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 essence 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 support secession 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 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 Californians, 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 them.

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 now off the coast of Groton, Connecticut, 30 miles from the Groton 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 loiter off the coast of Connecticut is not doing it because of the great climate and weather. It is freezing weather out there. They are doing it, obviously, with aggressive intent, to say the least.

Mr. Speaker, this is part of a pattern that is going on right now not just off the East Coast of the U.S., but also overseas. The USS *Porter*, which is a Navy missile ship, was buzzed by military aircraft from Russia on February 10. They came within 200 yards of the ship. Again, because we have such incredibly competent and professional leadership that captain those vessels, an incident was avoided.

However, the danger of jet aircraft moving within 200 yards of a U.S. naval ship obviously is just common sense to anyone how high risk that is in terms of creating an incident that could have huge ramifications.

In addition to that, the news reported again just the last couple of days or so that the Russian military is now deploying intermediate medium-range nuclear warheads in different places throughout Western Russia, near Eastern Europe. Again, this is clearly in violation of treaties that go back decades.

As General Breedlove, who was the commander of NATO and the European Command who just stepped down, said that this new effort really just cannot go unanswered. It completely destabilizes the balance of power in that theater of the world.

Again, the folks in Connecticut woke up this morning with that news about the spy ship off the coast. As you can imagine, it has created a lot of consternation and questions.

Once again, I would reiterate that I have total confidence in our Navy leadership both at the Groton Navy base and here in Washington that they will react to this with total vigilance and professional competence to make sure that, again, our security is protected.

But I think it is time now for all of us in Washington, D.C., to understand that Vladimir Putin, during the 5 years that he has been in power, again, has taken a posture that is completely destabilizing any sort of global system of peace and security.

This new administration, which clearly has an infatuation with Putin—and this goes back during the campaign with President Trump talking on the campaign trail about his high regard for Putin's leadership—needs to basically move on and recognize that this is an emerging threat and that we have 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-changer 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 naive assumptions that somehow the Putin government is somehow something that we can trust, and shows any regard 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 because 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 access women's health and have 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.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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. The 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 watched 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, unconstitutional Muslim bans, gag orders on public servants, unfinished and unfiled 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.