

OHIO: NUMBER ONE STATE FOR BUSINESS

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

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the great State of Ohio, my home State, for being named the number one State for business. As someone who owned and operated manufacturing businesses in Ohio before coming to Congress, I know firsthand that our State's greatest asset is the hardworking, resilient, and dedicated people who power Ohio's economy and build up our communities that make Ohio thrive.

Ohio's number one ranking is a testament to the commitment that has propelled Ohio into national leadership in economic growth and opportunity that directly benefits our workers and our families.

Ohio's success didn't happen by accident. It reflects policies that encourage investment, reward innovation, and reduce unnecessary barriers to growth. When government gets out of the way, Americans do what they do best. They build their families, grow businesses, create jobs, and strengthen our communities.

Looking ahead, I know Ohio's business leaders, our Chamber of Commerce, and, most importantly, Ohioans themselves will continue to thrive. With God all things are possible, and that is especially true in the great State of Ohio.

HONORING OUR FALLEN TROOPS

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

Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Private First Class Isabella Gonzales, First Lieutenant Tyler James Feehan, Sergeant Angel Rampersad, and Sergeant Michael Emmanuel Swinton.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 5 months since President Trump started his reckless war with Iran, 1 week since these young servicemembers lost their lives.

Isabella, only 19, was graduated from Hebron High School in Texas last year. Her friends remember her as outgoing and how she pushed herself through boot camp to prove her bravery.

Angel had a smile her loved ones say lit up every room she entered. She had plans to travel the world.

Tyler, at 25, leaves behind his family and a community at Southern Utah University. He was mere weeks away from finishing his MBA.

Michael leaves behind his wife Mia. In the last photo of Michael, he is holding his daughter in his arms before deployment.

Eighteen American troops are dead, and more than 400 are wounded, all in the name of an ill-conceived and ill-be-

gotten war. Dropping more bombs on Iran is no way to remember these heroes, and if our President won't say their names, I will.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO MR. CONRADO "BETO" VILLEGAS

(Mrs. GRIJALVA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a remarkable Arizonan and celebrate the 100th birthday of Mr. Conrado "Beto" Villegas.

Reaching a century of life is an extraordinary milestone, and I was honored to join Mr. Villegas' family, friends, and neighbors in Nogales to celebrate this special occasion, highlighted by him taking over the dance floor with his wife at his birthday party.

Mr. Villegas is a proud World War II veteran whose courage and selfless service continue to inspire all of us. Like so many of his generation, he answered our Nation's call in a time of great need, helping defend the freedoms we cherish today. His service and his life remind us of the enduring values of sacrifice, resilience, and commitment to country and community.

I extend "mil gracias"; "1,000 thanks" to Beto for his service, his example, and the extraordinary legacy he has built over the past 100 years.

On behalf of the people of Arizona's Seventh Congressional District, I extend my heartfelt thanks and wish him a very happy 100th birthday.

"Feliz cumpleaños. Que Dios lo bendiga"; "Happy birthday. May God bless you."

□ 0910

HONORING MATT TREVENEN

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

Ms. MEJIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor one of the newest inductees to the New Jersey Lacrosse Hall of Fame, Mr. Matt Trevenen.

A graduate of Montclair High School, he is one of the most decorated attackmen at Montclair. He was a two-time first team all-State selection, a two-time Lacrosse all-American, and a two-time New Jersey Attackman of the Year.

In 1998, Mr. Trevenen was named the Star-Ledger New Jersey State Player of The Year and the first player in State history to record two 100-point seasons.

He currently still holds or shares six individual Montclair records.

As if that wasn't enough, he went on to Princeton where he was a 3-year starter and a member of the 2001 NCAA championship team.

In 1999, he was one of five New Jersey players selected to the U.S.A. Lacrosse

U-19 National Team, which captured the World Championship in Adelaide, Australia.

Mr. Speaker, since retiring as a player, Mr. Trevenen dedicated himself as a coach and a leader in Glen Ridge, New Jersey. I rise to celebrate him.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO EUGENE WILLIAMS

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Mr. Eugene Williams, a dear friend and colleague, who has passed away recently.

Eugene is the brother of my district director, Ms. Cherita Logan. Their family has been involved with our activities for more than 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank the family of Eugene for their engagement, involvement, and participation. May he rest in peace.

REMOVING BARRIERS TO WORK FOR DISABLED AMERICANS ACT

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1438, I call up the bill (H.R. 8884) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reauthorize demonstration authority for the disability insurance program, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1438, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print at 119-34 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 8884

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Removing Barriers to Work for Disabled Americans Act".

SEC. 2. TEMPORARY REAUTHORIZATION OF DISABILITY INSURANCE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT AUTHORITY.

(a) *TERMINATION DATE.*—Section 234(d)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 434(d)(2)) is amended by striking "December 31, 2021, and the authority to carry out such projects shall terminate on December 31, 2022" and inserting "December 31, 2030, and the authority to carry out such projects shall terminate on December 31, 2031".

(b) *AUTHORITY TO WAIVE COMPLIANCE WITH BENEFITS REQUIREMENTS.*—Section 234(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 434(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking "December 30, 2021" and inserting "December 31, 2030";

(2) by striking "90 days" and inserting "120 days"; and

(3) by inserting after "the expected annual and total costs," the following: "evaluation metrics to be used with respect to the experiment or demonstration project,".

(c) EXPENDITURE.—Section 201(k) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 401(k)) is amended to read as follows:

“(k) Administrative expenditures for experiments and demonstration projects under section 234 shall be paid from funds made available for the administration of this title. Benefits payable to or on behalf of individuals by reason of participation in experiments and demonstration projects under section 234 shall be made from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund or the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, as determined appropriate by the Commissioner of Social Security.”.

(d) LIMITATION.—Section 234(e) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 434(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking the “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) that the total income of an individual will not be reduced due to the individual’s participation in an experiment or demonstration project.”.

(e) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 234 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 434) is further amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1), by striking “subsection” and inserting “section”; and

(2) by striking subsection (f).

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2027.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) each will control 30 minutes.

The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8884, the Removing Barriers to Work for Disabled Americans Act, introduced by our colleague from Georgia, Representative AUSTIN SCOTT.

Many Americans that are living with disabilities want to enter the workforce and seek gainful employment. In fact, an estimated 60 percent of Americans who receive benefits under the Social Security Disability Insurance program have stated a desire to return to work. Yet less than 1 percent leave the disability insurance program each year for a job. That is a gigantic gap between the number of disabled Americans who want to work and the number who successfully return to work.

The Removing Barriers to Work for Disabled Americans Act seeks to shrink that gap by simply restoring the Social Security Administration’s authority to test drive solutions that

can empower more of our fellow Americans to get back to work.

Up until 2022, the SSA had such authority to run demonstration projects on improving work outcomes. With that authority expired and with so many disabled Americans still unable to successfully navigate the current program, we have to find a better way forward.

In fact, some of the challenges cited for why so few SSDI beneficiaries successfully return to the workforce are confusing rules of the road for eligibility, that and a fear of overpayments and benefit cliffs.

Just so we do not forget why we should be focused on this issue, at a hearing of the Ways and Means Social Security and Work and Welfare Subcommittees in September, we heard from a witness, a former beneficiary, about how the work he found helped give his life real purpose and a different outlook. He was talking about the dignity of work, and that is what this bill will help deliver.

Representative SCOTT has been a long-time—and I would say long-time, tireless champion for Purple Heart veterans. Many of them wish to return to work but cannot afford the severe restrictions placed on their work status. I commend Mr. SCOTT for expanding his bill to allow the SSA’s demonstration authority for so many impacted individuals, including blind Americans. He has identified a commonsense solution and is fighting to see it come to pass, just as it did through the Ways and Means Committee with bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, at a time when Americans are dealing with skyrocketing prices and vulnerable populations like seniors and people with disabilities are struggling to get help with their Social Security benefits because this administration has created a customer service crisis through reckless staffing cuts, it is shameful that Republicans have chosen to bring H.R. 8884 to the floor. This bill won’t lower costs, won’t improve customer service, and won’t make it easier for people with disabilities to access the benefits they have earned. Instead, it opens the door to cutting those benefits while making SSA’s customer service crisis even worse.

H.R. 8884, the Removing Barriers to Work for Disabled Americans Act, aims to remove barriers to employment faced by individuals receiving Social Security Disability Insurance, or SSDI, benefits. It tries to do this by authorizing the Social Security Administration to conduct demonstration projects designed to test program changes that may encourage work.

Let me be clear that Democrats strongly support the goal of reducing unnecessary barriers for disabled Americans who want to explore return-

ing to work. Over the years, Democrats many times have supported giving SSA this demonstration authority. However, the bill before us today tries to accomplish this worthwhile goal in the worst possible way.

Instead of protecting beneficiaries, it hands the Trump administration broad new authority to experiment with Social Security disability benefits with virtually no meaningful guardrails.

First, let me be clear about what Social Security disability benefits are for. SSDI supports some of the most vulnerable Americans who have severe and long-lasting medical impairments that prevent them from being able to work at a level needed to financially support themselves.

SSDI is an earned benefit, with the average beneficiary having worked and paid into the system for 22 years before becoming disabled. It also has stringent eligibility criteria. To qualify, applicants must provide extensive medical evidence and undergo a rigorous eligibility determination process. Many applicants are initially denied and must appeal a process that often takes a year or more. Even after all levels of appeal, SSA typically finds only about one in three applicants eligible. SSDI benefits are extremely low, at an average of about \$20,000 a year.

□ 0920

Most SSDI beneficiaries could not survive without these monthly payments, and that is why we must ensure that any potential change to the program does not put those benefits at risk. Yet, this bill explicitly leaves that possibility on the table. Rather than protecting earned disability benefits, it gives the administration broad discretion to test policies that could reduce them.

This isn’t some abstract policy debate. Here is what this could look like in the real world.

Picture this: You have been on Social Security disability for the past 10 years after a devastating car accident rendered you unable to work and support yourself. Your monthly SSDI check isn’t much, but it is the reason you can pay your bills and keep food on the table. Then, one day, the Social Security Administration contacts you about an opportunity that sounds promising—a demonstration program that will make it easier for you to get a part-time job while remaining on SSDI.

This sounds great to you because it could mean some extra income for you and your family. You sign up and start working only to realize that you are no better off financially because for every dollar you make at your new job, you lose a dollar in SSDI benefits.

After a few months, the demands of the new job start taking a toll on your health, and it becomes clear that it isn’t sustainable. You contact SSA to revoke your participation in the demonstration so that you can start receiving your full SSDI benefit amount

again, but SSA doesn't reinstate your benefits right away.

Two weeks later, you still have to call SSA's 1-800 number every day, trying to get your benefits back. Every time, you are on hold for more than an hour. Even when you do get through to a staff member, they say there is a backlog. No one can tell you when you will get your check. Rent is due in a few days. You don't have the money. You feel desperate.

That is exactly the kind of outcome this bill fails to protect. Here is why. The problem is simple. This bill only guarantees that an individual's total income will not be reduced due to participation in a demonstration project. That deceptive phrasing does not guarantee that your Social Security disability benefits won't be cut or reduced because you are earning money at a part-time job.

These are two very different things. The empty promise of no reduction in total income leaves the administration with enormous discretion over people's earned benefits.

This isn't a hypothetical concern. The Trump administration has repeatedly tried to cut disability benefits and make it harder for disabled Americans to qualify. They have shown us exactly what they want to do given the opportunity.

During the first Trump administration, President Trump repeatedly tried to throw disabled people off their benefits by making it harder to qualify and subjecting them to more frequent continuing disability reviews. He proposed a budget plan that tried to slash disability benefits by \$50 billion over 10 years, and a key part of that plan was to push beneficiaries into demonstration programs.

No past demonstrations had indicated that savings of any level, let alone \$50 billion, could be possible without punitive measures to cut beneficiaries who can't return to work.

Just last year, the Trump administration was reportedly considering a plan to eliminate age as a factor in deciding whether someone is unable to work and eligible for SSDI, which could have blocked an estimated 750,000 people from receiving benefits. Thankfully, this plan was dropped after enormous public outcry, but that shouldn't be enough to convince us that this administration isn't still gunning to slash benefits.

An administration that has a track record of trying to cut Americans' earned disability benefits should not be given any new authority to conduct open-ended experiments that could reduce benefits.

This couldn't come at a worse time. Thanks to the administration cutting over 7,000 staff at Social Security, our constituents are waiting for hours on the phone and facing extremely long backlogs when trying to get their issues resolved.

SSDI beneficiaries rely on their benefits every month to make ends meet.

They can't afford delays or roadblocks to getting the full amount of the benefits they have earned.

To make matters worse, this bill would require any new demonstration programs to be funded by SSA's operating budget, the same budget that supports the agency's customer service. In other words, this bill asks SSA to take money away from serving the public to run experiments that could jeopardize people's disability benefits.

When the Ways and Means Committee marked up this bill last month, Ranking Member JOHN LARSON offered a commonsense amendment that would have addressed these concerns by requiring demonstration projects to be funded not by SSA's customer service budget but by the SSDI trust funds, and by adding guardrails to what the Trump administration might do with the demonstration authority.

Those guardrails included ensuring that no one would see their benefits, not just total income but actual benefits, reduced due to participation in a demonstration.

The amendment would also have ensured that no demonstration could be used to deny eligibility for new SSDI applicants and would have required the SSA to provide notice and public comments on the details of any planned demonstrations.

These were basic protections to ensure that people with disabilities couldn't lose their earned benefits simply for participating in a demonstration project, yet every Republican voted this down.

If Republicans truly cared about making life better for people on Social Security disability benefits, we would be discussing bills to increase monthly benefits, fix the appeals process so people with disabilities aren't waiting years to get approved for benefits, and fix customer service at SSA by undoing this administration's disastrous staffing cuts.

Instead, Republicans have brought us a bill that gives the Trump administration new authority to experiment with Social Security disability benefits while failing to protect the very people it claims to help. People with disabilities deserve certainty, not experiments with the benefits they have earned.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the first thing I will do is thank Chairman SMITH and his staff for working with me to get this piece of legislation to the floor. I also thank the many bipartisan cosponsors of the Purple Heart Freedom to Work Act.

Mr. Speaker, I want Americans to know how this piece of legislation originated. I was taking a young man,

a marine, hunting several years ago. That marine stepped on a pressure plate and lost both legs. We were having a discussion as we were in the vehicle headed to the farm that we were going to hunt, and I asked him if there were things that we could help him with.

We had a candid conversation. He said that he wanted to go back to work. He worked at the local auto parts store and wanted to work more hours, but if he made \$1 more than, at that time, the \$1,100 a month, he would lose 100 percent of his Social Security benefits.

□ 0930

Here, we have a young, combat-wounded man who lost both legs and wants to work. Let me tell you something: If you want to help a disabled veteran, let them get out of the house and go back to work. Let them. This doesn't force anybody to do anything. It is voluntary.

The idea that if a combat-wounded veteran wants to go back to work and they make \$1 more than some imaginary number, then their family has less money at the end of the month than if they didn't work is ridiculous. So we wrote the Purple Heart Freedom to Work Act. I have had broad bipartisan support for that bill, but I have not been able to get it through and signed into law.

We went back, under Chairman SMITH's leadership and with his team, and looked at other ways to do this. This authority was there, up to and until 2022, I believe. President Biden had it and could have done it. Other Presidents have had the ability to do it. We are simply asking that we do the same thing, give the same authority that we have had in the past so that we can do pilot projects.

It doesn't force anybody to do anything. It gives people who are currently receiving Social Security disability benefits the ability to go back to work if they voluntarily choose to, in order to have a little more money at the end of the month instead of less. That is what it does.

I don't understand the objection from the other side in allowing people to go back to work and not lose 100 percent of their government benefits. It is something that we, as Republicans, have pressed for across a wide range of benefits, and that is to get rid of the cliff.

We are not trying to force anybody to do anything. We are simply giving people the ability to go back to work, not lose 100 percent of their Social Security benefits, and have more money left over at the end of the month.

After my conversation with that young man, that young marine, that warrior, I honestly couldn't believe it. I came to D.C., and I met with the lawyers. I said, this can't be right. This defies logic. We went through the law. The lawyers told me he was right, and we wrote the bill.

I am going to tell you, I am disappointed that my Democratic colleagues are taking the position on the floor that they have with this. We want people to be able to go back to work. This originated with a marine who stepped on a pressure plate, lost both legs, and wants to go back to work. If they go back to work, they lose 100 percent of their Social Security benefits if they make \$1 more than this imaginary threshold, which is not enough for them to live on.

I think this is a wonderful piece of legislation. I thank the chairman and his staff for helping us find a way to solve this problem. I think the President will do a pilot project—if you give him the authority—that will be very close to the Purple Heart Freedom to Work Act.

Purple Heart Day is coming up August 7. It will be wonderful for us to get this across the finish line and be able to do it on that day for them. I hope my colleagues, in a very bipartisan manner, will support H.R. 8884 and help us remove the barriers to work for disabled Americans.

The same things that will work for our wounded warriors will also work for other Americans, if they choose, if they want, if they volunteer, if they voluntarily want to go back to work and make a little extra money, and not lose 100 percent of their Social Security benefits.

The Purple Heart Freedom to Work, I think it will work for a lot of Americans. We, as Republicans, believe work is good. We know there are a lot of people that are on Social Security disability that want to go back to work. It is voluntary. They will always have more money. They will not have any less money if this is done.

Again, I hope my colleagues, in a very bipartisan manner, will support H.R. 8884.

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

Helping Purple Heart recipients find employment is wonderful and laudable. There is nothing in H.R. 8884 that requires SSA to test the Purple Heart Freedom to Work Act. It is not mentioned in the underlying bill at all.

At a Ways and Means Committee markup, Ranking Member LARSON asked the majority if SSA had shared information on what demonstration projects it had planned. They said: No. Trust us.

In fact, when the bill was considered at the Rules Committee a few weeks ago, Ranking Member MCGOVERN made a motion to add a new section to the rule that would have provided for immediate consideration of Representative SCOTT's Purple Heart bill on the House floor. Republicans all voted "no" on this motion, including Representative SCOTT himself.

If Republicans want to do the Purple Heart bill, let's vote on that bill, not on H.R. 8884, which doesn't even mention Purple Heart recipients.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative CHU for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that you can measure the greatness of a society by how well it treats its old, how well it treats its young, and how well it treats those who have difficulties caring for themselves, through no fault of their own, yet need help from other elements of society.

If this bill is an indication of how we value our most vulnerable citizens, then we are not in good shape. Instead of going after billionaire tax cheats or ultrawealthy tax evaders, my Republican colleagues are advancing a bill that purports to remove barriers to work for disabled Americans.

In all actuality, H.R. 8884 targets the earned benefits of workers who qualify for the Social Security Disability Insurance, SSDI.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose H.R. 8884 and urge my colleagues to do the same, rather than give the Trump administration unfettered authority to conduct a demonstration program that will ultimately result in a reduction of benefits for older, severely disabled, and low-income workers.

The bill under consideration today fails to remove employment barriers for some of the most financially vulnerable Americans. Past Social Security Administration demonstration programs have shown these reemployment initiatives to be unsuccessful in helping beneficiaries return to work.

Additionally, let us be reminded that the first Trump administration repeatedly proposed massive cuts to Social Security disability benefits. Its plans included stripping away benefits from older, severely disabled workers, making it harder to qualify for benefits and throwing disabled people off benefits by subjecting them to more frequent continuing disability reviews, just to name a few.

Alarming, President Trump's budgets proposed using SSA demonstration authority to slash disability benefits by approximately \$50 billion over 10 years.

□ 0940

Let me say it again. The first Trump administration wanted disability demonstration authority to slash \$50 billion of earned benefits.

Just last year, the Trump administration proposed a rule that would exact deep cuts to SSDI, particularly for older workers. These are workers who cannot support themselves due to severe and longstanding disabilities that impact their ability to work.

Mr. Speaker, with this bill, my Republican colleagues want to grant the Trump administration unchecked power and authority to conduct demonstration programs aimed at reducing SSDI benefits.

Just to further imagine, the Trump-created customer service crisis at SSA due to massive staffing reductions, this bill requires funding for these dem-

onstrations to be supported out of SSA's operating fund.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, among others, H.R. 8884 is opposed by the AFL-CIO, Social Security Works, and the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare.

The Trump administration has repeatedly demonstrated its willingness to harm the elderly, the disabled, and the poor, and so I urge my colleagues to reject this harmful bill in exchange for a more thoughtful approach to improving employment outcomes for people with disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we ought to want and should help, not harm and not hurt those individuals who deserve and need disability benefits.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers and am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the risk that this bill poses to vulnerable Social Security disability benefits cannot be overstated. President Trump has tried time and time again to kick people with disabilities off of their benefits, including by pushing people into demonstration programs. This bill would give this administration open-ended authority to do that.

Congress has authorized this kind of SSDI demonstration authority in the past but only after working with SSA to closely review its intended projects and their impacts.

In contrast, the current SSA has not disclosed any information on how it plans to use the SSDI demonstration authority, and Ways and Means Republicans rejected a Democratic amendment that would have required a notice and public comment period for any demonstration before it gets enacted.

The bottom line is that this administration cannot be trusted to not cut people's benefits. These are earned benefits that people with disabilities rely on to make ends meet. This bill puts that lifeline in jeopardy, and that is why this House should reject this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have heard some amazing arguments on the floor just now, but one thing that has been crystal clear by the arguments that we have heard in opposition to this bill which helps veterans is simply that the Democratic Party is focused on legislative items that allow them to control Americans.

They want to have 100 percent control over the benefits of Americans. They don't even want to give them the opportunity to have the dignity of work. They said it on the floor today.

I can't believe that they would possibly want to say that they know better for your livelihood than what you do, but that is what the speakers are

saying, and that is why they are opposing this bill. That is a shame.

Mr. Speaker, you hear individuals say that it is a risk. The only risk of this bill is simply that my Democratic colleagues can't have 100 percent control over the benefits of veterans who are disabled. This bill allows them to give the opportunity to have the dignity of work and not lose their benefits but to still be able to thrive.

We are focused on the success of the individual, not the fact that the government can control your livelihood.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage this body to support this great piece of legislation that Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT has worked on for some time to deliver relief for real Americans, for veterans, and not to the Democratic Party, who wants to control their benefits.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1438, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

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

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

Ms. CHU. 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Adoption of H. Con. Res. 89; and Passage of H.R. 8884.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

DIRECTING THE PRESIDENT, PURSUANT TO SECTION 5(c) OF THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION, TO REMOVE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES WITH IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 89) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities with Iran, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on adoption of the concurrent resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 208, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]

YEAS—214

Adams	Golden (ME)	Neguse
Aguilar	Goldman (NY)	Norcross
Amo	Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez
Ansari	Gonzalez, V.	Olsewski
Auchincloss	Goodlander	Omar
Balint	Gottheimer	Pallone
Barragán	Gray	Panetta
Barrett	Green, Al (TX)	Pappas
Beatty	Grijalva	Pelosi
Bell	Harder (CA)	Perez
Bera	Hayes	Peters
Beyer	Himes	Petterson
Bishop	Horsford	Pingree
Bonamici	Houlihan	Pocan
Boyle (PA)	Hoyer	Pou
Brown	Hoyle (OR)	Pressley
Brownley	Huffman	Quigley
Budzinski	Ivey	Ramirez
Bynum	Jackson (IL)	Randall
Carbajal	Jacobs	Raskin
Carson	Jayapal	Riley (NY)
Carter (LA)	Jeffries	Rivas
Casas	Johnson (GA)	Ross
Case	Johnson (TX)	Ruiz
Casten	Kaptur	Ryan
Castor (FL)	Keating	Salinas
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez
Chu	Kennedy (NY)	Scanlon
Cisneros	Khanna	Schakowsky
Clark (MA)	Krishnamoorthi	Schneider
Clarke (NY)	Landsman	Scholten
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Schrier
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Latimer	Sewell
Conaway	Lee (NV)	Sherman
Correa	Lee (PA)	Simon
Costa	Leger Fernandez	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Levin	Sorensen
Craig	Liccardo	Stansbury
Crockett	Lieu	Stanton
Crow	Lofgren	Stevens
Cuellar	Lynch	Strickland
Davids (KS)	Magaziner	Subramanyam
Davidson	Mannion	Suozyi
Davis (IL)	Massie	Sykes
Davis (NC)	Matsui	Takano
Dean (PA)	McBath	Thanedar
DeGette	McBride	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	McClain Delaney	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	McClellan	Titus
Deluzio	McCollum	Tlaib
DeSaulnier	McDonald Rivet	Tokuda
Dexter	McGarvey	Tonko
Dingell	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Doggett	McIver	Torres (NY)
Elfreth	Meeks	Trahan
Escobar	Mejia	Tran
Español	Menefee	Underwood
Fields	Menendez	Vargas
Figures	Meng	Vasquez
Fitzpatrick	Mfume	Veasey
Fletcher	Min	Velázquez
Foster	Moore (WI)	Vindman
Foushee	Morelle	Walkinshaw
Frankel, Lois	Morrison	Wasserman
Friedman	Moskowitz	Schultz
Frost	Moulton	Waters
Garamendi	Mryan	Watson Coleman
Garcia (CA)	Mullin	Whitesides
Garcia (IL)	Nadler	Williams (GA)
Garcia (TX)	Neal	
Gillen		

NAYS—208

Aderholt	Bentz	Burlison
Alford	Bergman	Calvert
Allen	Bice	Carey
Amodei (NV)	Biggs (AZ)	Carter (GA)
Arrington	Biggs (SC)	Carter (TX)
Babin	Bilirakis	Ciscomani
Bacon	Boebert	Cline
Baird	Bost	Cloud
Balderson	Brecheen	Clyde
Baumgartner	Bresnahan	Cole
Bean (FL)	Buchanan	Collins
Begich	Burchett	Comer

Crane	Jack	Onder
Crank	Jackson (TX)	Owens
Crawford	James	Palmer
Crenshaw	Johnson (LA)	Patronis
De La Cruz	Johnson (SD)	Perry
DesJarlais	Jordan	Pfleger
Diaz-Balart	Joyce (OH)	Reschenthaler
Donalds	Joyce (PA)	Rogers (AL)
Downing	Kean	Rogers (KY)
Edwards	Kelly (MS)	Rouzer
Ellzey	Kelly (PA)	Roy
Emmer	Kennedy (UT)	Rulli
Estes	Kiggans (VA)	Rutherford
Evans (CO)	Kiley (CA)	Salazar
Ezell	Kim	Scalise
Fallon	Knott	Schmidt
Fedorchak	Kustoff	Schweikert
Feenstra	LaHood	Scott, Austin
Fine	LaLota	Self
Finstad	Langworthy	Sessions
Fischbach	Latta	Shreve
Fitzgerald	Lawler	Simpson
Fleischmann	Lee (FL)	Smith (MO)
Flood	Letlow	Smith (NE)
Fong	Loudermilk	Smith (NJ)
Fox	Lucas	Smucker
Franklin, Scott	Luna	Spartz
Fry	Mackenzie	Staubert
Fulcher	Malliotakis	Stefanik
Fuller	Maloy	Steil
Gallagher	Mann	Steube
Garbarino	Mast	Strong
Gill (TX)	McCaul	Stutzman
Gimenez	McClain	Taylor
Goldman (TX)	McClintock	Tenney
Gooden	McCormick	Thompson (PA)
Gosar	McDowell	Tiffany
Griffith	McGuire	Timmons
Grothman	Messmer	Turner (OH)
Guest	Meuser	Valadao
Guthrie	Miller (IL)	Van Drew
Hageman	Miller (OH)	Van Dwyne
Hamadeh (AZ)	Miller (WV)	Van Epps
Haridopolos	Miller-Meeks	Van Orden
Harrigan	Mills	Wagner
Harris (MD)	Moolenaar	Walberg
Harris (NC)	Moore (AL)	Weber (TX)
Harshbarger	Moore (NC)	Webster (FL)
Hern (OK)	Moore (UT)	Westerman
Higgins (LA)	Moore (WV)	Wied
Hill (AR)	Moran	Williams (TX)
Hinson	Murphy	Wilson (SC)
Houchin	Nehls	Wittman
Hudson	Newhouse	Womack
Huizenga	Norman	Yakym
Hunt	Nunn (IA)	Zinke
Hurd (CO)	Obornolte	
Issa	Ogles	

NOT VOTING—9

Barr	Evans (PA)	Mace
Cammack	Graves	Rose
Dunn (FL)	Luttrell	Wilson (FL)

□ 1024

Mrs. HOUCHIN, Messrs. LATTA, JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mrs. LUNA, Messrs. BILIRAKIS, FITZGERALD, Mrs. FEDORCHAK, Messrs. MOORE of North Carolina, EMMER, MORAN, NORMAN, CRAWFORD, and BRECHEEN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. ADAMS, Messrs. KEATING and NEAL changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GOSAR changed his vote from "present" to "nay."

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVING BARRIERS TO WORK FOR DISABLED AMERICANS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 8884) to amend title II of