



## Labor and Employee Benefits Congressional Review Act Resolutions Signed Into Law

Resolution	Description	U.S. Chamber Activity
<p><b>H.J. Res. 37</b></p> <p><b>Joint Resolution disapproving implementing regulation for Fair Pay and Safe Workplaces EO (aka blacklisting rule)</b></p> <p><b>Passed House, February 2 (236-187)</b> <b>Passed Senate, March 6 (49-48)</b></p> <p><b>Signed into law, March 27, 2017</b></p>	<p>Would have forced federal contractors to disclose mere allegations of federal labor violations, potentially blocking them from federal contracts without giving them a chance to challenge the charges.</p> <p>Unions would have used this information in corporate campaigns to organize and leverage in collective bargaining.</p>	<p>As the No. 1 labor priority, led employer community's opposition by—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Filing extensive comments detailing the constitutional, statutory, logistical, and economic flaws and setting up arguments for later litigation.</li><li>• Meeting with various administrative officials, including then-Secretary of Labor Tom Perez, to voice objections.</li><li>• Working with congressional offices to promote legislative remedies such as appropriations riders and amendments to the Department of Defense Authorization Act.</li><li>• Activating grassroots network and generating over 1,400 contacts.</li><li>• Rescinding the blacklisting rule, saving affected businesses nearly \$1 billion in initial compliance costs and annual costs of nearly \$900 million in each subsequent year.</li></ul>
<p><b>H.J. Res. 83</b></p> <p><b>Joint Resolution disapproving OSHA's regulation relating to Clarification of Employer's Continuing Obligation to Make and Maintain an Accurate Record of Each Recordable Injury and Illness (aka Volks rule)</b></p> <p><b>Passed House, March 1 (231-191)</b> <b>Passed Senate, March 22 (50-48)</b></p> <p><b>Signed into law, April 3, 2017</b></p>	<p>Would have expanded OSHA's statute of limitations for issuing citations for record-keeping violations from 6 months to 5 years, contrary to the statutory provisions. This would not have improved workplace safety.</p>	<p>Worked to fight this regulation by—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Submitting thoroughly written comments objecting to the Volks rule.</li><li>• Working with House Education and Workforce Committee to initiate the CRA process.</li><li>• Leading the Coalition on Workplace Safety's efforts to generate support from employers to convince House and Senate leadership to move the CRA resolution.</li><li>• Sending Key Vote letters.</li><li>• Harnessing grassroots network and generating over 7,500 contacts.</li></ul>



# Labor and Employee Benefits Congressional Review Act Resolutions Signed Into Law

Resolution	Description	U.S. Chamber Activity
<p><b>H.J. Res. 66</b></p> <p><b>Joint Resolution disapproving state-sponsored retirement plans</b></p> <p><b>Passed House, February 15 (231-193)</b> <b>Passed Senate, May 3 (50-49)</b></p> <p><b>Signed into law, May 17, 2017</b></p>	<p>Regulations would have allowed states and/or cities to mandate private employer participation in state-sponsored or city-sponsored automatic IRA programs.</p>	<p>Worked with the House and Senate to ensure passage of both pieces of legislation by—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementing a grassroots campaign where 2,900 advocates sent over 9,500 letters to Congress.</li> <li>• Releasing both print and radio advertisements.</li> <li>• Sending Key Vote letters and a joint letter signed by over 75 trade associations objecting to these regulations.</li> </ul>
<p><b>H.J. Res. 67</b></p> <p><b>Joint Resolution disapproving city-sponsored retirement plans</b></p> <p><b>Passed House, February 15 (234-191)</b> <b>Passed Senate, March 30 (50-49)</b></p> <p><b>Signed into law, April 13, 2017</b></p>	<p>Regulations would have provided that states and/or cities offering these programs not be subject to ERISA, despite considerable opinions to the contrary.</p> <p>Regulations would have encouraged a patchwork regulatory scheme that would have created untenable burdens for employers operating in multiple states and/or cities.</p>	