retirement assets—no pension, no roll-over 401(k), and no 403(b). States have stepped in to begin to address this crisis with innovative legislation that gives workers the opportunity to set aside their own money in low-cost, professionally managed savings accounts. Importantly, private sector money managers and administrators will be hired to run these programs on behalf of the states, generating American jobs.

The Department of Labor issued rules that clarified that employers would not be subject to the fiduciary responsibilities and reporting requirements of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) under these state initiatives.

In addition to helping workers achieve a dignified retirement, the state initiatives also are fiscally prudent actions that will save public spending. A new study by Segal Consulting estimated that state Medicaid costs would be reduced by $5 billion within the first ten years of implementation of the rules. New data show exponential growth over time as more workers retire with greater amounts of savings.

Five states—California, Connecticut, Illinois, Maryland and Virginia—have enacted legislation and will soon begin taking payroll contributions. About half of states have studied or are studying this concept. Massachusetts is considering legislation that would also allow employer contributions. Contrary to misinformation being spread about these plans, the program funds are not Federal funds, and state and participating employers will have no liability for the payment of retirement funds earned by the participants. These plans are stand-alone, employee-initiated that appropriately use states as laboratories for innovation. They are a win for workers, for employers, and for governments at all levels.

SEIU is also deeply concerned with efforts under the Congressional Review Act (CRA) to circumvent the Executive process of rulemaking and issuing regulatory guidance. Using the CRA authority to undo Agency regulations and guidance crafted carefully and thoughtfully would weaken or undo past and future rules that protect workers.

SEIU respectfully urges you to vote against resolutions H.J. Res 66 and H.J. Res 67 disapproving of these important rules. We urge you to vote today to uphold our legislator scorecard. If you have any questions please contact John Gray. Legislative Director.

Sincerely,

MARY KAY HENRY,
International President.

Small Business Majority,

Re: House Joint Resolutions 66 and 67.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCARTHY: As a leading representative of the 28 million small businesses in America, Small Business Majority writes today urging you to oppose HJR 66 and HJR 67, which would overturn the U.S. Department of Labor’s rule enabling states to establish retirement savings plans for private sector workers. Striking down this rule would have a chilling effect on states that are setting up their own retirement savings programs, which would be harmful to small businesses and their employees. We strongly believe states should be allowed to decide whether to implement these types of programs and how best to administer them in order to serve small businesses and employees who struggle to save for retirement.

The U.S. currently suffers from a retirement savings gap of more than $6 trillion, and more than three million households do not have any retirement savings at all. This lack of savings disproportionately affects those who are employed by small businesses. Eighty percent of workers employed by businesses with fewer than 25 employees do not have a pension or retirement plan at all. This is important because small businesses employ half of all private sector workers. Unless small businesses and their employees begin to address this crisis, we will not have enough money for their golden years.

The Small Business Majority’s state opinion polling found small business owners struggle to offer retirement savings programs due to a number of barriers, but they want to offer this benefit to their employees because it helps them attract and retain talent. What’s more, the majority of small employers are concerned their employees will not have enough saved for retirement. That’s why small businesses overwhelmingly support state efforts to establish state-administered retirement savings programs, like the Secure Choice Savings programs in Illinois and California.

When implemented, these programs will offer a convenient and affordable option for small businesses and their employees to save for the future. That’s why we support these programs and urge you to support them as well.

Sincerely,

KEVIN McCARTHY,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives,
Business owners know offering benefits like retirement savings create a happier and more productive staff, which in turn leads to increased productivity. Many small business owners think that their employees are best served by their own employer-sponsored plan, but it’s not surprising they support programs that enable them to foster a happier workforce while protecting their workers and their bottom lines.

Additionally, programs like these help level the playing field between small business and larger retirement program competitors, but can’t, and their larger counterparts that can. This helps small businesses compete for the best employees, and gives employers peace of mind knowing they are doing what’s best for their workers.

Small employers need retirement savings options for their employees that make sense for their firm and their bottom line. State-administered retirement savings programs, like those currently being established in California and Illinois, can help many small business employees better save for their futures. We urge you to uphold the Labor Department’s rule and allow states to design programs, like those currently being established in California and Illinois, can help many small business employees better save for their futures. We urge you to uphold the Labor Department’s rule and allow states to design programs, like those currently being established in California and Illinois, can help many small business employees better save for their futures. We urge you to uphold the Labor Department’s rule and allow states to design programs, like those currently being established in California and Illinois, can help many small business employees better save for their futures. We urge you to uphold the Labor Department’s rule and allow states to design programs, like those currently being established in California and Illinois, can help many small business employees better save for their futures.
Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I in- 
the goal is not to compete or replace the 
private market, but to fulfill a significant 
unmet need in the market that must be an-
swered for the sake of those families and our 
entire state economy. The market is cur-
rently falling though nearly half the work-
force even though the demand is there. 
According to an AARP 2013 survey, 64% of small businesses in Connecticut that were 
not offering a retirement plan stated that they 
would take advantage of a state plan if it 
were offered.

Connecticut was heartened by the U.S. De-
partment of Labor rule last August, pro-
viding for states to conduct these programs. While we have been advised by 
several ERISA attorneys that the U.S. 
Department of Labor rule was not required, 
and the states that have the right to es-
tablish such programs, the proposed bills 
nullifying the U.S. Department of Labor rule 
and attempting to roll back states' rights 
may create a chilling effect on the compa-
ties in support of H.J. Res. 66.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I in-
clude in the RECORD a letter, under-
signed, representing thousands of busi-
nesses, individual employees, and retir-
es from almost every single group in support of H.J. Res. 66.

FEBRUARY 15, 2017

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES 
CONGRESS: The undersigned organizations, 
representing thousands of businesses, employers, 
sponsors of programs that provide retirement savings opportunities for private sector employees retirement pro-
grams that do not have the same high-level protections as other private employer-sponsored 
programs. Below we highlight a number of our con-
cerns with the "safe harbor.

Fewer employer plans, especially among small businesses—if a state mandates auto-
IRAs, some employers will decide to avoid 
taking on the work of offering their own plans and let the state take it on instead, re-
sulting in the loss of significant retirement savings opportunities. State Senator Daniel Biss won 
passage of the Illinois Secure Choice Savings Program that creates a retire-
ment plan with automatic deductions that has proven successful in increasing 
individual retirement savings. Last summer, the U.S. Department of Labor 
acted to move this plan forward for Illinois and other States.

Today Republicans are trying to pre-
vent States and cities from expanding 
private retirement savings. Nearly 1.3 
million workers in my State, Illinois, 
are not offered a job-based retirement savings option. State Senator Daniel Biss won 
passage of the Illinois Secure Choice Savings Program that creates a retire-
ment plan with automatic deductions that has proven successful in increasing 
individual retirement savings. Last summer, the U.S. Department of Labor 
acted to move this plan forward for Illinois and other States.

Today Republicans are trying to pre-
vent States and cities from expanding 
private retirement savings. Nearly 1.3 
million workers in my State, Illinois, 
are not offered a job-based retirement savings option. State Senator Daniel Biss won 
passage of the Illinois Secure Choice Savings Program that creates a retire-
ment plan with automatic deductions that has proven successful in increasing 
individual retirement savings. Last summer, the U.S. Department of Labor 
acted to move this plan forward for Illinois and other States.

Today Republicans are trying to pre-
vent States and cities from expanding 
private retirement savings. Nearly 1.3 
million workers in my State, Illinois, 
are not offered a job-based retirement savings option. State Senator Daniel Biss won 
passage of the Illinois Secure Choice Savings Program that creates a retire-
ment plan with automatic deductions that has proven successful in increasing 
individual retirement savings. Last summer, the U.S. Department of Labor 
acted to move this plan forward for Illinois and other States.

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), a senior member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, America should no longer be shocked with the Republican mantra of “no” to everything—that is, until Wall Street and the financial services industry calls. Today’s action on H.J. Res. 66 and 67 ill illustrates this unfortunate reality.

Congressional Republicans once again are ignoring the financial industry ahead of average American workers. Their attempt to roll back President Obama’s Department of Labor rules, which expanded working families’ abilities to save their own retirement money through State- and large-cities-sponsored retirement savings programs. The Republican proposal restricts saving options for working people.

For years, Republicans have hawked a false crisis about Social Security solvency; now they are proposing a very real retirement security crisis for America’s seniors. We are nearing a boiling point. The difference between what average Americans have saved for retirement and where their savings should be is staggering: more than $6 trillion in shortfalls.

Roughly half of all U.S. families have no money set aside for retirement. Thirty-nine million Americans don’t have access to a workplace retirement savings plan, even Americans who work diligently to save for retirement are falling behind. With 10,000 American seniors reaching retirement age every day, enormous strain on the Federal budget is mounting to make up the difference.

Today most workers don’t have a pension. Those that do, can’t be so sure it will be there throughout their golden years. There has been a dramatic decline in guaranteed retirement benefits through employer support.

Without access to easy and affordable savings vehicles, far too many American workers will retire into poverty. This leads to overreliance on Social Security and other State and Federal assistance programs. It surely isn’t the American Dream.

President Obama identified this crisis. He spoke to Congress about trying to work together to address it through bipartisan action, but our Republican colleagues said “no.” Their failure to act drove President Obama to coordinate with States, eight of which have already passed laws to create State-administered retirement programs for private sector workers, which H.J. Res. 66 and 67 would roll back.

More than half the States are considering similar action to improve retirement readiness, and these plans help small businesses offer savings plans for their employees without imposing financial burdens.

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 10 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, so what do Congressional Republicans have as an alternative solution? Nothing. The cost to roll this rule back is significant. It is not good for retirees or workers, and it maintains the growing burden on taxpayers who fund assistance programs.

I urge all of my colleagues to reject this shortsighted action. Stand up for the American working class and oppose both H.J. Res. 66 and 67.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I just make one comment that, when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle had both Houses and the White House gone to work just as they should. My great laboratories of our democracy went to work just as they should. My Gentleman is talking about some of the Democrats that didn’t even exist when we had the majority.

In States across the Nation, the great laboratories of our democracy went to work just as they should. My State of California decided to create something called Secure Choice, a State-run retirement plan that allows employees to be auto-enrolled into an IRA if they work for a business with five or more employees.

In doing so, California will give almost 10 million workers access to retirement savings—no substitute for a pension or a 401(k), but a vital step toward a greater retirement security. Other States have stepped forward with their own plan, the gentleman from Oregon before the States of Oregon and California, Illinois, Washington, State, Connecticut.

The Republican measure targets workers’ savings accounts in those States and chills efforts to foster retirement savings accounts in some 20 other States. In some cities, including the city of our chair, Mr. CROWLEY, New York City is attempting to move in that direction.

So today, instead of supporting States’ innovation—this is a states’ rights bill to the party of states’ rights—Republicans have decided Wall Street’s profits are more important than workers’ retirement savings.

This Republican resolution is opposed by the AARP, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the AFL-CIO. In fact, the AARP letter to Congress states, starts, as a matter of fact:

On behalf of hardworking Americans who struggle to save for retirement, AARP urges you to vote against the Congressional Review Act resolution to overturn the Department of Labor’s final rule on “Savings Arrangements Established by States for Non-Governmental Employees.”

And while Republicans race to do the bidding of their Wall Street friends, they still have not lifted a finger to create more good-paying jobs for hardworking Americans.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her hard work on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, every American should be able to trust in the promise that, after a life of hard work, a secure and dignified retirement will be there for them. But today, that promise is at risk. Half of all private sector employees in America, almost 60 million people, do not have access to any type of employer-sponsored retirement plan.

It is a problem that Republicans should remember when they plan to raise costs on seniors, when they work to slash Medicaid and they destroy the sacred guarantee of Medicare.

Yet, once again, Republicans have come to this floor not with the retirement security of hardworking families in mind, but with a greedy Wall Street first agenda.

Under the Obama administration, the Department of Labor empowered the States to create innovative solutions to the retirement savings crisis. The gentleman is talking about some of the Republicans that didn’t even exist when we had the majority.

In States across the Nation, the great laboratories of our democracy went to work just as they should. My State of California decided to create something called Secure Choice, a State-run retirement plan that allows employees to be auto-enrolled into an IRA if they work for a business with five or more employees.

In doing so, California will give almost 10 million workers access to retirement savings—no substitute for a pension or a 401(k), but a vital step toward a greater retirement security. Other States have stepped forward with their own plan, the gentleman from Oregon before the States of Oregon and California, Illinois, Washington, State, Connecticut.

The Republican measure targets workers’ savings accounts in those States and chills efforts to foster retirement savings accounts in some 20 other States. In some cities, including the city of our chair, Mr. CROWLEY, New York City is attempting to move in that direction.

So today, instead of supporting States’ innovation—this is a states’ rights bill to the party of states’ rights—Republicans have decided Wall Street’s profits are more important than workers’ retirement savings.

This Republican resolution is opposed by the AARP, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the AFL-CIO. In fact, the AARP letter to Congress states, starts, as a matter of fact:

On behalf of hardworking Americans who struggle to save for retirement, AARP urges you to vote against the Congressional Review Act resolution to overturn the Department of Labor’s final rule on “Savings Arrangements Established by States for Non-Governmental Employees.”

And while Republicans race to do the bidding of their Wall Street friends, they still have not lifted a finger to create more good-paying jobs for hardworking Americans.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her hard work on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, every American should be able to trust in the promise that, after a life of hard work, a secure and dignified retirement will be there for them. But today, that promise is at risk. Half of all private sector employees in America, almost 60 million people, do not have access to any type of employer-sponsored retirement plan.

It is a problem that Republicans should remember when they plan to raise costs on seniors, when they work to slash Medicaid and they destroy the sacred guarantee of Medicare.

Yet, once again, Republicans have come to this floor not with the retirement security of hardworking families in mind, but with a greedy Wall Street first agenda.

Under the Obama administration, the Department of Labor empowered the States to create innovative solutions to the retirement savings crisis. The gentleman is talking about some of the Republicans that didn’t even exist when we had the majority.

In States across the Nation, the great laboratories of our democracy went to work just as they should. My State of California decided to create something called Secure Choice, a State-run retirement plan that allows employees to be auto-enrolled into an IRA if they work for a business with five or more employees.

In doing so, California will give almost 10 million workers access to retirement savings—no substitute for a pension or a 401(k), but a vital step toward a greater retirement security. Other States have stepped forward with their own plan, the gentleman from Oregon before the States of Oregon and California, Illinois, Washington, State, Connecticut.

The Republican measure targets workers’ savings accounts in those States and chills efforts to foster retirement savings accounts in some 20 other States. In some cities, including the city of our chair, Mr. CROWLEY, New York City is attempting to move in that direction.

So today, instead of supporting States’ innovation—this is a states’ rights bill to the party of states’ rights—Republicans have decided Wall Street’s profits are more important than workers’ retirement savings.

This Republican resolution is opposed by the AARP, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the AFL-CIO. In fact, the AARP letter to Congress states, starts, as a matter of fact:

On behalf of hardworking Americans who struggle to save for retirement, AARP urges you to vote against the Congressional Review Act resolution to overturn the Department of Labor’s final rule on “Savings Arrangements Established by States for Non-Governmental Employees.”

And while Republicans race to do the bidding of their Wall Street friends, they still have not lifted a finger to create more good-paying jobs for hardworking Americans.
and Reinvestment Act. One week after that, the Senate passed the bill. And on February 17, which would be Friday of this week, 4 weeks since the inauguration of President Obama, President Obama signed into law the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, which created or saved around 4 million jobs of the American people, stopping the loss of jobs that existed in the Bush administration. That is something that is so remarkable.

So where is the jobs bill from the Republican colleagues? Where is their jobs bill? Where is the infrastructure bill?

By the way, President Obama also passed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act even before the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, which had bipartisan support in the Congress and much more.

This do-nothing Congress, except do stuff for your friends who will exploit the energy of clean air, clean water—you name it—retirement savings, has done nothing.

As I said, within 4 weeks of the Obama administration, all those bills had passed.

Today is February 15, and I ask my Republican colleagues: Where is your jobs bill? Why do you have time for Wall Street’s agenda, but no plans to create jobs for hardworking Americans?

This is the people’s House. We must do the people’s business. You must do a better job by the people we serve. When you are ready to do that, we look forward to working with you in that regard.

I join the AARP in urging a “no” vote on this ill-advised CRA.

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

In response to the gentlewoman from California, I would just say that much of what she was doing for the past 4 weeks on the floor, including today, is trying to give a shot in the arm to our economy, to our workers, our workforce, our retirees, and savers to take some of the traps that have been put in place that have frustrated this economy and the growth of this economy for 8 years.

There is a reason for what took place at the ballot box. And the expectation is that we move to take some of the clamps of the Federal Government off the productive sectors of our States, our local communities, and, more importantly, the citizens of this country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank all of my colleagues who came this afternoon to speak in opposition to this resolution. It shows how important it is to the working people in our States and in our districts. These are people who do not have a retirement plan. That is who we are looking out for.

I urge all my colleagues today to stand up for workers who deserve that chance at saving for retirement and who will get that chance because Oregon and other States and the Federal Government have stepped up and are taking action.

Again, the Department of Labor safe harbor rule applies to States that have strict investor protections. We wouldn’t be here today if those strict investor protections were not maintained.

I especially urge my colleagues, particularly those of us who are concerned about states’ rights, not to undermine States like Oregon and all the others that have stepped up to create these innovative solutions. There is a gap. That is why so many people today do not have retirement savings.

Colleagues, please join us in opposing H.J. Res. 66.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I express appreciation for the full-throated debate that went on here. It is good to do that.

It is good for the opportunity to make it very clear that retirement security is a significant challenge facing this country. We have said that. I am glad that on the floor of the House today both sides of the aisle indicated concerns for that. Too many men and women are struggling to save for their retirement years.

Unfortunately, in recent years, we have seen regulations like the fiduciary rule that will make it harder for low- and middle-income families to save for retirement. And we have seen a regulation that would strip away important protections for retirement savers.

As policymakers, we must do more to expand retirement options for workers. That is a given. That we can agree on.

However, the regulatory loophole created by the Obama administration is clearly not the answer.

I want to remind my colleagues that this resolution does not prevent States from coming up with new retirement options for workers. That is not what this resolution is about, and simply reading it will assure you of that.

This resolution is about ensuring every American has strong protections for a secure retirement.

I urge my colleagues to protect retirement savers by voting in favor of H.J. Res. 66.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 116, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

Ms. BONAMICI. 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.
Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 116, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 67) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to savings arrangements established by qualified State political subdivisions for non-governmental employees, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution we are debating right now would restrict our hardworking businesses to offer 401(k) plans to their employees, which they implemented regulatory loophole we are seeking to close today. Congress should be in the business of helping people save for retirement, not in the business of unfairly limiting or jeopardizing workers' ability to save for retirement; nor should Congress go out of its way to undermine the rights of cities and counties to implement innovative solutions that are needed for their residents.

I urge my colleagues to reject H.J. Res. 67 and get to work on meaningful solutions to address our country's retirement security crisis. America's working families deserve the opportunity to be able to save enough to retire with dignity and security.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY), who evidenced his complete commitment to meeting the needs of all people by receiving an ambassadorship and performing duties very well to the Holy See.

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 67, a resolution which will protect individual savers for their retirement and small business retirement plans.

I was proud to introduce this resolution to affirm the bipartisan protections the ERISA law has afforded workers and retirees for decades. ERISA offers important legal safeguards so workers and retirees will receive their hard-earned savings.

We need Federal Government policies that will empower and incentivize small businesses to offer 401(k) plans to their employees.

H.J. Res. 67 preserves these policies and protections, and will terminate the defective efforts instituted in the last hours of the recent administration, in which they implemented regulatory loopholes to replace private savings for retirement with sweetheart deals for city- and State-run programs with fewer protections and safeguards.

The California folks that are in charge of this stuff were quoted in an article in a national publication in the spring, gloating about their exciting win, and that it “would have no liability or fiduciary duties for the plan. We have been given the green light.”

The regulation we are terminating here would restrict our hardworking savers with, deciding what they can invest in. They will now regard the government as their hard-earned money to State and local bureaucrats unless they affirmatively opt out.
The government will decide what investment options will be available to them. There is a serious risk of political or social investing by these bureaucrats instead of individual investor-based decisions.

Work in about a regulation which we are abolishing would undermine the very successful 401(k) retirement savings program. Due to 401(k)'s and related defined-contribution plans, savings have gone from $7.8 billion to over $25 billion in about 20 years. It has been a huge success.

We should be encouraging Americans and private companies to privately invest in 401(k) plans, which offer three distinct advantages:

The contribution amount to a 401(k) plan is three times what can be put in an IRA.

Employers match contributions. Many companies match 1 for 1 up to 4 percent of what the employee puts in. That is a powerful incentive for the employee to save.

The last thing is, 401(k) plans are protected by the ERISA law. They ensure that workers' savings are secure.

In the end, the regulations which we are abolishing were just another Big Government mandate to crowd out the private sector. These resolutions will put an end to the Obama administration's sweetheart deal, and will ensure that private sector workers continue to receive strong protections as they save for their retirement.

This contribution will block the chance for cities and States to get their hands on our friends' and our employees' retirement savings.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to protect retirement savers today by voting in favor of H.J. Res. 67.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), the chair of the House Democratic Caucus and a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, sweet heart deals?

Since when is it a sweetheart deal to have a modicum of retirement for working poor and middle class people?

That is a sweetheart deal?

All I hear from the other side of the aisle is people talking about government executive orders, and unnamed bureaucrats. So it is surprising that today the Republican majority is creating a manmade roadblock toward helping working Americans save their own money for their own retirement.

We have all heard about the olden days when, if you worked for a company for life, you could retire with a guaranteed pension. Now, with the exception of union workers, the days of a guaranteed pension plan for most private sector workers are a thing of the past. Captains of industry don't offer them anymore. They line their own pockets instead.

Some employers have tried to fill that retirement income gap by offering 401(k) retirement savings plans. Not a bad thing, but it was not the answer that everyone thought it was going to be, the panacea that everyone made it out to be.

But for far too many companies, they don't offer any retirement package to their employees at all. Today, half of all Americans going to work are not offered a retirement plan from their employer, meaning these workers are not accumulating any future Social Security for their retirement years.

To address this growing retirement savings crisis, the Obama administration made it easier for States and large municipalities to sponsor their own 401(k)-style retirement plan for their residents who work in the private sector, but are not offered any retirement plan from their private sector job. They are not offered by their employer that 401(k) plan. They have nothing, no opportunity.

These rules simply do it is create a pathway for States and large cities. When they choose, to enroll private sector workers into a retirement savings vehicle so they can start saving early to enjoy the benefits of a more financially secure retirement. And what is wrong with that?

It is a universal fact that the most successful way to get people to save for their retirement is to enroll them in a retirement plan through their workplace and have a percentage of their pay taken out automatically and invested for the long-term future and for their benefit.

So these Obama administration rules were actually adopting best practices to help workers who had been offered no opportunity to save for their retirement, to start to build their own nest egg with their own money for their own future, potentially even investing in a private 401(k) plan down the road. The cruel irony is, if these two bills pass, congressional Republicans will have prohibited States and local governments from trying to help those workers who have been forgotten about by some in the Federal Government and ignored by the private sector marketplace.

What ever happened to local government being the laboratory of democracy?

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Now, I could understand if Republicans in Congress were actually adopting best practices, to start to build their own nest egg with their own money for their own future, potentially even investing in a private 401(k) plan down the road. The cruel irony is, if these two bills pass, congressional Republicans will have prohibited States and local governments from trying to help those workers who have been forgotten about by some in the Federal Government and ignored by the private sector marketplace.

What ever happened to local government being the laboratory of democracy?

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT), a new member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 67, which is yet another assault on working families.

Mr. Speaker, not only are my Republican colleagues launching a broad, concerted attack on our ability to have access to retirement savings opportunities for our workers, but through H.J. Res. 67, they are directly targeting my whole life could have some form of guaranteed income in addition to—and not as a replacement for—Social Security.

But you don't have one. You never have. I won't say you never will, but you have not, and you have not yet. Then maybe there would be some justification for the action you are taking today, but that is not the case.

In fact, Republicans in Congress have done nothing to protect workers or retiree benefits, and they are the party that wants to privatize Social Security.

But today, with these two bills, they go one step further to eliminate the ability of millions of workers from even the potential to enjoy some financial comfort after a lifetime of work. It is time for a progressive agenda for America that puts America's workers first and their families first.

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

Again, I just—for matters of accuracy about the legislation that is in front of us, I think it ought to be clear that both sides of the aisle can agree that we ought to encourage retirement savings and we ought to be willing to look for choices, opportunities, variety, all of that, and allow States, local communities, cities, to be creative, to look for a means by which we can foster increased retirement savings.

All this legislation is doing, though, is saying that we want those approaches to be protected for the retirees. That is all we are saying. We are not opposing States. We are not opposing cities. We are not opposing counties, municipalities, from establishing plans. But we want them to come under ERISA, the same requirements that other people come under, and make sure that people aren't sold a bill of goods that they lose in the future. That is all we are saying.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make that clear. None of the proposals or the statements that are being made that what we are trying to do is stop people from having retirement options is accurate. We just want them to be protected.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
home of New York City and the constituents of New York’s 13th Congressional District. Once again, without any regard to the consequences of these reckless actions, Republicans are playing politics with the lives and financial security of our citizens. 

If passed, H.J. Res. 67 will nullify a Department of Labor rule, just 1 month after it went into effect, that supports the efforts of large cities or counties, like New York City, in establishing retirement savings plans for their residents.

This rule is narrowly applied to jurisdictions that are populous enough to be their own State and whose States do not already have provided statewide payroll deduction saving plans. This is to ensure that the policy only goes into effect in cities where the people are in need.

In New York City alone, 1.5 million private sector workers—almost 60 percent of the private sector workers throughout the city—do not have access to a retirement plan through their employer or business.

This rule gives New York City the ability to expand access for private sector workers to retirement savings plans. Rolling back this rule rips the opportunity to save for retirement out of the hands of millions of people.

Mr. Speaker, rushing to overturn this innovative rule without offering a single constructive alternative is irresponsible and is yet another example of Republicans attempting to hastily undo provisions that have helped people in real need without even providing a replacement plan to ensure working families have financial security after their retirement.

To make matters worse, using the Congressional Review Act to roll back this rule will prevent the Department of Labor from reissuing any substantive explanation for its rule. As a result, the regulatory loophole created by the Trump Administration will remain.

Younger workers are trying to save for their children to go to college. They are trying to buy a home or build the emergency fund they will need if their car breaks down. Others are wondering if they can afford to start their own business or maintain financial security to leave their job for a better opportunity.

Older Americans are looking at retirement and if they will be able to support themselves and maintain a good quality of life without working. We know that savings are the path for individuals but we want to see the American Dream, yet that dream is increasingly being put at risk.

We can turn this around, Mr. Speaker. We can put building a college savings account, a nest egg, and a retirement plan back in reach for millions of American families.

That is why I have put forward a plan of action entitled “Building Better Savings, Building Brighter Futures.” You can read my action plan on my website at https://www.bernie.senate.gov.

This plan is a comprehensive approach to ensure no American who works their whole life will spend their retirement in poverty. But to get to that point, we need to stop wasting time going backwards. So let’s allow States and local governments to continue to do what they are doing to help those workers who are being left behind now.

Oppose these two bills that target workers’ retirement savings, and let’s work towards positive solutions to address the real problems of America’s working families. We can do that with my proposal, Building Better Savings, Building Brighter Futures.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I re-serve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This has been a good discussion, but I want to reemphasize that there is a retirement crisis. People are insecure about their retirement. There are too many people—millions of people across the country—who do not have retirement savings. So, today, my colleagues aren’t coming here and saying: We have a plan; let’s help these people save for retirement.

Instead, they are going to make it harder for States and municipalities and workers to make our step-up to fill this critical need.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand with workers who deserve a chance at saving for retirement and who will get that chance because, as with the State bill, there are several large municipalities stepping up to help.

I urge my colleagues not to undermine the work of those cities and municipalities that are working to enact innovative solutions. Again, these are managed by investment professionals. There are investor protections in these plans. People do not have to participate, but they are hungry for this opportunity. Millions of people across the country are watching.

Where is the solution? Let’s not get in their way. Please join me in opposing H.J. Res. 66 and H.J. Res. 67.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I appreciate the full-throated debate that went on here in the discussion of a most important issue. I am grateful that ERISA was in place for my father, a tool and die maker, a machinist. He didn’t have that protection. But he was able to achieve the American Dream, yet that dream is increasingly being put at risk.

We have a plan; let’s help these people save for retirement.

Every American, regardless of what city or State they live in, deserves strong protections and secure retirement. That is why, for over 40 years, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act has been the law of the land. Denying those longstanding protections to certain workers is a completely backwards approach that undermines the retirement security of working families, and everyone has the opportunity for secure retirement savings. We all support creating new options for retirement savers. Unfortunately, the regulatory loophole created by the Obama administration is not the answer.

So I certainly resonate with the desire to make sure the middle class families and everyone has the opportunity for secure retirement savings. We all support creating new options for retirement savers. Unfortunately, the regulatory loophole created by the Obama administration is not the answer.

Every American, regardless of what city or State they live in, deserves strong protections and secure retirement. That is why, for over 40 years, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act has been the law of the land. Denying those longstanding protections to certain workers is a completely backwards approach that undermines the retirement security of working families, and everyone has the opportunity for secure retirement savings. We all support creating new options for retirement savers. Unfortunately, the regulatory loophole created by the Obama administration is not the answer.

So I certainly resonate with the desire to make sure the middle class families and everyone has the opportunity for secure retirement savings. We all support creating new options for retirement savers. Unfortunately, the regulatory loophole created by the Obama administration is not the answer.
Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 116, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution 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 joint resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 191, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—234

NAYS—191

Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. ROSEN, Messrs. DeSALVADOR and ELLISON changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. Speaker, the unfinshed business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 67) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to savings arrangements established by qualified State political subdivisions for non-governmental employees, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 193, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—231

Abraham
Adelhart
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Bakin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bengson
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blondin
Blum
Boehm
Budden
Buck
Bueschel
Budish
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (TX)
Cater
Chaffetz
Chaffetz (NY)
Cheyney
Colman
Coelho
Colmenares (LA)
Colmeske
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culbertson
Curbelo
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Denham
DelBianco
DelBianco (IA)
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Farenthold
Faso
Farr
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox
Franken (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Nunes

NAYS—193

Adams
Aguiar
Barragan
Bass
Beaty
Bera
Beyer
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Browner (CA)
Burgess (TX)
Burks
Butler
Byrne
Capito
Carpenter
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Carter (FL)
Castañeda (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtesty
Crawley
Cummings
Davis (CT)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Dooley
Doyle
Elson
Engel
Espaillat
Espy
Evens
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garza
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green
Green (OH)
Greig
Grijalva
Gudino
Hanabas
Hastings
Hastings
Himes
Hoyer

NOT VOTING—7

Carter (GA)
Gray
King (IA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

☐ 1702

So the joint resolution was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr.トン, Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. I had been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 96.

DISAPPROVING RULE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF LABOR RELATING TO DRUG TESTING OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION APPLICANTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 22) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to drug testing of unemployment compensation applicants, on which the yeas and nays were ordered. The Clerk then read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 189, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

YEAS—236

Abraham
Aderhold
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Bakin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bengson
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blondin
Blum
Boehm
Budden
Buck
Bueschel
Budish
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (TX)
Cater
Chaffetz
Chaffetz (NY)
Cheyney
Colman
Coelho
Colmenares (LA)
Colmeske
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culbertson
Curbelo
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Denham
DelBianco
DelBianco (IA)
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Farenthold
Faso
Farr
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox
Franken (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gohmert
Nunes

NAYS—193

Adams
Aguiar
Barragan
Bass
Beaty
Bera
Beyer
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Browner (CA)
Burgess (TX)
Burks
Butler
Byrne
Capito
Carpenter
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Carter (FL)
Castañeda (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtesty
Crawley
Cummings
Davis (CT)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Dooley
Doyle
Elson
Engel
Espaillat
Espy
Evens
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garza
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green
Green (OH)
Greig
Grijalva
Gudino
Hanabas
Hastings
Hastings
Himes
Hoyer

NOT VOTING—7

Carter (GA)
Gray
King (IA)
Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, 2017, I was absent due to personal reasons and missed votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: Rolcall No. 93 on Ordering the Previous Question“aye”; Rolcall No. 94 Adoption of the Combined Rule of H.J. Res. 43 and H.J. Res. 69, “aye”; Rolcall No. 95 passage of H.J. Res. 67, “aye”; Rolcall No. 96 passage of H.J. Res. 66, “aye”; and Rolcall No. 97 passage of H.J. Res. 42, “aye”.

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK.


EYES IN THE SKY: FLIGHT ATTENDANT SAVES VICTIM OF TRAFFICKING

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on a recent flight, flight attendant Sheila Fedrick of Alaska Airlines noticed a young girl, 14 or 15 years old, with blonde hair. Sheila approached two individuals, but the young girl refused to speak or make contact with her. The next week, the girl was defensive as she tried to make conversation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to join me in calling for a thorough, bipartisan, independent investigation.

I also want to commend and thank President Trump for his very rapid reaction to our request for emergency help from the Federal Government on Oroville Dam. His team responded very quickly to our ask, and he understands and is working for infrastructure needs and repairs across this whole country.

And that is just the way it is.

OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on an issue that is of critical importance to every person in this room, every father, mother, every family in our Nation. That issue is our national security.

While the resignation of General Flynn was appropriate, it has led to more questions than answers. One of the most important, if not the most important, questions is this: What did General Flynn do to make him so indispensable for the President?

In my 27 years as a law enforcement officer, I have conducted both internal and criminal investigations at the highest level of law enforcement. I understand the importance of seeking the truth through such investigations.

In a time of confusion and uncertainty, the American people deserve answers and transparency. That can only come through a thorough, bipartisan, independent investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to join me in calling for a thorough, bipartisan, independent investigation.

I also want to commend and thank President Trump for his very rapid reaction to our request for emergency help from the Federal Government on Oroville Dam. His team responded very quickly to our ask, and he understands and is working for infrastructure needs and repairs across this whole country.

And that is just the way it is.
for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, last week, Congressman STEVE CHABOT and I, as the co-chairs of the Cambodia Caucus, called upon Secretary Tillerson and the administration to prioritize human rights, democracy, and the rule of law in Cambodia.

Just days later, Sam Rainsy, the leader of the opposition party in Cambodia, resigned in the face of a proposed bill that would dissolve the opposition party if he continued to lead the party.

This law on political parties would give the government far-reaching powers to suspend political parties at will. I urge the Cambodian National Assembly to set aside this undemocratic law that dangerously moves Cambodia toward being a one-party state, and to allow the Cambodian people to freely choose their own leaders.

ONLY CONGRESS HAS THE POWER TO DECLARE WAR

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have just seen a news report that the President may invade Syria with ground troops.

Now, I criticized former President Obama for his actions in Libya, Iraq, and Syria, without seeking authorization from Congress, and leaning on the weak need that these were somehow authorized back in the AUMP after 9/11. This is far beyond the scope of that resolution, which I helped write, so to have a ground invasion of Syria, without authorization from Congress, will trigger the War Powers Act.

Let's be clear: The Constitution says, once we are at war, the President runs the war as Commander in Chief. But it is only the United States Congress that has the power to declare war, authorize war, which this essentially would be.

So the President must come to the Congress and ask for a new Authorization for Use of Military Force before launching any ground invasion of Syria.

SEATTLE’S DIVESTMENT FROM WELLS FARGO

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my hometown, the city of Seattle, on its historic decision to terminate its $3 billion relationship with Wells Fargo Bank over its financing and support of the Dakota Access pipeline.

Last week, the Seattle City Council voted unanimously to divest from Wells Fargo, making it the first major city to do so.

Led by Native American and environmental activists, our city made an important statement about the vision that we have for our community and for our world. That vision centralizes both the rights of our native brothers and sisters, and our environment.

Just like it did with the $15 minimum wage, Seattle continues to be a model for the rest of the country, and activists and cities around the United States have picked up the torch.

We stand united in prioritizing our environment, as it is deeply connected to the rights of our constituents. Rather than allowing dangerous pipeline projects to continue, putting millions of people at risk, we should be focused on being leaders in the international fight against climate change.

I am committed, Mr. Speaker, to taking every opportunity to protect our resources and fight for a bold alternative energy plan that includes a just transition that creates great union jobs and puts us on a sustainable path forward.

RUSSIAN INFRINGEMENT

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

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is literally every day now that something new and even more shocking comes out about the Trump administration and its connections with the Russian Government. Just last night, it was reported that, according to American intelligence officials, at least four members of the Trump campaign, senior members, were in contact with Russian intelligence officials for a year.

Mr. Speaker, this is not so much about Republican or Democrat as it is about democracy, our democracy. I want to thank those few Republicans in the Senate who have courage to put country before party and come forward and demand an independent, bipartisan investigation. Sadly, that has been met with silence on the Republican side of the aisle in this House.

We must have a 9/11-like commission to investigate to what extent Russian intelligence infiltrated our election.

MUSLIM AND REFUGEE BAN

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to read a letter from a Syrian refugee to the interfaith coalition sponsoring his family, which settled in Bloomfield, New Jersey, last month.

Muhammad is a father of four. His family was one of the last to arrive prior to the signing of President Trump’s ban.

Muhammad wrote:

I feel ashamed when I repeat the words: Thank you.

I feel it’s very few and very weak in front of your interest and your generosity.

The first thing I want to learn in the English language is how I can thank you more and more.

America is beautiful because you live in it.

These are the kind of families the Trump administration wants to turn away. They are the oppressed and the persecuted, the kind of people this country was founded for.

I understand the need to vet people coming to our country, and the importance of protecting our Nation’s security. No one questions that at all.

But we cannot close our country to refugees like Muhammad and his family. We cannot sacrifice what it means to be American.

Muhammad is right, America is beautiful, and we can keep it that way by remaining a beacon of freedom and hope.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BRITISH-AMERICAN INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BERGMAN). The Chair announces the Speaker’s appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761, and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following Member on the part of the House to the British-American Interparliamentary Group:
Mr. ROYDEN DAVIS, Illinois
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THE BLUE COLLAR CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, we are going to talk today about something very important: our economy, jobs, and the state of America in regards to those subject matters.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the State of South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), who is a good friend of mine, our colleague, and our assistant leader, to come address us on a very important issue that relates to many of those things that we talk about.

I would like to invite Leader Clyburn to come address us today. I really appreciate his coming and taking the time to be part of this hour.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Congressman VEASEY, from the great State of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as part of the observation of Black History Month to continue my series of remarks recognizing HBCUs, Historically Black Colleges and Universities. I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating Benedict College in Columbia, South Carolina.

Founded in 1870, just 5 years after the end of the Civil War, by the American Baptist Home Mission Society, Benedict was originally named Benedict Institute, after Stephen and Bathsheba Benedict of Rhode Island, Baptist abolitionists who had donated the funds to acquire the property on which the campus sits. Formerly the site of a pre-Civil War plantation, the first classes were held in a dilapidated mansion on the grounds. Benedict Institute was formerly chartered by the South Carolina General Assembly in 1894 and renamed Benedict College.

From its founding through 1930, Benedict was led by northern White Baptist ministers. In 1930, Reverend John Starks, an alumnus of Benedict, became the school’s first African-American president. The heart of its campus has been designated the Benedict College Historic District, consisting of Morgan Hall, Pratt Hall, Duckles Hall, Antisdell Chapel, and Starks Center.

Like Allen University, its neighbor, Benedict College has a long legacy of activism for civil rights and social justice. One of the very first civil rights campaigns in South Carolina was organized at Benedict College in 1937. Students participating in a national NAACP campaign led a demonstration in support of antilynching legislation pending in Congress.

One of Benedict’s early graduates was Reverend Richard Carroll. Born into slavery in Barnwell, South Carolina, Reverend Carroll was a prominent Baptist minister in the late 1800s who received honorary degrees from both President William McKinley and President Theodore Roosevelt. Other prominent alumni include Modjeska Simkins, a prominent civil rights and public health champion; General Matthew Zimmerman, who served as Chief of Chaplains of the United States Army; and I.S. Leevey Johnson, the first African-American president of the South Carolina State Bar Association.

In the modern era, under the leadership of President Swinton, Benedict has grown to a student body of more than 2,800 undergraduate students. In 1995, Swinton revived the football program and marching band 30 years after they had been shut down. He also championed a new sports complex on Two Notch Road in Columbia, which includes a football stadium, tennis courts, baseball fields, and fitness facilities. The liberal arts curriculum now offers degrees in 30 different disciplines. President Swinton also has the effort and restore many of the historic buildings on the campus, in part paid for with Federal funds from the HBCU Historic Preservation Program that we in this Congress have championed.

President Swinton will retire this summer after 23 years of service to the institution. I wish him well and thank him for his leadership.

Today, on the same land where Blacks once toiled in slavery, their descendants are now learning the tools they need to live up to Benedict College’s motto: to be powers for good. Like so many HBCUs, Benedict offers a unique religious experience in which students from many different backgrounds share a common struggle for equality, and I am pleased to recognize them today.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the leader for his comments and for participating tonight. I really appreciate his words and that recognition.

I want to thank everyone that is with us today to talk about our Blue Collar Caucus and jobs in this country. I think that there is nothing more important to any individual—any man or woman—than the ability to be able to have a good job, to take care of your family, and to be able to be a part of the American economy and to contribute to that economy.

I look forward to talking about President Barack Obama. Under President Barack Obama, the American economy added 9.3 million jobs and overcame one of the worst economic crises our Nation has ever seen.

In Arlington, Texas, which is part of the district that I represent in the Dallas/Fort Worth area, we have a General Motors plant. As you know, we could not lose our cars, and we have a probably the most profitable plant in the General Motors family. All of the cars that you see around here at the Capitol, all of the Yukons, all of the Suburbs, the Escalades, we make those in Arlington, Texas. We are very proud of our plant, very proud of the company being there all those years and for the UAW workers there that help make that plant great.

Despite the gains that we have seen with President Obama’s saving the auto industry with the 9.3 million jobs and our overcoming one of the worst economic crises, again, that our country has ever seen, many workers across the U.S. felt that the economic recovery had left them behind. The rise of automation and outsourcing pushed many of those workers out of jobs that they absolutely loved. The frustration felt by these workers is understandable. Everybody everywhere has a good job that lets them, for their family, be able to take care of themselves, be able to pay their bills, send their kids to college, and buy a car.

President Trump appealed to many blue-collar workers during his campaign with a populist message and pledges to help working America, but his actions since taking office directly contradict so many of his promises. President Trump is one of the slickest political scams we have ever seen on hardworking American families. It is a scam. It is not real.

On his first day in office, President Trump signed an executive order that raised mortgage rates for new home-owners. Those same people that live in those Rust Belt States are those same individuals that were Democrats that went on television and went on social media and said they were going to give their last chance to a candidate on the very first day? We are going to raise interest rates on new home-owners, people trying to live the American Dream. There is nothing more that embodies the American Dream than being able to buy that first home. It was a slap in the face to those blue-collar workers and a boost to Wall Street.

President Trump also signed an executive order that made it easier for Wall Street bankers to make money on risky bets. His Labor and his Treasury Cabinet nominees both have track records that are very unfriendly to the middle class and have no understanding what middle class workers face.

It is clear that President Trump does not have a plan to fight for the working man and woman as he promised on the campaign trail. That is why my colleagues and I, who are here with me from the State of Pennsylvania, we formed the Blue Collar Caucus to address challenges facing
blue-collar workers in today’s economy. We are going to stand up to the Trump administration when he turns his back on working class America.

Our mission is to listen directly to middle class America’s concerns and translate those into policies that allow them to adapt to the changing job market. We have to be able to equip our blue-collar workers with training that leads to jobs and opportunities. We just can’t say “job training.” Those training initiatives have to mean something, which is a real job with a paycheck and some benefits.

This year alone, the U.S. is expected to add 2.5 million middle-skill jobs, the majority of which employers are telling me—and they have been to my office, and Mr. BOYLE has probably heard the same thing. They are saying that these jobs are hard to fill. The Blue Collar Caucus is going to prioritize training of conversations that my colleagues and I have had this effort with the gentleman.

I have a lot more to say, but I do want to turn it over to BRENDAN BOYLE from Pennsylvania, my good friend, who also has some passion to represent and really stand up for working class America, for blue-collar America—not just promise them things, not just get them pumped up with a bunch of hype, but to really talk about real policy initiatives that will help them be able to put some food on the table, put some money in the bank, be able to buy that first house and buy that car so they can put some money in the bank, be able to buy that first house and buy that car, that car that they always wanted. I thank the gentleman very much for his dedication to blue-collar America.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. I am very excited to be joined in this effort with the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, this comes out of a number of reasons that my colleague, MARC VEASEY, and I have had just in the back of this Chamber about both of our experiences growing up, which are very similar, coming from working class or blue-collar parents who had the good fortune to make sure that their children had opportunities that they may not have had. In many ways, that is the American experience: people who work hard, play by the rules, pay taxes, raise their kids, and hope that their kids will have opportunities that they didn’t have. That is what built the American middle class.

What is so difficult about the time in which we are living is that it is not just economic growth that is 2 percent; it is not just about the statistics that we often cite on this House floor. It is about a loss of hope in the power of the American Dream.

There was a statistic that came out—having nothing to do with statistics, let me cite one—that I think is, in fact, very telling and really shocking. Ninety-two percent of the World War II generation went on to earn more than their parents did. For the generation of which I am a part and MARC is a part, when I took my first job, which was an unpaid one, it is exactly one-half—46 percent.

Consider another statistic. Compared to the year 2000, in inflation-adjusted figures, the middle class has less wealth today than at that point 16, 17 years ago. That is the only decade-and-a-half that you can look at in American history in which the middle class is worse off than the decade-and-a-half that preceded it.

So while these are presented as just “economic issues,” really, they are much more than that. They strike at the very heart of who we are as Americans and what we want to be. So we are going to be talking, as part of this caucus and over the next close to an hour or so and for many weeks and months to come, about what we can do specifically for the blue-collar economy, for those who work with their hands and for those who have been, in many ways, held back because of transitions that our economy has faced.

I have many things that I want to talk about as part of that, but I don’t want to talk about the issue of whether we have been joined by someone who doesn’t just talk the talk, but has walked the walk, a union worker himself, an ironworker. I believe, a good friend of mine from Massachusetts, and someone who works hard himself both in his previous occupation and now standing up and fighting for working people.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the State of Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. It is wonderful to join Mr. BOYLE and Mr. VEASEY from Texas. I thank them for creating the Blue Collar Caucus. I think that time is perfect for the challenges that we face as a country, and I think also, as a Democrat, embracing some of our tradition. I think, in some cases, we have drifted from that.

I do want to talk about the blue-collar economy and what is happening to people who work in the building trades and work as truck drivers and nurses and people who are really the backbone of this country.

As BRENDAN mentioned, I was an ironworker for about 20 years, I know what it is when you are trying to work from paycheck to paycheck, standing on a pair of work boots every single day.

I also want to focus tonight on one part of Mr. Trump’s executive orders and policies that have really hurt people in our demographic: regular working people. I want to speak specifically about veterans.

As most people heard, President Trump, when he came into office, initiated what was called a Federal worker hiring freeze, stopping any workers from going to work for the Federal Government. I just want to remind people out there that about 30 percent of those people are veterans. So 30 percent of the people who go to work for the Federal Government are veterans. By putting a freeze on Federal workers, you are blocking almost one-third of workers who are veterans who would be trying to go to work.

The Federal Government is expansive. That includes workers at the VA; it includes workers at the FAA; it includes workers at the Defense Department; the State Department; and on and on and on. So this is really freezing out veterans from going to work.

I had a young veteran in my office the other day who had some skills in radiology. He learned that through his military service in Afghanistan, but also when he got out, with the GI bill, and trying to go to work at the VA. I had to explain to him that President Trump, when he came into office, put a hiring freeze on, and that we were going to have to try to figure out another way to put him to work.

Well, that case is playing out over 50 States, and thousands—probably tens of thousands right now—of veterans are being denied the opportunity to go to work for the Federal Government. Many of them have skills that are necessary.

We have people retiring and leaving Federal employment on a daily basis. We have nurses that are retiring at the VA and folks that work for the EPA and folks that are working at the energy jobs. They are retiring. Yet, we are blocking these veterans from filling those positions because of the President’s hiring freeze.

So that, that I actually drafted a bill that I am happy to share. It is H.R. 1001. It will basically create an exception. It will keep the President’s freeze in place, except for veterans coming back from Iraq and Afghanistan, veterans who have served in previous conflicts. Anyone who has put on this country’s uniform as a veteran would be exempt from the hiring freeze so that we can do the right thing.

Each and every one of these young men and women—and there are a lot of women, I think, that have been our times now; Afghanistan, about 9 times; and I am amazed at the number of young women who serve our country in uniform.

I already have, including my colleagues here, 23 Democrats who have signed on. I would love to get some of my Republican friends on this bill. This should not be a partisan issue, trying to put veterans to work. I am sure we have got some good Democrats and Republicans out there who agree on this, and this should be a bipartisan issue. We can stop the—let’s be hopeful it was unintended consequences of the hiring freeze. We can stop this by coming together. Sign onto H.R. 1001.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their advocacy on behalf of workers.

I notice today that the President’s nominee for Labor Secretary, Mr. Puzder, who had a very bad record with workers, withdrew his nomination. He has withdrawn from consideration. I think it is because of the hard work that Mr. VEASEY and Mr. BOYLE have done in speaking out on behalf of American workers and pointing out the
bad decisions and the wage and garment issues that Mr. Puzyr had. I just think that their advocacy helped enormously in having him withdraw that nomination.

I thank my colleagues again for the great work that they do on behalf of all America and I appreciate their service to the country.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE).

Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. We are planning, actually, to talk about someone who was, quite frankly, the worst Labor Secretary nominee in our Nation’s history; literally putting the fox in charge of the henhouse. You can tell I am from the city because I botched that metaphor, but maybe Marc will be able to help me with that.

To put someone in charge of the Labor Department who had a complete history of ripping off fast food workers, paying minimum wages in some Happy Jack’s, below minimum wage because they were falsely classifying workers, I can’t think of really someone who, in many ways, epitomized the kind of greed that we see in our economy today in the former Labor Secretary nominee.

That actually works to a point that I wanted to raise. I think it is a big part of what has been happening in our American economy today.

In the post-World War II era, for roughly three decades we had large gains in productivity and large gains in wage growth. That is from roughly the mid-1940s to about the late 1970s. You saw workers becoming more productive, working harder and smarter and better than ever, and you saw wages growing to almost exactly the same percentage: 97 percent increase in productivity, 91 percent increase in wage growth.

But then, over the last 30 years, something quite different has happened. The productivity growth has continued. The American worker is more productive than at any point in our Nation’s history and is the most productive workforce in the world. That is not boasting; that is an economic fact.

Yet, since the 1970s, wages have barely gone up at all. Those are the averages. That doesn’t account for the fact that if you are talking about the blue-collar economy, when you are talking about those who don’t have a higher education, when you control for just that group, wages are actually lower today than they were 30, 40 years ago.

Now you might wonder: Well, how are CEOs doing? Have they shared in the pain?

Well, 50 years ago, CEOs made 20 times what typical workers made. As of 2013, they make just under 300 times a typical worker’s pay—from making 20 times more than your average worker to more than 300 times your average worker.

I believe in capitalism and I believe in the market, but clearly something is deeply wrong in our economy, the structure of it, when we have that sort of situation, when workers are not being rewarded for their hard work.

We have, I recall, Mr. Easley, talking a little bit about his family experience and the similarities to my own and the fact that blue-collar workers like our parents actually have fewer opportunities in America today than they did when we were growing up. We have fewer higher-wage jobs. We have lower wages and not as rich benefits. I say not as rich benefits, but, actually, very insecure benefits in terms of health care and a lack of a defined pension.

If Mr. VEASEY would possibly talk more about that and other parts of the heart and soul of our Blue Collar Caucus.

Mr. VEASEY. One of the things I remember growing up in Fort Worth, Texas, was that we were blessed to have many manufacturing facilities that were union shops. We had General Dynamics, which is now Lockheed Martin. When I was growing up, it had about 30,000 employees out there.

We had Bell Helicopter, which is owned by Textron. There are lots of employees out there. We had Miller Brewing Company, which is still there. Now it is MillerCoors. We had several places, like General Motors, which I think I mentioned a little bit earlier.

So we have several places that had good benefit. I had family members that worked at many of those places. Good benefits, good jobs that people could really be proud of. One of the reasons why we have seen the decline of pay in this country is because of the Republicans and their efforts to undermine labor.

When you start talking about under-mining labor and when you turn on these talk radio shows—you turn on the Rush Limbaugh Show, you turn on Mark Levin, you turn on these shows—they are always talking about how bad unions are in this country. But when I think about my own experience growing up in Fort Worth and I think about towns like White Settlement; towns like Benbrook; the community that I grew up in, Stop Six and Como; and I think about the middle class jobs that many of these union shops brought to all communities, again, whether it was the white community, the Hispanic community, or Black, they allowed people to be able to put some food on the table.

I have got to tell you, I was really kind of tickled and shocked at the same time by an article in the opinion section in The Wall Street Journal back on September 3, 2015. It was titled: “The Shop Steward in the White House.” It was taking a shot at President Obama for all of the things that he was doing for American workers, and many of the things that the Wall Street guy that wrote the article was complaining about, saying all these things about President Obama, they were all actually really good things that the President was advocating for.

My question and what I want to know and what I want Rust Belt workers and people all around the country to ask is: Is this Presidency, is this administration going to embody and really embrace those same principles that were talked about for President Obama when he was really trying to protect these workers? Is this President going to do the same thing? Are his partners in the legislative branch, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Senators on the other side of the Capitol that are Republicans, are they going to also stop going after American wages, stop going after American workers and their benefits, and start standing up for these workers so they can put some more food on the table?

That is what I want to know. Those are the type of questions that we should be asking and we should be talking about.

Let’s let President Trump put out a statement on this right now if he wanted to, but obviously he has a lot of other things going on.

The Davis-Bacon Act, as many of us know, is the rule that ensures all Federal contractors are paid a fair wage while they are working on public works projects.

If there was ever a repeal of Davis-Bacon, we would see a decrease in the quality of blue-collar jobs, and we can absolutely not afford that. Stagnating wages, like I talked a little bit earlier, has left workers unable to care for their families. As a result, one-third of blue-collar families are enrolled in one or more social safety net programs.

That is not what blue-collar workers want. They want the ability to be able to take care of their own families. They don’t want these social safety net programs. They want to be providers and be proud of their jobs.

The Blue Collar Caucus intends to defend the Davis-Bacon Act and fight any attempts to decrease wages for America’s already struggling working class. We know that we can build an economy that works for everybody if we just work together. So work with us as we stand against President Trump’s unfulfilled promises and stand up for these blue-collar workers. That is what we want our friends on the other side of the aisle to do.

But what I would really like to see right now, even before President Trump reaches out to again, his Republican friends in the legislative branch, is for him to come out and make a statement for these blue-collar workers, for these people in the Rust Belt, for these people in the South, for these people in Dallas-Fort Worth, and all over the country. I want him to come out and make a statement on where he stands on Davis-Bacon.

It is one thing to just talk in broad categories about bringing jobs back to
our country, stopping our jobs from going overseas. This is an actual policy that we know has been good for many workers in Mr. Boyle's district and in mine and, again, everywhere. Where is the President on this issue? Why is he not saying anything about Davis-Bacon? That is what he has to say. I know that Mr. Boyle knows about just how important things like Davis-Bacon are and other issue areas are.

Another area is the Supreme Court nominee, Mr. Gorsuch. Where is he going to rule when it comes to working families? That is what I want to know. That is the type of thing that I hope that people on the factory floors and shops across this country start talking about is how is this man going to rule? We already know that he has made several bad rulings as it relates to working families, rulings that will directly affect how big their paychecks are, literally has made rulings that have taken money right out of those pockets, right out of their bank accounts. Those are the types of things that we need to be talking about, not all 35,000-feet-up-in-the-air-type stuff, but actual policy details that we know can impact lives.

Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Marc is exactly right. I was so glad that he brought up unions and the important role that they play because when I talked earlier about the fact that for 30, 40 years we had an economy that was working well, that saw productivity gains but also wage gains in roughly equal proportion. And then suddenly in the last 30 years you have seen that change. You have seen the productivity gains continue, but you have seen wage growth at practically zero.

Well, it is not a coincidence that for three, four decades you had strong unions, from the mid-1940s until about the late 1970s, when we were fighting for workers, fighting for increased wages, fighting for a secure retirement, fighting for real health benefits.

Then you saw an economy beginning in the early 1980s where the power of unions declined. The number of workers involved in the workforce who were unionized declined. I don't think it is a coincidence that just as you saw the number of workers in unions decline and the power of unions decline, you also saw real wages decline. Certainly no coincidence. For 70 years, worker wages and the strength of unions have moved in tandem, going up together or going down together.

Critical to the strength of the American workforce are provisions like Davis-Bacon that have existed since the late 1940s that guarantee a prevailing wage on Federal projects. It helps not just those workers who are unionized, but all workers because when you have a union that is out there fighting for higher wages and fighting for better benefits for its members, it helps all workers. It helps all of those in the workforce.

I talked earlier, and I was thinking about this when Marc was talking about his family's experience in those towns in the Dallas-Fort Worth area. I remember from my family's experience in the early 1980s where we very lucky that my dad, without a college education, with the equivalent of a high school education, after many years of trying, was able to break in to Teamsters Local 169 in White Plains. It simply means that he worked in a warehouse as Acme Markets. He did that for 25 years. There were a couple thousand such workers who were employed in the city of Philadelphia.

Then in the late 1990s, around the year 2000, they closed all those warehouses. They laid off close to 2,000 workers. They decided that they would set up shop, instead, in a place where they could pay the workers half the wages, reduced benefits, and not as many of the things that worked okay for my dad. He ended up on his feet. He spent the last 16 years as a worker, as a janitor for SEPTA, the Southeast Pennsylvania Transportation Authority. He is one of the people who, who got laid off in their 50s and 60s weren't as lucky. Many of them never found, again, a job as well paying or as secure. Some of them turned to alcohol. Some of them turned to drugs. A couple even committed suicide. We need to show that these are not just economic issues. Sometimes the elites—and I mean elites not just on the Republican side; elites of all political ideologies—sometimes look at these as just economic issues. They are real-life issues. When we see the diseases of hopelessness that are happening right now in places like western Pennsylvania or Texas or Kentucky or, really, all parts of our country—and, by the way, when we talk about campaign operatives on the -- General Flynn and there being so much right now, with the resignation of General Flynn, I want to see those jobs come back, too. I want to see those jobs come back, too.

I think that with everything going on right now, with the resignation of General Flynn and there being so much talk about campaign operatives on the Trump campaign talking to Russian intelligence officials, I think that he is going to be too distracted to help these workers. I think that Republicans are going to be too distracted to help these workers in the Rust Belt, to help these blue-collar workers.

I have got to tell you, during our retreat last week while we were in Baltimore, I opened up The Wall Street Journal first thing in the morning. I saw this article about how—and it was about jobs still in Dallas and in Monterrey, in Mexico, it was really one of the saddest things that I ever read. For some manufacturers, Mexico is still the best move. They specifically were talking about a corporation called the Rexnord Corporation.

It really broke my heart when I was reading the articles about how they were asking the workers at this plant
Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank B RENDAN—Representative NORCROSS— for putting together a Blue Collar Caucus just to remind ourselves what we should be doing here is focusing on jobs. Jobs, which is the best social program I have ever been with.

I entered my professional life as an electrician, as an electrical apprentice. I entered through 4 years of school. It was called an apprenticeship. I worked on bridges, refineries, pipelines throughout the Delaware Valley. I understood how tough it is sometimes for people to make it. When work got slow, I went out of work, and unemployment. Those are the struggles that men and women in our great country are going through each and every day. If anything, this last election cycle reminded us of that, that sometimes the dignity of being able to take care of your family, send your kids to school, and retire with dignity is the most important thing we can do.

Mr. NAVIY. 1815

I have seen firsthand what happens with minimum wage. They tend to think it is all a bunch of kids flipping hamburgers. Well, it is much more than that. It is a woman I spoke to, who had a choice—she had to work two jobs just to make sure that in the winter, when her daughter need- ed a coat for winter, that she could take care of her. And she recalled to us how badly she felt that her daughter's teacher had been wanting her to come in and help. She had to decide whether or not to keep food on her table or par- ticipate in her child's school. That is a tough decision when we both want to help.

When we look at what we have done as a country, as compared to elsewhere in the world, it is very different when we look at the blue collar, particularly in the building trades where I came from. Throughout Europe, particularly in Switzerland and Germany, they look at working with your hands with just the same dignity as going through college. This country doesn't always do that. Guidance counselors tend to push them into college as the only measurement.

College isn't for everybody. I have three brothers. They went the tradi- tional college route. I decided I really enjoyed working with my hands. I went and became an electrician. Those jobs, we are on over 20 years ago, I still talk to my kids about it today—the dignity of working with your hands.

This country is starting to change, particularly when you need an electrician. When Mr. BOYLE's lights in his house go out, who does he call? That electrician is worth his weight in gold, isn't he?

And I know Mr. BOYLE's story. His parents came over here as first genera- tion and are living the American Dream. They have to be so proud of him.

And in Mr. VEASEY's district, those refineries are important for jobs, as they are in mine. I think we absolutely have to keep the focus on making sure that we have renewables, that we have clean energy. But we also understand with each of those decisions comes whether or not somebody is going to be able to go home and say: Honey, I lost my job today.

Today was a remarkable day—the first withdrawal of a nominee for the Department of Labor. And I guess this is where, during the election cycle, I see the difference. It is very clear that the President wanted to talk about jobs, good jobs, putting America back to work. And then we have the secretary nominee put up—who talks about minimum wage is a bad thing, talks about robots doing things you don't have argument with. He wants to outsource. That is not the way to rebuild the economy.

Mr. BOYLE talked about the discrep- ancy between those who work for a liv- ing, the average worker on the line, and those who work for a salary. That is the American way— that democracy. Yet, the nominee for Labor wanted to do away with the NLRB, which is the group from the Department of Labor that judges whether or not elections with unions are done fairly. There was a suggestion that they are not being treated fairly. It couldn't be any further from the truth. If workers want to have a voice, they should have that voice and choose whether or not they want to join with their co-workers, that union. I have seen firsthand, when a worker is fired, when a worker is cut, when a worker is not being treated fairly, it is like putting the fox in charge of the henhouse, unless, of course, you own the henhouse, and then it is okay.

I want to finish up by saying to Mr. VEASEY and Mr. BOYLE how appreciative I am of keeping this focus on the forefront of what we do here in Congress. I created a Buildings Trades Caucus, along with a colleague, Mr. MCKINLEY, out of West Virginia. We could try to move this forward, create an infrastructure package that puts America back to work and keeps our roads, our bridges, and our grid safe.

Let's remember one thing: a fair day's pay for a fair day's work and the dignity of a job. I appreciate what you have done.
been—quite frankly, there is no other way to say it—some of it has been put down. But those workers are important. We need to stop having people rank jobs and make sure that we know that all jobs in this country are important.

Since 2000, the United States has lost about 4.8 million manufacturing jobs. That is a 29 percent decrease in jobs for blue-collar workers. Again, manufacturing jobs are good-paying jobs. Manufacturing jobs pay about 20 percent higher than all other jobs do. So any manufacturing job that we lose in this country is bad.

One of the saddest stories—and there are so many sad stories about these plants that have closed down, and so much of the focus has been on the Rust Belt, and rightfully so. And MARCY KAPTUR may tell me if I am pronouncing the name of this city correctly. But there is a story about the closing of a Rubbermaid facility in a place called Wooster, Ohio. They said that they were shutting down this Rubbermaid facility in Wooster, Ohio, but they were going to keep the big outlet mall open. And I thought to myself: How in the world can people afford to go to the outlet mall, or any mall, if the jobs are gone? Is it just another sad story about how America is losing manufacturing jobs.

Luckily, we have people like the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), who fights for her State and fights for manufacturing jobs, and not just in her State, but for the entire country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. KAPTUR for her dedication to the working class men and women in this country and for all blue-collar workers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) for his great leadership in bringing blue-collar workers and blue-collar Caucus, I feel very comfortable. I actually have blue on today.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) of the greater Philadelphia area, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS), and myself from the Toledo to Cleveland, Ohio, part of our country to bring to the attention of the American people the fact, for example, that workers in northern Ohio, since the year 2000, on average $7,000 less than they did at the beginning of the century. They have taken some great hits. They are hardworking people. They are fighting back, but they need our help.

In the last 3 weeks, if we take a look at President Trump’s term thus far, we begin to see the real Donald at work. If I might quote one of the news media. After months of grandiose campaign promises to renegotiate NAFTA, bring back American manufacturing jobs, and make America great, we can begin to assess where he is putting his attention. I think this is really important for us, as we represent blue-collar America, what is he doing for them. I think the proof is in his actions, or lack thereof.

After roughly 20 executive orders and actions, we see President Trump has a penchant for mediagenic events and executive orders, rather than hedging our bets with executive orders, rather than actually sending any legislation up here yet. And most striking is his clear motivation to assist his wealthy friends on Wall Street with appointments to the administration, such as Secretary of Treasury, rather than appointing average Americans who voted for him. He exhibits a great penchant for public approval rather than a focus on efforts to improve the current economic stagnation of average Americans.

We are noting that he is filling his Cabinet with billionaires and multi-millionaires who simply can’t figure out how to walk in the shoes of blue-collar America. His actions to help the wealthiest Americans will have significant consequences.

So what happened with his promise to drain the swamp?

I thought in the first month we would have had something that would really resonate out in the heartland.

So some of this happens just miles away at the White House, our Republican congressional colleagues remain either silent or moving the car in reverse.

Why would they criticize activity that helps those who fund their elections?

We need campaign finance reform to dominate their political focus and write their policy objectives, like taking away today here in the House the ability of workers to save money for their own pensions, for heaven’s sake.

In Trump’s first days, he took action to roll back the financial reform bill called Dodd-Frank and tried to eliminate protections for seniors as they seek retirement advice. We know there are a lot of sharks out there in the financial waters.

Why wouldn't you want to help the American people rather than hurt them more?

He did nothing to address the trade issues, which were in his power to do on day one, and propelled his victory through our part of the country. I note my colleagues come from Texas, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and me being from Ohio was actually the Midwestern States that lifted this President to victory. He hasn’t declared China as a currency manipulator. He could have done that already.

He had no elimination of the Buy America waiver, which affords access to U.S. Government contracts for all firms and goods from 45 World Trade Organization nations and 16 additional U.S. Free Trade Agreements that exist. Not a word about that.

No NAFTA renegotiation. He could have pulled the plug on that on day one. Nothing.

Where is the negotiating team in place to take care of what NAFTA has done to the people of the heartland and our country in general?

What will President Trump do for ongoing negotiations he inherited on the U.S.-China Bilateral Investment Treaty, the Trade in Services Agreement, the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership? Will he put American workers, global workers, and environmental concerns at the forefront of negotiations? Or will he continue to allow corporate and wealthy financial interests to dominate trade negotiations over workers and communities?

Candidate Trump promised the 15,000 steelworkers laid off due to a flood of unfairly traded imports that he would support America’s manufacturing and industrial base. He came to Ohio and said that. He promised to protect our industries from the Chinese and to keep jobs at home. But in the pipeline of executive action, he actually endorsed issues on trade. He signed the Buy America waiver, negating his promises to help America’s steelworkers. How about that? That was done in the first month.

Just recently, the U.S. Department of Commerce released a report that showed the U.S. trade deficit hit a 4-year high as it rose to over half a billion dollars for 2016. Middle America isn’t surprised this trade deficit continues to hollow out U.S. manufacturing jobs and deprive our people and our great Nation. Reducing our trade deficit should be a top priority for the new administration. I hope the President puts a big scoreboard in front of the White House on his progress on this front. It would do wonders to fix the economy for working Americans if we balanced that trade deficit.

As Congressman VEASEY has said, the Democratic Party has long championed issues for blue-collar America that create real life success for working class people. Lost in the political dialogue is the reality that Democrats have always stood for individual and economic rights for average Americans of all backgrounds. Each of our own lives represents that, and it is a privilege to serve here in this House.

For blue-collar families, education remains a vital stepping-stone in upward mobility. Democrats continue to prioritize early childhood literacy and STEM education efforts to make Americans globally competitive in advanced manufacturing, science, medicine, and research and development. Democrats continue to expand apprenticeship options to allow young people to enter the workforce trained and without the enormous burden of student loans.

Meanwhile, Republicans push policies that exacerbate the ever-expanding wealth gap, even allowing it to invade our school systems. Just watch the opposition Mr. Trump and his newly minted Education Secretary Betsy DeVos have towards public schools.

In closing, let me thank our esteemed leaders here in the Blue Collar Caucus, Congressman VEASEY and Congressman BOYLE. I don’t see that this
President is draining the swamp. He is actually digging deeper into it. I really thank them for being an accountability wing here in the first branch mentioned in the Constitution—the legislative branch. I congratulate both of them. It has been a great privilege to join them tonight.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative KAPTUR and everybody that has participated tonight.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ISSUES OF THE DAY AND REFLECTING BACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOMERT. Mr. Speaker, in our Judiciary Committee today, we have been marking up what should have been a couple of rather simple bills, but it is really as if the instructions on the Soros-funded website, manual, things telling us to obstruct the current majorities in the House and Senate and administration, could possibly be carrying over here into the Capitol itself because there are so many amendments being offered and things—being drug out and people saying the same thing over and over. It is about Russia and corruption and one thing and the other—on and on and on.

It is just interesting when people are talking about their dramatic concerns over Russia, who, for years, have been totally silent. When everybody I know of on the Republican side here had been asking that President Obama and his administration do something about the terrible hacking problem from Russia, China, etc., Khomeini, Iran, he didn’t seem terribly bothered. I mean, it was as if he were afraid he might hurt Putin’s feelings or Khamenei’s feelings in Iran and maybe they would want to kill Americans in a more brutal way, the Iran terrorists being paid, I can’t help but think that there will be people in the next 4 years who are Americans, who are Muslim, Jews, Christians—especially those groups—who would be killed because of the billions and billions of dollars that this administration forced into the hands of the largest supporter of terrorism in the world: Iran.

It was as if the world—and in particular, the United States—had not been punished enough for the mistakes of the Carter administration in thinking that by pushing the Shah of Iran—not a great man. Apparently, he could be pretty brutal in his own right, but he kept radical Islam at bay.

When President Carter encouraged his followers to leave office, much as President Obama did, that was the end thing with the President of Egypt, in both cases, it created a vacuum that was immediately filled by radical Islamists. The Muslim Brotherhood is who filled it in Egypt. In Iran, yes, it was radical Islamists. And probably for the first time since the Ottoman Empire, radical Islamist leaders were given a country, a country’s military with which to wreak their havoc on the world.

It is interesting that in the intervening years between President Carter leaving office in January 1981 and President Obama coming in in January 2009, all history had been forgotten or possibly even not really learned.

I guess, if you are learning at the hands or at the feet of Jeremiah Wright, who has such contempt—GD America was his feelings and expression—or if you are at the feet of Bill Ayers, who felt that blowing up police stations, things like that, hadn’t quite served the purpose, or perhaps if we take over educating college students who will one day train elementary students and high school students, then we can utilize the anarchy that we were trying to create in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Back then, we were unsuccessful, but great inroads have been made here recently. You would just have to believe that America was the problem for the world in the last 100 years, and apparently there are those who feel that way.

But for those of you who have talked with friends of different religions—Muslim, Christians, Jews, secularists—there is a different world those who are actually fair minded make it very clear: the United States has been the greatest force for good as a nation that the world has ever known since the Dark Ages. It just has.

And thank God we have had such wonderful allies in the endeavors that we have undertaken. Of course, in the liberation of Kuwait from Saddam Hussein’s hands, we had many other countries who joined us. President George H.W. Bush went to Iraq. So many Democrats had screamed at President George H.W. Bush as troops were moving into Iraq after the liberation of Kuwait, screaming: Stop, stop, stop. They are giving up. They are giving up.

President George H.W. Bush ordered the stoppage, and immediately thereafter, the Democrats that screamed for him to stop began berating Bush because he didn’t finish the job in Iraq. Some of those same people were around to condemn his son George W. Bush when he actually did finish the job.

There was yellowcake uranium that was taken out which showed that Joseph Wilson had apparently said one thing to CIA agents and testified to something totally different, who said something totally different from his original interview when he got back from Africa. Of course, he was heralded a hero by the mainstream media.

But it has just been amazing to see the flow of international relations. And reflecting back as I did earlier today, as so much from my Democratic friends in Judiciary was made about connections between the Trump administration and Russia, it is just hard not to remember so vividly the comments by Mitt Romney in a debate with President Obama in 2012 that Russia was potentially the greatest threat. It may be mistaken, but it seems like President Obama even said something glibly like you, know, “The 1980s called and they want their foreign policy back,” something rather cheeky like that when, actually, across the aisle, in Judiciary at least, have come to realize that that was one thing Mitt Romney was right about and President Obama was wrong about.

But if you look at what the Obama administration didn’t do after George W. Bush. Perhaps it goes back to President Obama’s days when he was growing up in Indonesia and he commented in his book, “Dreams from My Father,” about how his stepfather was apparently paid off by the fat-cat guys, oil guys, fat cats from Texas and Louisiana, something to that effect, and you realize, holy smoke, he has had a great disdain for Texas, for Louisianans going back to, you know, preteen years. You couldn’t help but wonder if, in policies, it was carried through. Of course, he didn’t appreciate his stepfather for working, and working with the Americans back in those days. But perhaps that has affected him.

Now if George W. Bush had so soon as a principled stand against Russia after Russia assaulted the independent nation of Georgia—I mean, some of us remember that President George W. Bush, trying to do the good in people, came back from meeting Putin and said, you know: I looked into his eyes and saw his soul. He thought that is what he saw—may have been looking into shark eyes. But in any event, he soon learned that Russia was one of the things I liked about President George W. Bush. If he made a mistake, he was big enough to say that wasn’t the right way to go, and he would try to fix it.

That is exactly what he did in his relationship with Russia. When Russia attacked Georgia—unprovoked, really—President George W. Bush, his administration, properly took a very principled stand. Some didn’t think it was fast enough, but he immediately caused a cessation of the great relations that had been going on and took some steps to chill those relations because of Russia’s unilateral attack against Georgia, hoping to wake Putin up that you can’t just go attack a neighboring country like that. Even if you want the old Soviet Empire back, you can’t just do that without repercussions. So because of Putin’s imperialistic attack, Bush took a strong stand and let Putin know that we didn’t approve of what you have done, and we are cooling things, we are freezing things.
One of the first things that occurred after President Obama took office, he sent his new Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton, to meet with the Russians and they had this red plastic button—looked pretty cheap, but it was supposed to have said “reset,” but apparently, they couldn’t get the translation right. I am not sure what it said, peregruzka. I don’t know what it said. I don’t know what it was. But somebody that didn’t know how to translate “reset” put it on and delivered the wrong message.

But the more important message that Secretary Clinton and President Obama delivered to the rather ruthless imperialist leader of Russia was this: George W. Bush overreacted when you attacked your neighbor, Georgia, Mr. Putin, and we want you to know, we don’t have a problem with you attacking Georgia, attacking your neighbors, trying to take over their territory. So we are going to let him do big smiles and big laughs because we want to be such a good friend of yours, and we think it is perfectly fine what you are doing. We think you are terrific.

That is the message after Bush let Putin know: Wait a minute. We are not going to let you be the big bully in the world. Enough.

But the Obama administration sent a very clear message: We are not Bush. We don’t have a problem with you attacking Georgia.

And I have to say anything but that message that Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama, as our President, sent to Putin was clear: We would be okay if you attacked Ukraine, Crimea. You know, we are okay with that. If it is adjoining, yeah, yeah, attack away.

What else is Putin supposed to think when President Bush reacts harshly when he attacks a neighboring country, and the new President comes in and says: We are fine with everything that he did. We are not doing anything but smiles and plastic red buttons. We are good. We don’t mind anything you have done. We want to be your good friend.

If the message from that was not clear enough, before he was reelected in 2012, a microphone he didn’t realize could pick him up, picked up our President telling the President of Russia: Basically tell Vladimir I will have a lot more flexibility after the election.

We are only going to have one meaning, and that is, I got to look tough and like I am standing up tough to Putin right now before the 2012 election, but make sure Putin knows that after the election I can give the farm a whole lot easier. I can let him do a whole lot more that he wants to do. We can be a lot more chummy once I get past my second and last election as President. So you make sure Vlad knows—my bosom buddy over there, my best friend forever—I am going to be able to work with him like he wants me to once I get past the next election.

So with those kind of messages, then, as if it wasn’t enough, followed up by another message to Russia and the world when he stated that, basically, if President al-Assad in Syria used gas on people in Syria, that would be a red line. And if he crossed it, obviously we would have to do something. He created a red line. Nobody asked him to. Putin is more like that. For all of the problems he presents, one problem he does not present is where he stands, where he wants to go, and what motivates him. He’s very clear.

I could see that during the summer that I was there as an exchange student, and I went out to a collective farm. And being from East Texas, I worked on farms and ranches. And during summer, as this was sometime in July, I went out to a collective farm there; and there were massive acres, huge numbers of acres out there. It looked like the Soviet Union was being cultivated and what wasn’t, what even the crop was. It didn’t look good. It was brown. I couldn’t get over how sad things looked out there. This was down in the Ukraine, the bread basket of what was once the Soviet Union at the time.

I know that if you are going to work around the latitude that that was in Ukraine—similar to ours back in Texas—in the summer, you best start around sun up so that you don’t have to work when the Sun reaches its hottest time in the day.

Seeing all of the farmers gathered in the shade there near the center of the village—a little town they had there—they were all sitting in the shade mid-morning. I tried to tell Russi an that I could speak at the time and asked them, tried to use a smile: You know, when do you work out in the field?

They laughed. I thought, well, maybe I messed up a word and made it into a weird translation.

Then one of them spoke up in Russian, and he said: I make the same number of rubles if I am out there in the field or if I am here in the shade—very clear. I tried to tell Russian that I could speak at the time, and they were all sitting in the shade, so I am here in the shade.

I thought at the time that is why socialism, communism could never work. If you are going to pay people the same thing not to work as you do the people who are working, then eventually most people are not going to work.

It is a good thing to have a safety net for those who, through no fault of their own, find themselves unemployed; but you can’t turn into a Socialist nation where you reward people—provide the safety net, sure—but you can’t provide incentives to sit in the shade and not work at all. Because eventually some day, your people will go hungry and your nation will fall as a nation-state, and it did. There were many factors that contributed, but the bottom line is that type of system can never work in this world, in this life.

The Pilgrims tried it in that beautiful Mayflower Compact where they were going to turn to the Sun and the Sun was being cultivated and what wasn’t, what even the crop was. It didn’t look good. It was brown. I couldn’t get over how sad things looked out there. This was down in the Ukraine, the bread basket of what was once the Soviet Union at the time.

I am not sure what it said, but some-
taking on water, for whatever reason. There were different things said about what may have been the cause.

But for whatever reason, they had to do a bit like Gideon did, they had to winnow it down to the people that had the best chance of making it to America so they could fit on that small Mayflower. So they winnowed the group down. They came over on the Mayflower.

It was a beautiful thing, loving, working hard as they did. But when such a huge number of their settlers died during that first winter, basically, the short version, they ultimately tried something new resembling private property, with a little take yourquerous. You grow. You use it however you want. And whatever you grow and produce, that is yours.

It’s amazing that worked out so well. Unlike the collective farms in the Soviet Union, there was incentive to work hard, produce, and people thrived, did so well. That actually gave a lot of incentive to others. Hey, this private property thing can work out well.

And all the years later, we have people wanting to go back to that way of life that has failed every time it has been tried. Even when the Apostle Paul tried it, he ultimately had to throw up his hands and say: Okay. New rule. If you don’t work, you don’t eat.

Because the socialist way of doing things in this world is not going to work.

I am glad that my friends who were so vocal about not wanting a strong relation—such as the current leader of Russia, I am glad they finally realized that those of us on the Republican side—most of us—have been saying for a very long time. Yeah, we can work with the Russians to defeat our common enemy, but they should never lose sight of the fact Putin does not really want us for friends. He wants to see this country gone. He wants to see our way of life fall. So just don’t lose sight of that.

It is also interesting—we had amendments being proposed today with the same theme being repeated constantly about a Muslim ban, in essence, that we should not ever take religion into account when it comes to immigration. That has played a role.

Yet, when our chairman, one of our other Members brought up the—I believe it was RAUL LABRADOR—the Launenberg amendment that so many of us support, when you know a group of people—such as the Jewish people in another part of the world—are being killed and they are being persecuted, when we know that is taking place, it is a good thing to consider who they are and that their religion is being persecuted.

When there are Christians in another part of the world being persecuted beyond what other religions are, it is a good thing to try to help them.
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When there were Muslims being persecuted in Eastern Europe, the Clinton administration responded, came to their aid. And for those that say, gee, standing up to radical Islam will only encourage more recruitment—my word—how much worse can it get than it has gotten during the last 8 years?

I am sorry, but no—we had used—we had let the Northern Alliance, residents, citizens in Afghanistan, we let them fight our enemy because, though they were Muslim, most of them, they didn’t want radical Islamists running Afghanistan.

A mistake was made after our friends in the Northern Alliance totally routed the Taliban. We sent in tens of thousands of American troops, and our friends, who loved us and heralded us for our liberation from the Taliban in Afghanistan, became the occupiers, I have been to Afghanistan enough. I have seen the way that relationship has gone, from us being the heroes that liberated their country from those radical Islamists that were going to take them over to us being the peace-loving Muslims wanting to live and not be terrorized by radical Islamists, and somehow we ended up becoming bad guys to so much of the country because of our massive presence.

I do believe, however, there is potential with all of the chaos that is beginning to raise its head again in Afghanistan. I heard a report this morning that Afghans had confined to a Republic here in town when he was over there visiting that al-Qaida is even back in Afghanistan. So it is not just the Taliban back stronger than ever; now al-Qaida is back in Afghanistan.

And what was the cost to America, to our military, to our 8 year—al-allowing the Taliban to come back stronger than they were originally, to al-Qaida, to come back in Afghanistan stronger than they were originally? My personal opinion, I believe it was because of President Obama’s rules of engagement. But we lost four times more precious military lives in Afghanistan during President Obama’s command than were lost during just under 8 years under Commander George W. Bush.

How could we lose four times more American military and suffer such a setback over the last 8 years, where we are back maybe a little worse off than things were when we went in to Afghanistan in October of 2001? Well, it has to do with the commitment. I heard former Vice President Cheney say that when President Obama announced he is committed to Afghanistan and he sent a surge into Afghanistan, he also announced, what seemed almost simultaneously, we are going to be out in 18 months.

As we know from history, nobody that ever won a war, a police action, a confrontation, ever set a deadline: We are going to win by this date or we are coming out, whether we have won or not. That message went out loud and clear to the Taliban that was growing back that if we can just hang on for 18 months, we will own Afghanistan all over again.

I understand that, apparently, General Harwood, that has apparently been named by President Trump as the new National Security Adviser—and Mr. Gorka, I have been to Afghanistan because of this because of what Billy and Karen Vaughn have come to mean to me since I met them some years back, after the death of their SEAL Team 6 son, Aaron. Gosh, I have come to know—I never met him while he was alive, but I have come to know him and feel like I knew him as a friend and as one of his admirers, vicariously, through his parents, Billy and Karen.

When I heard the general’s name come back up as one of those being considered, oh, please, surely not, because Billy and Karen made clear, you know, as family members were finding out what happened there in Afghanistan that took the most SEAL team lives we had ever had, they found out after they did not have carried our SEAL team members. They went onto this Chinook and supposedly, going on a mission, and yet because of the rules laid down by President Obama and his administration, they had to make sure that the Afghans knew exactly what was going to occur, where they were going, what they were going to do.

Even knowing that after Vice President Joe Biden’s gaffe, where he released classified information, that it was the SEALs who took out Osama bin Laden, it wasn’t supposed to come out. It was another gaffe. But immediately, Bill and Karen said, after Biden outed the SEALs and it came out in the National Post, I had that call from Aaron saying: Hey, you need to get off social media. The radical Islamists are going to be looking for us, for our family members.

So this administration put big targets on SEAL Team 6 by disclosing classified information that ultimately led to their deaths, and it put targets on family members of SEAL Team 6. I know they didn’t mean to do it. I know it wasn’t intentional. They just didn’t realize how serious it was.

I know they must not have realized, or at least President Obama must not have realized, how serious it was when I watched the video of the gentleman that was called his body man, was with him through so many days, and he was answering questions at a university in California. It has been some years back that I watched. But he was asked, in effect, what was it like being with President Obama when he went into the room where they were watching SEAL Team 6 so after President Obama. He basically said: Oh, we didn’t stay in there long. The President looked in but said, “I’m not watching this,” and they...
went and played cards, several hands of cards, while the SEAL Team 6 was putting their lives on the line for their country.

So if that is your way of thinking, then it is understandable that you wouldn't appreciate the dangers in going into combat in Iran when an Afghan commander came up. They knew where they were going. He comes up and pulls off their elite soldiers, off the Chinook helicopter, and replaced them with people whose names were not on the manifest. Well, under the rules, that should have ended the task, should have ended the operation right there. They were told to go on, so they went and have seen the transcript of testimony, statements—by gunship, C-130 gunship in the area. They had all kinds of imaging.

And this isn’t classified because this was on the DVD that was given to the families. They were later told if they would give it back. They didn’t realize quite how much information they had put. Yeah, they sure didn’t because the family members, like the Vaughns, watched it, read it, found out what was on it.

We had a C-130 gunship, and I—my 4 years on Active Duty in the Army. I was never in combat. I think we should have gone into combat in Iran when an act of war occurred and our embassy was attacked. But that was Commander-in-Chief Carter’s call, and he decided not to send anybody. I think if he had responded within 48 hours and said, “You either release our hostages, or we are sending our United States military, and you better not hurt them or there will be a powerful price paid by you and your country,” I think they would have released them. I think that is why, probably—I mean, I was watching closely from Fort Benning. All of us were watching the news. Were any of us going to be sent?

The Ayatollah had a spokesman. I have not seen anything about it since I watched back in those days, ’79, but I recall him. It was very interesting. For a few days, we kept distinguishing that it was the students that attacked the U.S. Embassy. It was the students that had the hostages.

I said to some of my Army friends at Fort Benning: I think he is afraid Carter’s going to send our military, and he is using the students as a back door for him. So if Carter shows a backbone and says, “You either release our hostages or we are sending—you are going to feel the full vengeance of the United States military,” they had a better chance of having distinguished with the Ayatollah that had lost the greatest military members that we could have lost at that point, their every life is just priceless, invaluable. But there was so much money spent in training up these SEAL teams. It is an investment. You need to make sure they have the proper equipment, that you don’t have Afghans pulled off that are the best fighting members that Afghanistan has, and you put what they considered expendable Afghan soldiers on with our SEAL Team Six. When you know there are targets on their backs.

But when the families met General Harward, they said they were just so crushed, they were so devastated, and they found out that this AC–130 gunship, that there were opportunities to take out this patrol, this team, that shot down the Chinook and our SEAL team members. And there were other precious American lives on that helicopter in addition to the SEAL Team Six members, and they should not be shorted in when we owe them and their memories.

But they asked if they had an opportunity to take these guys out. And the crew said they did. They had the thermal imaging. They could see these guys moving like military. They could see them moving up to the high point and getting ready to fire. They asked for permission to take them out, and they were denied permission to take them out. They watched them fire over and over at the helicopters with the rocket-propelled grenades apparently of some kind, and they missed with the first one. As I understand it, they were still not allowed to shoot them down, take out the Afghan rebels. They fired again, and they fired again. And the second and third took out our precious American military members along with precious Afghan lives who should never have been on that helicopter to begin with.

Then they watched them dismantle their equipment and start to climb down. They asked if they could take them out, it is my understanding, and, once again, they were told there may be civilians in the area, so, no, do not fire; and they watched them fade back into the population of Afghanistan after killing so many of our SEAL Team Six and others on the helicopter.

They asked the general who is now apparently going to be our National Security Adviser: Why didn’t you take out these people, these Afghan radicals, immediately? Why didn’t you take them out before they took out our military members, our SEAL Team Six? Why?

His statement, from their memory, as related to me, was, in essence: Because we were trying to win hearts and minds. Our National Security Adviser is going to be more interested in—or at least he has in the past—apparently has been more interested in winning hearts and minds of people that hate our guts than he is of protecting the most precious assets the United States of America has: American lives.
We haven’t won any hearts and minds by allowing SEAL Team Six—so many of those members on that Chinook—to be killed. We haven’t. That strategy didn’t work.

I am sorry, I want to be supportive. I was excited President Trump won, but when I think how this man, who I understand today has now been named to be the new National Security Adviser, was given the task of encouraging and being empathetic to the family members who lost those precious American families that Chinook that should never have been allowed to take off, and the best he could do is say: Sorry, they had to die because we were trying to win hearts and minds instead of winning the war.

I hope that his mentality has changed. I hope he will not be willing to expend the best trained, the best and brightest military members we have, as he tries to win hearts and minds instead of trying to win a battle and win the war; but I guess time will tell.

Mr. Speaker, I want to finish by saluting all those brave Americans that have defended freedom, that have fought for America, and who have responded to military since 1979 and given their lives at the hands of radical Islamists. I hope and pray this President will pick people from here who will have the same feelings about precious American lives.

I know Donald Trump does, and I think he will be a good President. I think he blew it on this call, but time will tell.

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

INTERNATIONAL HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Higginson of Louisiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. Kaptur) for 30 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome my colleague, Congressman Joe Crowley, the chair of the Democratic Caucus who is joining us this evening as well. I know how very busy he is, and I appreciate it.

As author of the legislation that created our Nation's World War II Memorial here in Washington, I felt obligated and actually compelled to come to this event tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record the Trump administration's hollow January 27 statement commemorating International Holocaust Remembrance Day.

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT TRUMP ON INTERNATIONAL HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY—JANUARY 27, 2017

"It is with a heavy heart and somber mind that I remember and honor the victims, survivors, heroes of the Holocaust. It is impossible to fully fathom the depravity and horror inflicted on innocent people by Nazi terrorism.

"Yet, we know that in the darkest hours of humanity, light shines the brightest. As we remember those who died, we are deeply grateful to those who risked their lives to save the innocent.

"In the name of the perished, I pledge to do everything in my power throughout my Presidency, and my life, to ensure that the forces of evil never again defeat the powers of good. Together, we will make love and tolerance prevail throughout the world."

Ms. KAPTUR. Astoundingly, the White House statement made no reference to the 6 million Jews that perished in the Holocaust. There was no mention of anti-Semitism nor a reference to Israel, as has been customary in prior statements issued by our past Presidents.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record a statement by President George Bush in 2008.

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT GEORGE W. BUSH ON THE INTERNATIONAL DAY OF COMMEMORATION IN MEMORY OF THE VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST—JANUARY 27, 2008

On the third International Day of Commemoration, we remember and mourn the victims of the Holocaust.

I was deeply moved by my recent visit to Yad Vashem, Israel's Holocaust museum. Sixty-three years after the liberation of Auschwitz, we continue to educate ourselves about the lessons of the Holocaust and honor those whose lives were taken as a result of a totalitarian ideology that embraced a national policy of violent hatred, bigotry, and extermination. It is also our responsibility to honor the survivors and those courageous souls who refused to be bystanders and instead risked their own lives to try to save the Nazis' intended victims.

Remembering the victims, heroes, and lessons of the Holocaust remains important today. We must condemn the resurgence of anti-Semitism, that same virulent intolerance that led to the Holocaust, and we must combat bigotry and hatred in all forms in America and abroad. Today provides a sobering reminder that evil exists and a call that when we find evil, we must resist it.

May God bless the memory of the victims of the Holocaust, and may we never forget.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I will also include in the Record a statement by President Barack Obama from 2015 showing what the White House said about Holocaust Remembrance Day.

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT OBAMA ON INTERNATIONAL HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY AND THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF AUSCHWITZ-BIRKENAU—2015

On the tenth International Holocaust Remembrance Day and the 70th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz-Birkenau, the American people pay tribute to the six million Jewish souls who perished in Nazi-run death camps. Between 2.7 million and 3 million Jews were murdered in Nazi-run death camps. In the US SSR, 1,340,000 Jewish deaths were ordered by Joseph Stalin. At least 1.5 million of the victims forcibly killed by Hitler and Stalin were children.

Cumulatively, this carnage represented about two-thirds of the 9 million Jews who had resided in Central Europe. By way of explanation, for the 8 million Christians and others who were also murdered, the term generally used to describe their carnage is martyrdom. As an example, in Poland, 3 million Catholic Christian Poles were murdered by Nazi and Soviet killing machines.

The Holocaust also included Stalin's mass executions and forced starvation...
and relocation of Soviet prisoners of war to fight in horrendous places like the Battle of Monte Cassino after being marched through the Middle East. Many of them were buried in Tehran.

Stalin also perpetrated a massive post-war pogrom and religious pogrom of Jews and non-Jews. As Hitler and Stalin fought for control of the European continent, over 14 million innocent people—these aren’t soldiers I am talking about. This was in addition to the 14 million—women, children, and men—killed in Nazi concentra tion camps, also referred to as “extermination camps” or “death camps,” were almost exclusively “death factories.” German Schutzstaffel and police murdered nearly 2.7 million Jews in these killing centers either by asphyxiation with poison gas or by shooting.

For the millions of people in Europe, the 8 million non-Jewish victims of Nazi and communist campaigns of mass murder include Romas, Soviet prisoners of war, Aktion T4 patients, Ukrainian Holodomor famine victims, Serbs, the disabled, the LGBTQ communities, and others known only to God. There were also unfathomable crimes against entire nations, as Poland and Belarus were both slated for complete extermination. For example, approximating 20 percent of its entire population, with 6 million killed in the war, and Belarus, though smaller in population, lost 25 percent of its population. In Poland, leaders were annihilated. Many members of the Catholic clergy were either threatened with deportation, kept in custody, or sent to camps. The Catholic Church was particularly suppressed, for nearly a fifth of all priests—over 3,000—were killed between 1939 and 1945, most in concentration camps.

From 1939 to 1933, Joseph Stalin’s secret police, the NKVD, killed 168 people in its concentration camps. The NKVD, killed 168 people in its concentration camps. They also worked with the Gestapo to process targeted people from a collective farm could be, and often were, executed or deported to work camps. Stalin’s system of interna tional passports and brutal secret police forced collectivization of the land to Communist-run production.

After a long search through history and recordkeeping, I can personally testify and affirm that the Catholic Church located in today’s Ukraine, in which our maternal grandparents were married, held a dark secret. Joseph Stalin’s secret police, the People’s Commissariat for Internal Affairs, the NKVD, killed 168 people in its basement as Stalin’s Black Raven trucks drove the innocents to their death.

Historians continue to seek truth even until today about what happened. The questing for new information from the Soviet archives. Though some people try to erase history or ignore it, others work diligently to record it and learn from it. I recall how fondly our grandmother spoke of Jewish storekeepers in the region from which she emigrated, welcoming her before and after church on Sunday and telling her to change into her church shoes there before attending mass and after her 5-mile hike from her village and return hike back. The Jewish storekeeper would always give her a piece of candy.

There are other Members here tonight that wish to speak. I am so grateful for their presence here tonight because we are the bearers of liberty’s torch.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York, (Mr. CROWLEY), the great leader of the Democratic Caucus, and I thank him for taking time from his busy schedule to discuss this issue.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank my friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio, for being here this evening to have this Special Order to speak on an issue of such magnitude, of importance to we the people of the United States, important to the world, that we never forget what took place: the horror, the utter destruction of humankind during the Holocaust, but, in particular, the focus of that destruction upon the Jewish race.

It is important because we are seeing a rise quite frankly, of anti-Semitism not only around the world, but right here in the United States. It takes different forms in different places, but, in
the end, has the same result of target-

ing and hurting one of the histori-

cally most vulnerable groups in our

world: the Jewish people.

One of the things that has been the

most concerning to me is the mini-

mizing of the suffering of the Jewish

people during the Holocaust. Frankly,

it is really outright disturbing—I don’t

know if that does it justice—that the

White House of the United States of

America, the home of our President,

our present administration, rep-

resented by the very same country that

defeated Nazi Germany, the same coun-

try that bore the Greatest Generation,

the same country that led the fight

against anti-Semitism worldwide, while

recognizing from time to time it had

to douse it here in the United

States, our country, this same White

House that I referred to deliberately

refused to mention that the Holocaust

was designed to eliminate the Jewish

people from the face of the Earth. Not

a single mention of the Final Solution.

The Final Solution was to obliterate,

eliminate the Jewish people off the

face of the Earth.

Yes, many people died in the Hol-

ocaust, as the gentlewoman made re-

ference to them—disturbingly—but elo-

quently. Of the tens of millions of

people who died, we know of them

historically, but no race or religion

was designated for elimination like the

Jewish people were. The Final Solution

was about ridding the Jewish peo-

ple from the face of the Earth. It is that

simple. It is imperative that this mo-

ment does not pass without some clar-

ity.

What is clear is that the White House

purposely removed the reference. They

are proud of it. They doubled down.

They tripled down. They removed the

reference to the Jewish people in its

statement on International Holocaust

Remembrance Day.

What have we come to here? What

matters most? You have a country

where the President refuses to make

reference to how great his election

victory was.

So this Special Order tonight will

help us set the record straight, not just

on behalf of the millions of Jewish

Americans across this country, but to

send a clear message to all those who

are concerned about this. I ask this

question: Where are our Republican

colleagues on this issue?

Do you hear that? Silence.

We have given them opportunity

after opportunity to speak out against

what the White House has done, but

our colleagues refuse to make refer-

cence to how great the election of the

President would correct the situation.

In watching that press conference, as

disturbing as I was about the answer

from our President, I was more than a

bit disappointed, quite frankly, by

Prime Minister Netanyahu’s failure to

challenge the President on that. I wish

Prime Minister Netanyahu would have

asked President Trump to change his

statement; not to whitewash what was
done, but to change his statement on the

Holocaust. I still hope that the

Prime Minister does that in the time

that he is here.
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get what this country is made of. I know the Trump White House statement on the Holocaust falls far short of the administration’s ability to properly recognize and record history accurately.

The Trump White House has the means to hire appropriate staff to prepare thoughtful, carefully researched statements, and their 2017 statement is out of touch with history. History teaches us that wherever anti-Semitism has gone unchecked, the persecution of others has been present, or not far behind. Presenting historical truth and defeating anti-Semitism must be a cause of great importance not only for Jews but also for us, for people who value liberty, truth, free expression of religion, justice for all. I know that is the vast majority of the American people.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of our Special Order this evening.

Mr. Speaker, recently, Deborah Lipstadt, American historian and author of influential books such as Denying the Holocaust, wrote an important article in The Atlantic. In this article, entitled “The Trump Administration’s Flirtation with Holocaust Denial,” Lipstadt specifies an important distinction in types of Holocaust denial.

Most people are familiar with what Lipstadt identifies as “hardcore Holocaust denial.” In this type of rhetoric, anti-Semites argue that the Holocaust simply did not occur; that there was no systematic plan to destroy the Jewish people based solely on their religion.

This type of hate speech has unfortunately been espoused by those who seek to delegitimize the suffering of the Jewish people since the Holocaust began. It is not acceptable and we must not allow all we can to teach our children the tragic events of the Holocaust and how to counter such hateful rhetoric.

Yet, perhaps a more insidious form of denial rhetoric has begun to creep into our national discussion.

This is what Lipstadt terms “softcore Holocaust denial.” This form of denial, argues Lipstadt, “uses different tactics but has the same end-goal...” It does not deny the facts, but it minimizes them, arguing that Jews use the Holocaust to draw attention away from criticism of Israel.

“Softcore denial also includes Holocaust minimization, as when someone suggests it was not so bad.” Softcore denial, then, is potentially more insidious than our traditional form of denial, by minimizing the suffering of the Jewish people and suggesting that while the Holocaust may have occurred, it was not about the Jews per se.

By minimizing the suffering of the target of the Holocaust and the six million Jews who perished at the hands of the Nazis, we are denying the truth and setting ourselves up for the worst genocidal massacre in human history.

What is more disgusting and unacceptable, though, is that the President of the United States is now espousing these dangerous and hateful ideas.

By refusing time and again to acknowledge that Jews were the targets and victims of the Holocaust, our President is denying the truth of the Holocaust and is aiding and abetting the Holocaust deniers and White Nationalists in their goals of once again persecuting individuals based on their ethnicity, religion, race, etc.

We must do better. I call on the President to recall his statement and make clear that the Holocaust was a systematic persecution of the Jewish people.

AMERICA 2.0

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity. I just want to say thank you to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. Lipstadt) for her great words and Congressman CROWLEY, who was here a little bit earlier, for his good words as well.

I am starting tonight a segment that I am calling America 2.0. I think we are midst of, obviously, some chaos in the United States, in Washington, D.C., and in so many communities across the country that feel we are disoriented with our politics, disconnected from our politics, and we are disoriented around the idea of what is happening in our economy. Globalization, automation, all of these things have dramatically affected the American economy and American wages and standard of living.

We have actually seen, Mr. Speaker, over the course of 20 years, a huge decline, a sucking out of middle class wages that have gone primarily to the top 1 percent. Now, I am not here to bash rich people. I am not here to make any enemies, but I think it is important and important for us to look at where we were and where we are now.

If you look at where we were in 1980, of all the income growth in the Nation in 1980, 70 percent of all income growth went to the bottom 90 percent of Americans. So we had some significant income growth, and 70 percent of it went to the bottom 90 percent, 30 percent went to the top 10 percent. The wealthy were getting more, but the middle class, the upper middle class and the lower middle class, the bottom 90 percent saw 70 percent of the gains.

Fast forward from the early 1990s until just recently just a few years back, the bottom 90 percent, Mr. Speaker, got zero percent of income growth that happened in the United States—zero. So the economy in 1980, for average families in Youngstown, Ohio, or Struthers, Ohio, or Akron, Ohio, saw that hard work paid off; that if you worked hard, you played by the rules, you did what you were supposed to do, and if you were in the bottom 90 percent, you saw some income gains. Fair enough.

Where the anxiety has come in now is that people are working harder, they are working longer hours, and they are not seeing any growth in their incomes. We have teachers, for example, in the Youngstown City Schools who have not seen a cost-of-living raise in 9 years—9 years. Police and fire, people who cut hair, people who are waitresses, people who take showers after work instead of before work, those people aren’t getting ahead, and the cost of everything is going up. So that is where we are, erosion of our manufactures base and globalization and automation.

I was just looking at an article earlier about a new Amazon project—I
think it is called Amazon Go—where you can actually go into a grocery store—how cool is this? You can actually go into a grocery store and shop and pick out whatever it is that you want at the grocery store and walk out. Everything gets rung up, bagged, and all the rest, and you get billed, and you pay your bill.

Now, here we are in 2017, that is pretty cool stuff. The downside of that is, there are million workers who look at grocery stores. Where I come from, some of those grocery stores are actually unionized where the person at the counter actually makes a pretty good wage and has a pension and has a decent healthcare plan, standing on their feet all day long, probably not the easiest line of work to be in, but people go there and they work hard. Those jobs are going to be gone.

We hear all this technology about driverless cars and driverless trucks. Youngstown is not too far from Pittsburgh, and Ford just committed a billion dollars to Pittsburgh to advance driverless vehicles. Uber is in Pittsburgh investing in the research and development for driverless vehicles. It is going to be great. The downside is, in about 25, 26, 27 States, the number one job is driving a truck. It is driving a truck. Pretty cool that when you are going to be 3 in June, may never have to drive a car. As a parent who also has a 13- and 14-year-old at home and talking about when they are going to get the keys to the car, I kind of like the idea of a driverless kind of like that. At that point, it would be pretty safe.

But we have the downside to that, which is the loss of all of these jobs. So what we need to do as a country, as a dynamic country, as a wealthy country, as a creative country is we need to figure out what is America 2.0 because this isn’t your dad’s or your grandfather’s America. This isn’t going to be your grandmother’s America or even your mother’s America.

That is accelerating so quickly that as a legislative body that was designed to be slow, and those of us operating in a political system that was designed to slow things down, we didn’t want a concentration of power where a king ruled. We took that, and we divided the power up into a legislative branch, and then divided that up between the House and the Senate and the executive branch. The executive branch, governors, and the rest of them got to figure out how to work with each other. If they have got a problem, we have got a judicial branch that is going to reference the Constitution of the country to make sure that everything is abiding by the basic values on which we started the country. Pretty cool system, elections every 2 years, replenish the ideas in the legislative branch, and every 4 years in the executive branch, so we can try to get new ideas. But the system was designed to be slow.

So here we are, working within a system that is designed to be slow with an economy that is going 150 miles an hour down the highway, which means the legislators and the President and the Governors and the people elected to office, we better get our act together. We better figure out how to make things work because that is what we owe our country. That is what we owe that family who, for 30 years, hasn’t seen a raise. You know what? They want to send their kid to college.

Do you know what? They want to have a job, they want to have a pension, they want to have a secure retirement, and they want their kid to have more opportunity than they had. They are not going to complain, they are not going to moan, they are going to put their boots on, and they are going to go to work. It is our job to help create an environment where they can go and take advantage of those opportunities. God help those that help themselves. You have got to go to work and you have got to put the time in. It is not going to be easy, especially in this economy. It is going to be tough. It seems like it is going to get harder.

But with automation coming down the pike, what are we going to do as a country with all of these people in my district that are 50-year-old men who used to work in a steel mill, now it is closed, or used to work in an auto plant that used to have 16,000 people working there and now it is down to 3,000, or the supplier to that auto plant that used to have 13,000 people and now it is 1?

So we can say, yeah, pull yourself up by your boot straps and work hard. The jobs aren’t there. They are not there anymore.

So what are we going to do here in 2017? How are we going to get our President with his good brain that he has to sit down with us and figure out what we are going to do? So America 2.0 is: What is the next version of this great country, what is the next version, to where my grandfather could be a steelworker and a couple of generations later his grandkids are doctors, lawyers, and Congressmen?

That is what is important about these jobs we have. That is why they shouldn’t be taken lightly. That is why instead of tweeting about some show or some family business, you should be focused like as a legislator and we fix these problems. If you are not, you are not doing what you said you were going to do.

America 2.0 is a series of ideas. I will share a few tonight and a few over time in what I think we need to do. We have a near-term problem, mid-term, and long-term, some of what I mentioned. The near-term problem is wages, jobs, and workforce participation. Workforce participation rates are at 63 percent. They are still too low. People are unemployed. They are making less today than they were before the great crash in 2008, 2009, and 2010.

So what are we going to do? I know we have talked a lot about we are going to retrain. It is going to be great. We are going to get you this job, and you are going to be trained up and ready to take it.

What jobs? We need to create jobs. And it just so happens we need to rebuild the country. So let’s make the investment to put people back to work by rebuilding the country. We need waterlines. We need sewer lines in our pipes that people are drinking. We have old dilapidated homes all over older communities that need to be taken down. Even if we are going to put up just parks and green space, take those down. Those are all jobs that could be created. We need roads and new bridges. Most bridges are deficient in the United States. A good many of them need to be rebuilt. We need steel in those bridges, and we need concrete.

So let’s do a big jobs bill where we rebuild the country. I am not making stuff up. We have got to do this. Let’s put Buy American provisions in there so we put the American steelworker back to work, and the people that work at the concrete plants in America get the money, get the contract.

Those private businesses that do the roads and bridges and all of the rest, let’s make sure it is Davis-Bacon, it is a prevailing wage, so that our friends who work so hard and are so skilled in those unions are able to get that work because they have a good pension, a good wage, a good retirement plan, good healthcare benefits, and they are the most skilled workers in the country. Let’s make sure they get the work so we are actually lifting people up; and get people in these unions so that more people can earn a good wage, have a secure retirement and a little bit less anxiety.

So roads, bridges, pipes, airports, ports—everywhere in the ocean. This is nobody’s fault. The country is getting older. A lot of this stuff was done 50, 60, 70 years ago. It is time to reinvest. It is time to put a new roof on the house. We will put people back to work.

For every $1 billion we spend on infrastructure, we put about 27,000 people to work. So if we have a $1 trillion infrastructure plan and we ask the wealthiest people in the country—maybe people in the capital markets who have seen a significant amount of wage growth, we ask them to help us pay for it so we don’t have to borrow the money and put it on the backs of our kids.

So we are putting people back to work, we are doing what needs to be done, we are using American steel and American concrete and American union workers and having more people join the union so more people can have a secure living, and we are creating jobs. That is step one.

What also needs to be included in this is: How are we setting ourselves up for success in the next 10, 20, or 30
years? How are our kids going to be able to operate in this bridge we are creating to this new economy?

One of the things we need to do is we need to wire the country. We need to have the most sophisticated, broadband capable grid in the history of the country so that every community can participate in the new economy that is driven by a digital world.

We have companies, for example, in Youngstown, where we don’t have a whole lot of broadband in Youngstown. We don’t have a whole lot of penetration for broadband in Youngstown. We have companies that are very sophisticated that try to get defense work or work with defense contractors that actually are put at a disadvantage because they don’t, and we don’t have the broadband capability for them to be able to download the files they need to be able to download in order to get the contracts they need to do the advanced manufacturing work. So in Youngstown, the future of that community would be like not having a road going in and out of your community, or waterlines going in and out of your community 50, 60, 70 years ago.

Do you want to start a factory and create jobs? How are you going to get the raw materials in and the product out if you don’t have a road? The same concept with broadband in a 2017, 2027, 2037, 2047 economy. So this is a great investment.

The World Bank has studied this. They have said that every 10 percentage-point increase in broadband penetration equals 1.2 percent growth in your GDP. So you are making these investments and you are growing your economy at the same time.

I think we go to these coal miners who have been put out of work, we go to the steelworkers who have been put out of work, we go to the autoworkers who have been put out of work through the globalization, through with, globalization, and automation, and we say: You are hired. You are going to get on-the-job training. This isn’t going to go: We are going to train you for some job that may or may not come. You are hired in America 2.0. You are going to work. You are going to lay broadband.

We need to upgrade our energy grids. We need smart grids that are more efficient, more secure, and less prone to terrorist attacks—more efficient, can communicate with the user better so you know how much money you are spending when you wash your clothes. And you may go off hour so you can wash them at a different time and save a little money on your energy bill, money in your pocket because we make these investments.

You are going to work now on the smart grid. You are hired. And this country, as wealthy as we are, we are going to pay for it. We are going to build it, and we are going to change the trajectory of our country, and we are going to be ready to play ball in the economy.

So these workers that we are hiring that may be 50 or 55 years old, they don’t know how they are going to get to retirement, they are hired. And this is no make-work job because we feel bad for you. This is a job we need you to have in order for you to change the trajectory of our country for your kids and for your grandkids. If we don’t make these investments, if we don’t make this happen, America is going to be bringing up the rear.

We have got a great dynamic economy still, even with the stagnation that we have. We have just got to make a few key investments and not get caught up in this polarized political discussion that is getting us nowhere. Nobody in this Chamber suffers. Everybody in this Chamber draws a paycheck. They have got a job.

It is the family in Youngstown, it is the family in Gary, Indiana, it is the family in Milwaukee that suffers because we have failed to make the basic investments that we have always made—always: the interstate highway, the intercontinental railroad, land grant colleges, NASA, the space program. Look at all of the technologies that spun out of NASA—in health, telecommunications, energy—because we said, “We are going to the Moon”; and it was as much about going to the Moon and about spinning off new technologies and saying, “We can figure out how to get to the Moon” because we were committed, as a country, to do great things. And now we are committed to tweeting about some nonsensical show that is on TV or some backhanded comment that somebody gives. There is too much at stake. Every time we do this, we fall further and further and further behind.

One other piece of America 2.0, and the final piece or two I will share tonight, is green energy, resuscitating manufacturing in the United States. How do we do that?

I know we have discussions here about climate change. Some people say it is not happening. Some people say it is not man made. It is an important point to make that 98 percent of scientists who have reviewed all of the literature on this say it is happening and it is caused by man. I think that is an important point. But let’s set that aside.

How do we help people with their energy bill and how do we resuscitate manufacturing in the United States? I believe that, if we move towards a green economy, we will have a renaissance in manufacturing, and let me tell you why. Because for every windmill that we put up, there are 8,000 component parts to the windmill: gearshifts, hydraulics, steel, aluminum, plastics, all kinds of things, bolts. There is a sidewalk mile of concrete in a windmill.

These are things we make in this country. These are things we make in northeast Ohio. Talk to Timken; talk to Parker Hannifin; talk to some of these energy companies that make solar panels. That stuff needs manufacturing. And we can do it here in the United States with the smart energy grid, and we can build, and we shall build, and we shall build this. What is wrong with this picture?

We have a country now that is more reliable on renewable energy, that is increasing our manufacturing base, that is putting people to work. To me, that makes a lot of sense. So these families that are struggling—because we will be making a heck of a lot more solar panels than we are now—we can start getting these solar panels up in people’s homes and reducing their energy cost. So if we do the smart grids and we do the solar panels, and we start reducing people’s energy costs in their homes, you are putting money in their pocket, you are starting to close that gap a little bit, you are starting to reduce that anxiety a little bit, and you are starting to get us into new technologies and new ideas that are going to lead to growth.

So let’s build out the country. Let’s build out our roads, bridges, ports, and airports. Let’s extend broadband to every corner of the country and hire Americans to go do this work. Let’s redo our grid and extend it so that we can get this new economy all across the country; put people to work doing that; resuscitate our manufacturing base; and change the trajectory of our country so that our kids are wired, prepared, and living in a country that is ready to lead this world again in some of the great challenges that face us.

That is the outline of America 2.0. In my mind, that is the direction we need to go to. It starts, Mr. Speaker, by getting people back to work. It is talking focused and being disciplined, and talking about the things and figuring out how to work out the deals that need to be worked out here in order to help those people back home.

That is our obligation because the generations before us—whether it was the Intercontinental Railroad, or the social justice movement, or the equality movement, or the interstate highway, or the land-grant colleges, or NASA—gave us a pretty good world to grow up in. And now it is our obligation to take this to the next level and create the next version of America.

Create America 2.0. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED
Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:
ADJOURNMENT
Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 16, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the fourth quarter of 2016, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, are as follows:

H.R. 321. An act to inspire women to enter the aerospace field, including science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, through mentorship and outreach.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem ¹</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen</td>
<td>10/09</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>$276.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$276.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Cardno</td>
<td>10/28</td>
<td>10/30</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>$236.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$236.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salif Kouchy</td>
<td>10/30</td>
<td>10/31</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>$512.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$512.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Seyy</td>
<td>10/17</td>
<td>10/19</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>$303.37</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$303.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Blocher</td>
<td>10/19</td>
<td>10/21</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>$400.44</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$400.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Steinhauer</td>
<td>10/19</td>
<td>10/22</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>$411.55</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$411.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Cutright</td>
<td>10/22</td>
<td>10/24</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>$671.40</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$671.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Bednarzzy</td>
<td>10/07</td>
<td>10/08</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle Parker</td>
<td>10/18</td>
<td>10/19</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>$888.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$888.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Eltit L. Engel</td>
<td>12/09</td>
<td>12/10</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>$1,117.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,117.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira Reissick</td>
<td>12/19</td>
<td>12/20</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>$1,110.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Eliot L. Engel</td>
<td>11/19</td>
<td>11/20</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>$276.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$276.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Lee Zeldin</td>
<td>12/06</td>
<td>12/07</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>$3,166.56</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$3,166.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Muqardi</td>
<td>12/08</td>
<td>12/09</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>$388.61</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$388.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Zweg</td>
<td>10/09</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>$315.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$315.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hill</td>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>10/12</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>$1,561.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,561.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Shroppe</td>
<td>10/08</td>
<td>10/09</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>$1,561.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,561.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Maloney</td>
<td>10/08</td>
<td>10/09</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>$1,561.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,561.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Gerald Connolly</td>
<td>11/22</td>
<td>11/23</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee total: $25,195.61


REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem ¹</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Chris Smith</td>
<td>12/18</td>
<td>12/19</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>$276.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$276.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Mitnick</td>
<td>12/18</td>
<td>12/19</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>$276.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$276.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einke Schlagler</td>
<td>9/17</td>
<td>9/18</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>$2,308.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,308.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Helwig</td>
<td>10/16</td>
<td>10/17</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>$1,610.65</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,610.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hurd</td>
<td>9/12</td>
<td>9/13</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>$1,758.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,758.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewald Pfeiffer</td>
<td>10/09</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>$1,758.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,758.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Tiersky</td>
<td>10/15</td>
<td>10/16</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>$1,922.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,922.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Massara</td>
<td>10/16</td>
<td>10/17</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>$2,354.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,354.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Hurst</td>
<td>12/18</td>
<td>12/19</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>$9,170.42</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$9,170.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee total: $52,174.47

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
3 Military air transportation.
4 Indicates Delegation Costs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mrs. ENGEL, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. TUCKER):

H.R. 1059. A bill to provide for congressional oversight of actions to waive, suspend, reduce, terminate, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Rules and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FABO):

H.R. 1060. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to include certain individuals who work on farms or ranches as individuals employed in public service jobs for purposes of eligibility for loan forgiveness under the Federal Direct Loan program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PARENTHOLD, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. Velch):

H.R. 1061. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to regulate the use of cell-site simulators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LABRA DORS, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 1062. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to specify the circumstances in which a person may acquire geolocation information and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O’ROURKE (for himself, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. PETERS, Miss RICE of New York, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 1063. A bill to ensure that an individual who is transitioning from receiving medical treatment furnished by the Secretary of Defense to medical treatment furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs receives the pharmacological agents required for such transition; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. O’ROURKE (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 1064. A bill to authorize an individual who is transitioning from receiving treatment furnished by the Secretary of Defense to treatment furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to continue receiving treatment from such individual’s mental health care provider of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself, Mr. SCHRADE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. O’ROURKE, Mr. ROK of Tennessee, Mr. MOUTON, Mr. ROONEY of Illinois, Mr. DELANEY of Maryland, Mr. ZELEDON, Mr. STYVRS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. DOBROWOLSKI, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. SINEMA, Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. GABBA R, Mr. SOTO, Mr. WALZ, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BUSH, Ms. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BOST, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FRAMES of Arizona, Mr. COOK, Mr. GOHME R, Mr. HULTON, Mr. PETFENGER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HILL, Ms. STEFANIC of West Virginia, Mr. JONES, Mr. UPTON, Mr. KATKO, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mrs. BLACKS HIRE, Mrs. PENN, Mr. KING, Mr. VALENTINO of New York, Mr. KINZINGER Mr. NEWHOUSE)

H.R. 1065. A bill to establish biennial budgets for the United States Government; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H.R. 1066. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report regarding the organizational structure of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1067. A bill to amend section 524(c) of title 18, United States Code, to establish a structure for forfeited drug seizures to increase border security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. DELAURA O, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. Matsu, Ms. DeGETTE, and Mr. McNERNY):

H.R. 1068. A bill to enable needed drinking water standards, reduce lead in drinking water, plan for and address threats from climate change, pollution, and source water contamination, invest in drinking water infrastructure, increase compliance with drinking water standards, foster greater protection of drinking water quality, and promote technological solutions for drinking water challenges; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE (for herself, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. Napolitano, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. Wilson of Florida):

H.R. 1069. A bill to amend part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to ensure that mental health screenings and assessments are provided to school-aged youth upon entry into foster care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALVERLY:

H.R. 1070. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide that an employee’s ‘regular rate’ for purposes of calculating overtime compensation will not be affected by certain additional payments; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. MATSU, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUTLEDGE of South Carolina, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MERRICK, Ms. Eshoo, Mr. gene GREEN of Texas, Mr. MICHAEL F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUCKLEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WELCH, Ms. DeGETTE, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H.R. 1071. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to increase assistance for States, water systems, and disadvantaged communities; to encourage good financial and environmental management of water systems; to strengthen the Environmental Protection Agency’s ability to enforce the requirements of the Act; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SANFORD (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Ms. GOSAR, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):

H.R. 1072. A bill to repeal provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and provide private health insurance reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 1073. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a structure for visitor services on the Arlington Ridge tract, in the areas of the U.S. Memorial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUM (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. LOEBRACK, and Mr. KING of Iowa):

H.R. 1074. A bill to repeal the Act entitled ‘An Act to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation’; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Mr. SOTO, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. BASS, Mr. KIRBY, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VASIS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MEKES, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 1075. A bill to provide that the Executive Order entitled ‘Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States’ (January 27, 2017) shall have no force or effect, to prohibit the use of Federal funds to enforce the Executive Order, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Homeland Security, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Mrs. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BASS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SOTO, Mr. FUBUS, Mr. AIJAZ of Texas, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MEKES, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. BLUNT of Missouri, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CLAYTON of Arkansas, Mr. GEOFFREY JOHNSON of Texas, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 1076. A bill to provide that section 9 of Executive Order 13768, relating to sanctuary jurisdictions, shall have no force or effect, to prohibit the use of funds for certain purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.
H.R. 1071. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to regulate tax return preparers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 37. A bill of California (for herself, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. INOUYE, for Mr. HAMRICK): By Mrs. BACKS of California (for herself, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. INOUYE, for Mr. HAMRICK):

H.R. 1078. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to exclude the receipt of basic allowance for housing for members of the Armed Forces serving in noncontiguous areas for certain Federal benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GRILALVA, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California): H.R. 1079. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to disclose their concealed carry or open carry policies with respect to firearms; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. CONDIT, Ms. LEE, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 1080. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption and payments from taxation for 501(c)(3) bonds issued on behalf of a historically Black college or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EMMET (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.R. 1082. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to eliminate the State option to reduce the home equity exemption amount for purposes of eligibility for long-term care assistance under Medicaid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. LODFREN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. LEE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCLAREN of California, Mr. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLUMENTHAL of Delaware, Mr. BLUMENTHAL of New York, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PASCHELL of New York, Mr. SCHWELL of Alabama, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SANCHEZ of Texas, Mr. TURNER, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. JOHNSON of New York, Mr. SMITH of Connecticut, Mr. CONDELL, Mr. BUTLER of Nevada, Mr. ROY of Ohio, Mr. REED, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 1082. A bill to establish the United States Chief Manufacturing Officer in the Executive Office of the President with the responsibility of developing a national manufacturing strategy to address the manufacturing sector, spur economic growth, and expand United States competitiveness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SQUIRES (for himself and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 1083. A bill to require the Federal Transit Administration and the Federal Transit Authority to provide appropriate Congressional notice of safety audits conducted with respect to railroads and rail agencies; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. Slaughter (for herself, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CLYHURST, Mr. TONKO, MR. KIHUEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. DELAURéO, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MENG, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. TED LIU of California, Ms. CASTER of Florida, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BIVIER, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 1084. A bill to address slow economic growth and spur investment and development in underserved communities across America; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Agriculture, Financial Services, Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 1085. A bill to withdraw certain Bureau of Land Management land from mineral development; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 1086. A bill to require executive agencies to notify the public and consider public comment before relocating an office of the agency that is a center of public interest with the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 1087. A bill to establish a pilot program in certain agencies for the use of public-private partnerships to enhance the efficiency of Federal real property; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. MECKES, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. ESPAILLAT):

H.R. 1088. A bill to establish the African Burial Ground International Memorial Museum and Educational Center in New York, New York, and to appropriate funds for its replacement; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. TIPPON, Mr. WHITMER, and Mr. WALDEN):

H.R. 1089. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that kumbucha is exempt from any excise taxes and regulations imposed on alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. MURAKAMI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CARDENS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. KIND, Mr. COLE, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BLUM, Mr. CURBelo of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1090. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the credit for residential energy efficient property and the energy credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RENacci (for himself, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 1091. A bill to provide certain provi
dions of the Social Security Act relating to demonstration projects designed to promote the reemployment of unemployed workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. REED, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 1092. A bill to establish the United States Chief Manufacturing Officer in the Executive Office of the President with the responsibility of developing a national manufacturing strategy to address the manufacturing sector, spur economic growth, and expand United States competitiveness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SQUIRES (for himself and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 1093. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for approval of wetlands conservation projects for other purposes, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STEWART (for himself, Mr. LONG, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. TIPPTON, Mr. GUFFRETT, Mr. McCUL
tock, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 1094. A bill to change the date for regularly scheduled general elections for Federal officers to the first Tuesday after the first Friday in November in even-numbered years; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1095. A bill to amend the Torture Vic
tims Relief Act of 1998 to authorize appropriations to provide assistance for domestic violence and foreign programs and centers for the treatment of victims of torture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEWART (for himself, Mr. LONG, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. TIPPTON, Mr. GUFFRETT, Mr. McCU
tock, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 1096. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for transparency of out approved wetlands conservation projects for other purposes, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. REID, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURZIN, Mr. KIND, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PASCHELL, Mr. SKWELL of Alabama, Mr. LARSON of Connecticu
t, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. TURNER, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. JOHNSON of New York, Mr. SMITH of Connecticut, Mr. CONDELL, Mr. BUTLER of Nevada, Mr. ROY of Ohio, Mr. REED, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 1097. A bill to increase consumer protec
tion with respect to negative option agreements entered into on the Internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. REID, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURZIN, Mr. KIND, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PASCHELL, Mr. SKWELL of Alabama, Mr. LARSON of Connecticu
t, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. TURNER, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. JOHNSON of New York, Mr. SMITH of Connecticut, Mr. CONDELL, Mr. BUTLER of Nevada, Mr. ROY of Ohio, Mr. REED, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 1098. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the new markets tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself and Mr. RENacci):

H.R. 1099. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the removal of endangered wetlands conservation projects
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under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2022; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ZELDIN (for himself and Ms. SCHATZ of Hawaii):

H. Res. 1106. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate copayments by the Department of Veterans Affairs for medicines and preventive health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POCAHONTAS for himself, Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. TAKANO of California, Mr. COHEN of New York, Ms. KAPTUR of Ohio, Mr. CUMMINS of Arkansas, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOLLE of Rhode Island, Ms. MOORE of Texas, Ms. CORWRIGHT of Alabama, Mr. GARAMendi of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL of California, Ms. WATSON COLEMAN of New Jersey, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ of Florida, Mr. DESAULNERS of Vermont, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. NORCROSS of California, Mr. BLUMENTHAL of Pennsylvania, Mrs. JUDY CHO of California, Mr. JEFFRIES of New York, Mr. VEASEY of Texas, Mr. CONyers of Michigan, Ms. GRIJALVA of Arizona, and Ms. ROYAL ALLARD of California:

H.J. Res. 74. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DeFAZIO for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GARAMendi, Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota, Mr. NORTON of New York, Ms. POLIS of Colorado, Ms. SHEREHODA of Idaho, Mr. ROYAL ALLARD, and Ms. DeLAURO:

H. Res. 130. A resolution supporting efforts to increase competition and accountability in that health care marketplace that is to extend accessible, quality, affordable health care coverage to every American through the choice of a public insurance plan; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. R. 1059. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H. R. 1060. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H. R. 1061. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3, and the 4th and 14th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H. R. 1062. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3, and the 4th and 14th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. O’ROURKE:

H. R. 1063. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. O’ROURKE:

H. R. 1064. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MESSER:

H. R. 1065. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KILMER:

H. R. 1066. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. SENSENIBRENNER:

H. R. 1067. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. FALLONE:

H. R. 1068. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18. The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H. R. 1069. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CALVET:

H. R. 1070. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. TONKO:

H. R. 1071. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SANFORD:

H. R. 1072. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BEYER:

H. R. 1073. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2, relating to the effect of Congress upon laws and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. BLUM:

H. R. 1074. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H. R. 1075. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its Subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H. R. 1076. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its Subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. COHEN:

H. R. 1077. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. DAVALIS of California:
H.R. 783.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ELLISON:
H.R. 1079.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3 and Clause 18.

By Mr. EMMER:
H.R. 1081.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3 and Clause 18.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:
H.R. 1083.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:
H.R. 1085.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:
H.R. 1084.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:
H.R. 1086.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or office thereof.

By By Mr. WITTMAN:
H.R. 1087.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. REED:
H.R. 1090.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RENACCI:
H.R. 1091.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:
H.R. 1092.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. SQUIRES:
H.R. 1093.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. SANTELLI:
H.R. 1094.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section IV of the Constitution

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:
H.R. 1095.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 10

By Mr. STEWART:
H.R. 1096.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8 of the Constitution gives Congress the authority to enact this legislation.

By Mr. TAKANO:
H.R. 1097.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.

By Mr. ZELDIN:
H.R. 1099.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. KIHLING:
H.R. 1100.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POCAN:
H.J. Res. 74.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States, which states: The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. DeFAZIO:
H.J. Res. 75.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS
Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 31: Mr. Rice of South Carolina.
H.R. 36: Mr. Ferguson.
H.R. 41: Mr. Lance and Mr. Gene Green of Texas.
H.R. 82: Mr. Wittman.
H.R. 113: Mr. Clay, Mrs. Bratty, and Mr. Eilison.
H.R. 140: Mr. Sessions.
H.R. 179: Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 198: Mr. Smucker.
H.R. 257: Mr. Judy B. Rice of Georgia.
H.R. 275: Mr. Rothfus and Mrs. Dingell.
H.R. 365: Mr. Kilmer.
H.R. 355: Mr. Thornberry.
H.R. 367: Mr. Scalise.
H.R. 371: Mr. Norcross.
H.R. 392: Mr. Long, Mr. Kinzinger, Ms. Serrano, Mr. Lucas, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Mr. Kind, and Mr. Delaney.
H.R. 400: Mr. Bergman and Mr. Wilson of South Carolina.
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