

DISAPPROVING RULE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF LABOR RELATING TO SAVINGS ARRANGEMENTS BY QUALIFIED STATE POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS FOR NON-GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES

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. Pursuant to House Resolution 116, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 67

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 Qualified State Political Subdivisions for Non-Governmental Employees" (published at 81 Fed. Reg. 92639 (December 20, 2016)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 67.

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.

I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 67, the second of two resolutions the House is debating today to ensure strong protections for retirement savers.

There are two parts to the regulatory loophole we are seeking to close today. First, the Obama administration created a sweetheart deal that would allow States to deny important protections for retirement savers. Then, a second regulation was issued to extend that sweetheart deal to cover certain cities and counties.

The resolution we are debating right now would block the second regulation and ensure retirement savers in every city are afforded longstanding protections under Federal law. It would also ensure employers continue to have clear rules of the road for retirement plans. The last thing employers, who are trying to provide benefits for their employees, need is a confusing patch-

work of rules that vary across cities and counties, even in the same State.

As I mentioned during the earlier debate, States and cities should be free to experiment with new ways to help workers save for retirement. All this resolution says is that they must follow the law and provide retirement savers strong protections. That is a commonsense idea that we should all get behind.

I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 67.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 67, which would nullify the Department of Labor rule enabling certain State political subdivisions, such as cities or counties, to establish payroll deduction retirement savings plans.

Working families across the country deserve the opportunity to retire with security and dignity. That is not a reality for millions of Americans. In fact, about 40 million private sector workers do not have access to retirement savings plans at their jobs and are struggling to make ends meet.

Several States, including my home State of Oregon, have developed and are ready to implement innovative solutions that will help workers save for retirement. Municipalities are also interested in stepping up to address this challenge and help their residents save. These are people who do not have a plan currently. They want help; they need help in saving.

So in August of 2016, the Department of Labor issued its final rule providing guidance and clarity to States and private sector employees on the kind of State-based payroll deduction retirement savings programs that would not be subject to ERISA, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act.

As part of that August 2016 final rule, the Department of Labor indicated that it would initiate another rule-making process to consider whether and how to include other jurisdictions. The Department of Labor invited and considered public comment on this process.

As a result, in December of 2016, the Department of Labor issued a final rule that would allow certain localities under specific conditions to establish retirement savings programs.

□ 1530

To be eligible, the locality must have an authority under relevant State law; it must be larger than the least populous State, which is currently Wyoming, at approximately 600,000 residents; it must not be in a State that has already enacted a statewide payroll deduction savings plan; and it must implement and administer the plan for its workers.

Now, according to the Department of Labor's final rule, three cities, New York City, Philadelphia, and Seattle, were identified as having potential in-

terest. New York City's comptroller has noted that 57 percent of the city's private sector workers do not have access to a retirement plan at their place of employment.

This final rule just went into effect last month, and now my friends on the other side of the aisle are rushing to repeal the rule and prevent the Labor Department from issuing any substantially similar rule in the future.

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 workers to save for their retirement 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 lower standards.

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 duty for the plan. . . . We have been given the green light. . . ."

The regulation we are terminating here would restrict our hardworking savers from deciding what they can invest in. They will be required to blindly entrust 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.

Worst of all, the 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.

Furthermore, some 57 million Americans currently participate in privately funded IRAs.

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 resolution 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, sweetheart 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 overreach, 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 nest egg outside of 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 do not require employees to participate, so the captains of industry who don't offer their employees a retirement plan, under the Obama administration rules, would not even have to participate. These rules do not require any employer contributions.

What these rules simply do is create a pathway for States and large cities, if 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 working on a national plan to ensure that every American who works their

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 don't have, and you never have 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.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, to clarify further, this rule simply amends the State rule that we addressed in H.J. Res. 66, that gives the safe harbor to jurisdictions with strict investor protections.

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, overreaching attack on increasing access to retirement savings opportunities for our workers, but through H.J. Res. 67, they are directly targeting my

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 real 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.

□ 1545

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. This is just 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 substantially similar rule in the future. This is all on top of last year's Congress' abuse of the CRA in an attempt to nullify the fiduciary rule, which ensured that the advice workers receive is in their best interest.

This only further solidifies that House Republicans are not interested in helping workers. Instead, they are interested in deconstructing rules that protect our workers. House Republicans have failed to pass comprehensive and potentially bipartisan legislation to address our Nation's retirement security crisis and, instead, are pushing partisan legislation that is harmful to our Nation's workers.

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) because New York, according to their comptroller, has noted that 57 percent of the city's private sector workers do not have access to a retirement plan at their place of employment.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, we need to tackle a challenge that is threat-

ening the financial security of the middle class and those who are working hard to remain in it. That is not just in New York City, that is throughout our entire country, but particularly in my home city and my home State, and that is a savings and retirement security crisis in America.

The word "crisis" is no exaggeration, Mr. Speaker. Nearly half of U.S. households do not have a savings plan. Less than one-third have a cushion to cover basic expenses for just 3 months if a layoff or other emergency leads to loss of income.

The status for retirement savings is even more dire, Mr. Speaker. Remember, one out of every two Americans going to work today doesn't have a retirement plan provided by their employer. We are seeing a new generation of Americans growing up with little or no savings to help them climb the economic ladder or simply weather a difficult time.

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 have the 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 middle class families to achieve 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 crowley.house.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 reserve 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 need in this country. 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 who are stepping 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, now 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 pensions, but he was able to, as a result of making little-by-little allocations to a retirement savings plan, set aside money to make sure that, most specifically, my mother was taken care of—and she was—as a result of protections that were put in place, requirements that were put in place, and a savings plan for retirement outside of any pension. Her basic needs were cared for until the end of her life.

So I certainly resonate with the desire to make sure middle-income, 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 I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't want that to happen. We agree on that.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.J. Res. 67 to ensure workers and retirees in every city across the country continue to have the legal safeguards they need to retire with security and peace of mind.

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 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.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1630

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

- Passage of H.J. Res. 67;
- Passage of H.J. Res. 66; and
- Passage of H.J. Res. 42.

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

DISAPPROVING RULE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF LABOR RELATING TO SAVINGS ARRANGEMENTS BY QUALIFIED STATE POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS FOR NON-GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished 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 Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Abraham	Goodlatte	Olson
Aderholt	Gosar	Palazzo
Allen	Gowdy	Palmer
Amash	Granger	Paulsen
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Pearce
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Perry
Babin	Graves (MO)	Pittenger
Bacon	Griffith	Poe (TX)
Banks (IN)	Grothman	Poliquin
Barletta	Guthrie	Posey
Barr	Harper	Ratcliffe
Barton	Harris	Reed
Bergman	Hartzler	Reichert
Biggs	Hensarling	Renacci
Billrakis	Herrera Beutler	Rice (SC)
Bishop (MI)	Hice, Jody B.	Rice (TX)
Bishop (UT)	Higgins (LA)	Roe (TN)
Black	Hill	Rogers (AL)
Blackburn	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Blum	Hollingsworth	Rohrabacher
Bost	Hudson	Rokita
Brady (TX)	Huizenga	Rogers, Francis
Brat	Hultgren	Rooney, Thomas J.
Bridenstine	Hunter	Roskam
Brooks (AL)	Hurd	Ross
Brooks (IN)	Issa	Rothfus
Buchanan	Jenkins (KS)	Rouzer
Buck	Jenkins (WV)	Royce (CA)
Bucshon	Johnson (LA)	Russell
Budd	Johnson (OH)	Rutherford
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Sanford
Byrne	Jones	Scalise
Calvert	Jordan	Schweikert
Carter (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Scott, Austin
Chabot	Katko	Sensenbrenner
Chaffetz	Kelly (MS)	Sessions
Cheney	Kelly (PA)	Shimkus
Coffman	King (NY)	Shuster
Cole	Kinzinger	Simpson
Collins (GA)	Knight	Smith (MO)
Collins (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (NE)
Comer	Labrador	Smith (NJ)
Comstock	LaHood	Smith (TX)
Conaway	LaMalfa	Smucker
Cook	Lamborn	Stefanik
Costello (PA)	Lance	Stewart
Cramer	Latta	Stivers
Crawford	Lewis (MN)	Taylor
Cuellar	LoBiondo	Tenney
Culberson	Long	Thompson (PA)
Curbelo (FL)	Loudermilk	Thornberry
Davidson	Love	Tiberi
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Tipton
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Trott
Dent	MacArthur	Turner
DeSantis	Marchant	Upton
DesJarlais	Marino	Valadao
Diaz-Balart	Marshall	Wagner
Donovan	Massie	Walberg
Duffy	Mast	Walden
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy	Walker
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Walorski
Dunn	McClintock	Walters, Mimi
Emmer	McHenry	Weber (TX)
Farenthold	McKinley	Webster (FL)
Faso	McMorris	Wenstrup
Ferguson	Rodgers	Westerman
Fitzpatrick	McSally	Williams
Fleischmann	Meadows	Wilson (SC)
Flores	Meehan	Wittman
Fortenberry	Messer	Womack
Fox	Mitchell	Woodall
Franks (AZ)	Moolenaar	Yoder
Frelinghuysen	Mooney (WV)	Yoho
Gaetz	Mullin	Young (AK)
Gallagher	Murphy (PA)	Young (IA)
Garrett	Newhouse	Zeldin
Gibbs	Noem	
Gohmert	Nunes	

NAYS—191

Adams	Bera	Boyle, Brendan F.
Aguiar	Bishop (GA)	Brady (PA)
Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Brown (MD)
Blunt	Blunt	Brownley (CA)
Bonamici	Bonamici	

Bustos	Higgins (NY)	Pelosi
Butterfield	Himes	Perlmutter
Capuano	Hoyer	Peters
Carbajal	Huffman	Peterson
Cardenas	Jackson Lee	Pingree
Carson (IN)	Jayapal	Pocan
Cartwright	Jeffries	Polis
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Quigley
Chu, Judy	Keating	Raskin
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Rice (NY)
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Richmond
Clarke (NY)	Khanna	Ros-Lehtinen
Clay	Kihuen	Rosen
Cleaver	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Clyburn	Kilmer	Ruiz
Cohen	Kind	Ruppersberger
Connolly	Krishnamoorthi	Rush
Conyers	Kuster (NH)	Ryan (OH)
Cooper	Langevin	Sánchez
Correa	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes
Costa	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
Courtney	Lawrence	Schiff
Crist	Lawson (FL)	Schneider
Crowley	Lee	Schrader
Cummings	Levin	Scott (VA)
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Scott, David
Davis, Danny	Lieu, Ted	Serrano
DeFazio	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)
DeGette	Loebach	Shea-Porter
Delaney	Lofgren	Sherman
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Sinema
DelBene	Lowey	Slaughter
Demings	Lujan Grisham, M.	Smith (WA)
DeSaulnier	Lujan, Ben Ray	Soto
Deutch	Lynch	Speier
Dingell	Maloney	Suozy
Doggett	Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean	Swalwell (CA)
Doyle, Michael F.	Maloney, Sean	Takano
Ellison	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Engel	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	McEachin	Titus
Espallat	McGovern	Tonko
Esty	McNerney	Torres
Evans	Meeks	Tsongas
Foster	Meng	Vargas
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Veasey
Fudge	Moulton	Vela
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Velázquez
Galego	Nadler	Visclosky
Garamendi	Napolitano	Walz
Gonzalez (TX)	Neal	Wasserman
Gottheimer	Nolan	Schultz
Green, Al	Norcross	Waters, Maxine
Green, Gene	O'Halleran	Watson Coleman
Grijalva	O'Rourke	Welch
Gutiérrez	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
Hanabusa	Panetta	Yarmuth
Hastings	Pascrell	
Heck	Payne	

NOT VOTING—6

□ 1653

Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. ROSEN, Messrs. DeSAULNIER 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.

DISAPPROVING RULE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF LABOR RELATING TO SAVINGS ARRANGEMENTS BY STATES FOR NON-GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of 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, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.