

**MEMBERS' DAY HEARING ON PROPOSED RULES
CHANGES FOR THE 118TH CONGRESS**

HEARING
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON RULES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED SEVENTEENTH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

NOVEMBER 29, 2022



Available via <http://govinfo.gov>
Printed for the use of the Committee on Rules

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 2023

50-346

COMMITTEE ON RULES

JAMES P. MCGOVERN, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

NORMA J. TORRES, California	TOM COLE, Oklahoma
ED PERLMUTTER, Colorado	<i>Ranking Republican</i>
JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland	MICHAEL C. BURGESS, Texas
MARY GAY SCANLON, Pennsylvania	GUY RESCENTIALER, Pennsylvania
JOSEPH D. MORELLE, New York	MICHELLE FISCHBACH, Minnesota
MARK DeSAULNIER, California,	
<i>Vice Chair</i>	
DEBORAH K. ROSS, North Carolina	
JOE NEGUSE, Colorado	

DON SISSON, *Staff Director*

KELLY DIXON CHAMBERS, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE AND BUDGET PROCESS

JOSEPH D. MORELLE, New York, *Chair*

MARY GAY SCANLON, Pennsylvania	MICHAEL C. BURGESS, Texas
DEBORAH K. ROSS, North Carolina	<i>Ranking Republican</i>
JOE NEGUSE, Colorado	TOM COLE, Oklahoma
JAMES P. MCGOVERN, Massachusetts	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON RULES AND ORGANIZATION OF THE HOUSE

NORMA J. TORRES, California, *Chair*

ED PERLMUTTER, Colorado	GUY RESCENTIALER, Pennsylvania
<i>Vice Chair</i>	<i>Ranking Republican</i>
MARY GAY SCANLON, Pennsylvania	TOM COLE, Oklahoma
JOSEPH D. MORELLE, New York	
JAMES P. MCGOVERN, Massachusetts	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXPEDITED PROCEDURES

JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland, *Chair*

DEBORAH K. ROSS, North Carolina	MICHELLE FISCHBACH, Minnesota
<i>Vice Chair</i>	<i>Ranking Republican</i>
NORMA J. TORRES, California	TOM COLE, Oklahoma
MARK DeSAULNIER, California	
JAMES P. MCGOVERN, Massachusetts	

CONTENTS

November 29, 2022

	Page
Opening Statements:	
Hon. James P. McGovern, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts and Chair of the Committee on Rules	1
Hon. Tom Cole, a Representative in Congress from the State of Oklahoma and Ranking Member of the Committee on Rules	1
Witness Testimony:	
Hon. H. Morgan Griffith, a Representative in Congress from the State of Virginia	2
Hon. Tim Burchett, a Representative in Congress from the State of Tennessee	10
Prepared Statement	12
Hon. Carolyn Bourdeaux, a Representative in Congress from the State of Georgia	20
Hon. Aumua Amata Coleman Radewagen, a Delegate in Congress from the Territory of American Samoa	21
Hon. Warren Davidson, a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio	22
Hon. Robert E. Latta, a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio	25
Hon. William R. Timmons IV, a Representative in Congress from the State of South Carolina	26
Hon. Kat Cammack, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida	34
Hon. Thomas Massie, a Representative in Congress from the State of Kentucky	35
Additional Material Submitted for the Record:	
Letter from the Hon. Tim Burchett, a Representative in Congress from the State of Tennessee	45
Statement from the Hon. Lauren Boebert, a Representative in Congress from the State of Colorado	60
Statement from the Hon. W. Gregory Steube, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida, on Truth in Testimony Reform	62
Statement from the Hon. W. Gregory Steube, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida, on Drug Testing	64
Statement from the Hon. Sheila Jackson Lee, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas	65
Statement from the Hon. Raúl M. Grijalva, a Representative in Congress from the State of Arizona	68

MEMBERS' DAY HEARING ON PROPOSED RULES CHANGES FOR THE 118th CONGRESS

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 2022

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RULES,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 1:50 p.m., in Room H-313, The Capitol, Hon. James P. McGovern [chairman of the committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives McGovern, Torres, Perlmutter, Raskin, Scanlon, Morelle, DeSaulnier, Ross, Cole, Burgess, Reschenthaler, and Fischbach.

Mrs. TORRES. You are going to keep us here.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, until we—for a little bit anyway. But today's meeting gives all of our colleagues a chance to share ideas that may be useful as we look ahead to the 118th Congress. You know, as we have said over and over no party has a monopoly on good ideas.

When Democrats came into power during the 116th Congress we understood that everyone has valuable insight to offer, that is how we created probably one of most bipartisan Rules packages in recent memory by speaking with every Member from the longest serving to the newly elected and spent months of vetting ideas.

Collaboration and a willingness to work together are imperative to ensure that we have a well functioning House, one that doesn't work for one political party or the other, but for the American people. After all, that is what this is all about. A House governed by good rules not only is a sign of our democracy's health but allows us to tackle the issues that can make a positive difference in people's lives. That is why we all ran for Congress in the first place.

So this hearing will facilitate meaningful conversations and I hope we will inform the incoming Republican majority as they prepare the next Rules package. We shall all want to strive for rules that further improve transparency and accountability, measures that will bring this institution into the 21st century and reforms that will advance the efficiency and efficacy of Congress. So I look forward to what should be a productive discussion to hearing what our colleagues have prepared.

And now let me turn to our ranking member, Mr. Cole, for any comments he wants to make.

Mr. COLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Today's hearing is one of great importance.

The CHAIRMAN. Can we just have order?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Sorry.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Perlmutter is you know—

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I am working on some things.

Mr. COLE. Indeed you are.

Today's hearing is one of great importance as we provide a forum their ideas and proposals for Members in the preparation of the rules package to govern the House during the upcoming 118th Congress.

I want to thank our witnesses today not only for taking the time to appear before this committee, but also for their thoughtfulness and hard work in assembling these proposals. Indeed we are a better committee and a better institution for your participation today.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to today's discussion and I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

And so I would like to welcome our witnesses to provide testimony on Members' day on our Members' day hearing proposed rules changes for the 118th Congress. And Representative Griffith you are up first. Just make sure your mike is on that is all.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

Mr. GRIFFITH. All right. There we go. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate that. Let me start because I am going to mention him later in just saying that it was my privilege and honor to call Don McEachin a friend. We rarely agreed on policy, but as several have mentioned here today he was always—had a smile, he was a very good lawyer. And I have got a story to go with one of my amendments that involves Don and as I was contemplating it after learning the news last night I thought about taking it out and I thought no, it is a good story that talks about his legislative skill, I left it in my comments.

Before we started I wanted to let everybody know that while we didn't agree, he was a good friend and we served in the Virginia house before we served in this House together. And so we were long time colleagues.

All right. With that said, I don't know what numbers you all have, but the first one I have is my legislative text change which reinstates the Holman Rule. And I have a handout an article by Mark Strand from the last time the Holman Rule came into effect. And I will give it to our stenographer and you all can do with it what you will. But it is an article that talks favorably about the benefits of the Holman Rule. It is really not as big a deal as some have made it out to be. I wish I could say since I revived it, some years ago that it was as big as the Washington Post thought it was in changing the way we do business. But it is one of many steps we can take that empowers individual Members in trying to effect spending and it allows you to retranscribe spending in an agency which would include rearranging the deck chairs so to speak. And you can eliminate a deck chair or two if you wish.

The rule which existed for roughly 100 years on and off in Congress the rule is rarely effective in getting passed on the floor, but in those occasions when it has been, it has made a substantial change and exercised the will of the people through the people's House. I think it is a tool that we ought to go have as Members.

And look, all of the amendments that I am going to propose today are attempts to try to make this place to work better and to empower individual Members. The Holman Rule is just one small part of that. I would like to see a number these adopted.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Griffith, can you just recap the Holman Rule, please?

Mr. GRIFFITH. Sure. So what the Holman Rule does is it goes into Rule XXI and it allows you to cut spending and reorganize an agency inside of an Appropriations bill. It has to be a general appropriations bill, it can't be any other bill. That is one of criteria, you have to—you know, it comes up on the floor and you have to get a majority, which is why it is hard to get any of the amendments passed. In fact, we used it for 2 years previously and I don't believe—in fact, I know that none of the amendments were successful. I had one of my own, got some interesting information out of it, had a good debate. It allowed the Members to figure out what was going on in a particular issue, but nothing actually passed and that is the history of the Holman Rule over its 100 years is that I would dare say maybe a dozen things have passed during that time period.

But it is the safety valve that allows the Members to say, wait a minute, this agency isn't working right and we think there is a better way to do it with retranschement. You can't increase spending, you have to cut spending overall. But you can rearrange things. One that comes to mind and I am not planning on putting this in but just comes to mind is CDC has never been actually authorized. And while Energy and Commerce probably ought to figure out how to authorize the CDC, if we felt like there needed to be major changes then even the CDC director said there needs to be some changes. And if that needed to be done with a retranschement then you could possibly use that as a way to do that or just to have a good discussion on the floor in a legislative body. So that's what it does. So——

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Thank you.

Mr. GRIFFITH. That is what it does. All right. So that pretty much explains the Holman Rule. Mr. Chairman, I don't know if you want me to stop and answer questions or I could go through the whole package and then open up to questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Why don't you go through the questions and Mr. Burchett is here too and you can follow Mr. Griffith then we can go to——

Mr. BURCHETT. Burchett, Burchett like a tree. Burchett, Burchett.

The CHAIRMAN. What did I say?

Mr. BURCHETT. Burchett.

Mr. GRIFFITH. You gave it a fancier——

The CHAIRMAN. Okay. French pronunciation.

Mr. GRIFFITH. So you want me to stop, answer questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Yeah. Why don't you—why don't you come on up.

Mr. GRIFFITH. I have got about seven or eight.

The CHAIRMAN. Keep going. Why don't you keep going.

Mr. GRIFFITH. The next one that I have is a change in the germaneness rule, that is in rule 16. This would allow the speaker to have a more strict germaneness rule. So it restates in the germaneness rule. We've got the germaneness rule. It then goes in and

gives the speaker guidelines on what the speaker is to look at when determining if something is germane. The purpose of that quite frankly is to allow the speaker to set new precedent and create a more strict germaneness rule. Over the course of probably 100 years, and I haven't studied it carefully, but it looks like that is about right we have gotten laxer and laxer. And the precedents have made it so that really our germaneness rule is pretty weak. This says, if you are going to bring an amendment in it has got to be germane to the original purpose of the bill, that's why you look at the title. The guidelines say look at the title, look at the code sections are affected in the bill, look at the agencies that are affected in the bill.

If you go outside of that and if the original purpose is the doc fix in Medicare, you can deal with the doc fix in Medicare, but you can't come in and suddenly say we are going to take this bill that touches Medicare in one spot and turn it into an overall reform of Medicare. And you also—we had a—I know that was a rules issue, but we had it where the doc fix and you all might remember this and the payment in lieu of taxes were added together in a single bill or a single vote. Clearly not germane and clearly shows how far afield we have gotten from the idea and what the people expect us to do, they expect us to vote on one concept, one idea what the bill did. It doesn't mean you can't have complex bills, but it has to be a part of the original concept and not something that suddenly got added on in committee, in Rules or on the floor.

And the speaker would have the ability, and I gave the speaker—I will get to that later, I gave the speaker the ability to make that decision solely because I think we need to have a new understanding of germaneness. And an incoming speaker is the best chance to do that and in order to do that, you have to change the rule just a little bit so you have got a new rule to work with and you give them a new chance to set new precedent and that is the purpose of that one.

All right, moving on to the next which I have as number three, it's titled bill limitations. I will tell you it started off two different amendments and they are clearly severable. They are two different concepts but they line up in the rules in the same spot. So I have in rule 12 2(a) and then a separate and severable issues 2(b). I am going to talk to 2(a) first.

2(a) is no bill shall be introduced which contains more than one purpose or question or questions of a bill that violates a single purpose rule, the speaker on those questions the speaker also would have the ability to make that decision. Again, we sometimes get far afield, we don't want to talk about single purpose, and this is stuff the American people want and love. They like the idea of us voting on a single purpose. They like the idea of any amendments coming in being germane to the underlying bill.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Again, a new speaker—and I would hope that a new speaker would interpret these strictly, because I think it makes our legislative process easier and better when you get to the floor because you don't have to worry about all kinds of superfluous issues being suddenly raised on the floor with an amendment, which is one of the reasons why we have gone further and further away from open rules. I don't think we have had a true open rule

in years is because we are worried about, you know, somebody putting in, whether it be on the left or on the right, putting in some kind of a crazy amendment.

What this would allow us to do, in combination with the germaneness new rule, it would allow a speaker the ability to hone it in, make an announcement to everybody, hey, we are changing the tenor of this, and we are not going to allow those kinds of superfluous amendments to be brought to the floor.

The second part, 2(b), if I might go forward is—and this one is a little dicier and not as loved by anybody—but it is a calendar deadline to introduce bills. Now, I put a proposal together, because you have got to start somewhere. I am not saying that I have got this down pat. Some of these others I can defend to the death. This one is a little closer, but I do think that we need to figure out a schedule. Because what happens is that we have bills that are introduced all the time. That leads to—and all of us have probably done it, I know I have. Some issue comes up. It is the cause celebre of the day. And your constituents want to know what you are going to do about it. Well, I am putting the bill in today. And we get hundreds of those bills. And a lot of—most of the time they don't come to the floor.

But what happens is we have legislative staff, we have legislative services, or the people who help draft—the drafting people. They all have—they put in overtime to get all of this stuff drafted up and get it introduced.

What this says is if you have got an idea and you really like that idea, get it in. Now, I pick June 1 of each year. Get your bills in by June 1. After that—and I went fairly relaxed on it—after that, in order to put a bill in, you would need consent of the House. You don't have to have unanimous consent. I came out of the Virginia legislature. I was a member of the Virginia House for many years, and in that context we had to have unanimous consent if you passed the deadline.

I am not asking for unanimous consent, but you have got to come to the floor and say, hey, I got a really good idea, I think it ought to be a bill, and then the House has to vote on it. What that will do is—it better be something you are really passionate about if you are going to come and do a mea culpa in front of the whole House.

Now, I am going to tell you that I put it in as a calendar event. It may actually make more sense—and I am happy to work with anybody who wants to work on this—to say that you want to do this based on a term, in which case I would propose January 30 of the second year of the term. It would not reduce as much the drive-by legislation or the legislation for cause celebre of the day, but it would guarantee that, in the second year, you are dealing with the major issues and you are not dealing with a lot of distractions, because everybody has had plenty of time to put their bill in.

So those are a couple of bills. We have got more. Hang tight.

I have also a change in rule—and it is my no. 4—rule XXIX in its limitation on waiver. Now, this goes hand in hand with germaneness and having the speaker make a decision on that, and with the single purpose rule. And it says that you shall not waive it without two-thirds vote of the whole House. Now, majority in the

House. House can waive it with 51. They can waive the rule but it has to be two-thirds.

The point of putting this into the rules is to make it clear that the germaneness rule and the single purpose rule are special and should not be treated as just some other rule. That it is our intent that you ought to have a super majority to waive those two rules. That you shouldn't just do it willy-nilly because on that particular day you felt like you wanted to get out by 2 o'clock instead of, you know, working on something till 6 o'clock.

I know people have a long way to go home. And I understand that. But the American people elected us to get a job done and not waive all the rules that make things—may make things less comfortable, but I think this would help us in running this place more efficiently and more effectively over a long period of time. All of us are sloppy. We don't pay attention to it. We just throw our stuff in. Oh, it is close, but we need to pay attention to that.

Also going in line with some of these other rules. If you are going to have strict germaneness and you are going to have strict single purpose, which the American people I think want, and you make it clear you don't want it waived, if a speaker is consistently violating that, I think we need to have a vacate the chair motion. Now, I put some guardrails on it because I think there are legitimate concerns when you take the chair in the modern era. It worked for over 200 years. Worked very well. Only came up a few times.

But today we are living in a world where there is 24-hour notice. There is Twitter. I mean, we have all been in meetings where things are said, and before we can get out of the meeting, it is already all over Twitter and starts to get on Facebook and goes other places.

A speaker cannot establish their administration and establish that they are doing a good job if there is an everyday motion to vacate the chair. I do think an individual Member ought to have that right to bring the motion. It is not exactly, but it is kind of like our version of a no confidence vote. And so what I did was I said that any new speaker gets 7 months to get their administration established. At the end of the 7 months, a vacate the chair motion then becomes in order for any Member to make.

If a speaker faces a vacate the chair motion and succeeds in surviving the motion, they then—a new motion cannot be made for 60 days. Some might argue for 90. I prefer 60, but you have got, I think today, to have a true vacate the chair which restores power to the individual Members, but you also have to have guardrails on it. Because in the old days, what you did in D.C., probably the public back home didn't know about it for at least a week or two and sometimes months. Today, sometimes my constituents know what happened in a different committee before I do.

And so that is why I thought that we would need to look for some hybrid language that restores to the individual Members. Each Member should have a right to say, wait a minute, something is not working right here, and have a way to clean up things if necessary. I don't think it is going to be necessary very often. Wasn't for 200 years necessary very often. In fact, one of the times, the speaker himself called for a vacate the motion—vacate the chair

motion to prove that he had the support on the floor, and he did. So that is my modified vacate the chair rule IX.

Timing of the action reports. This one gets a little complicated. I will do my best to explain it to you. You may have some questions on it. But this one is kind of interesting. What it just says is, if a bill comes out of a committee, Rules Committee has to send that to the floor within 10 days or it comes up to the floor—10 legislative days. It has to come to the floor in order to be acted on, if it comes out of a primary committee.

That does two things, in my opinion. One, make sure that if we pass a bill out of a committee, it actually gets a vote on the floor before that term of Congress goes poof. That doesn't always happen. Lot of times the bills come out and they never get seen again. It also guarantees, I think, that the committee will do better work on the various bills. Because we shouldn't be fixing bills on the way to the floor.

And that brings up my Don McEachin story. I think it was the bill that dealt with surprise billing. Don raised the point in the committee. He said this doesn't work in Virginia because of the common laws—the common law and statutory requirements in Virginia on the doctrine of necessities. I looked at it. My only complaint was he found it first. It was brilliant lawyering. He was absolutely right. We got a, well, we will work on that on the way to the floor.

I spoke to Don 6 or 8 months ago. Said, do you know if they ever got it fixed? Because I never got any word back that it had been fixed. He said, you know, I don't know. I probably ought to check into that.

The Members have no way of knowing. We fix things on the way to the floor. And it is very efficient in the sense of getting things moved, but it is why sometimes you all get bills here in this committee that are not yet ready for prime time. If that bill is not yet ready for prime time, if two Members raise an objection based on a good legal—this was not philosophical at all. The bill was a good bill overall, this would have—fixing of this doctrine of necessities issue would have made the bill better. And, in fact, in the Virginia legislature, chair would have looked—because you couldn't send the bill after it was ready for prime time because it was going to show up on the floor 3 days later. The chair would have said, all right, Don and Morgan, the rest of us don't understand this, you all go out and figure out a fix. We would have gone out in the hallway and come back with a fix in 15 minutes.

It will make the committees work to get a bill that is in fact ready for prime time instead of saying, let's push it off to rules and let them fix it on the way to the floor. We should do our job. In every committee, we should do good legislation. Don McEachin stood for that. He was a great lawyer. Again, I disagreed with him on a lot of issues. This one had no philosophy to it other than trying to get the law right. And Dr. Burgess mentioned that earlier, that that was one of Don's hallmarks: Let's get the law right even if I don't agree. I feel the same way. This rule would allow you to do that.

Now, 10 legislative days is enough; you need 14, but it shouldn't be unending. Then there comes up the issue where we send bills

to multiple committees. So I created a safety valve for that. So if the primary committee reports it out, then once it is out of the primary committee, the remaining committees—and I have got to figure what I picked out here—I think I gave them seven—yeah, 7 legislative days. All of the other committees have to make a decision on what they are going to do within 7 legislative days.

Now, these committees are wanting to do. They may come out with different versions of the bills. The Rules Committee, after hearing from the chairperson of that committee—of each of the committees involved in the various versions or their designee, can then form the final bill. Figure out what the differences are in the bills and conform them to one bill, but then get sent to the floor. I allow additional time so that Rules can work on that and get that done before the bill has to be reported to the floor, but it still has to be reported to the floor.

Or in the alternative, the Rules Committee can say these things are so different and they are not ready for prime time. They can re-refer it or refer it back to the committees of jurisdiction to straighten it out and explain, this doesn't work, or we don't understand what committee A is trying to do here. Committee B and A get together, you all figure it out. We are sending it back. Have every right to do that. As does the floor, in the case if a bill gets to the floor that is not right. We can always send it back to rework it.

So that is the purpose of the timing on the—timing action on all bills, but that way the bill gets out of committee. People know there is going to be action. It is not going to go into some black hole that nobody ever sees again. And oftentimes it is not philosophical. It is that leadership, because they feel like they have to look at everything and time everything, they oftentimes don't have time to get to all of it. And so some good bills get left on the sidelines that the committee has already approved.

Now, sometimes the leadership is trying to get a good press conference going and they want to pick a special day. You know, we got a bill that deals with, you know, people falling in love. Then they want to time it for Valentine's Day. Well, this just says get your bills out. Let's do good legislative work. Let's not worry about the press conference. Press conferences are important, it is a part of our business, but legislating is a more important part of our business.

All right. Last, but not least. I might be the only person in the entire House who loves this one. Proportional seating on committees. It is language that was taken out of the Virginia rules. Virginia adopted this rule in 1998. It is a tough rule. It is a tough love situation. And what it says you have got to do is, is that if the House is divided, because we are a democratic republic—or a Republic based on democratic principles. If the House is divided 60/40, the committees ought to be 60/40. If the House is 51/49, committees ought to be 51/49. There is a formula to take care of half people, because you can't obviously have a half person on a committee. So all of the fractional seats are rounded towards the majority. Whoever has the majority gets that extra seat. It doesn't apply to Rules and it doesn't apply to Ethics, but you got to have—I think to get good legislation.

Now, you know, people don't like it because you can't get things done. But let me just give you a classic example of why this isn't right. And I am not trying to pick on either side. It is just the one that I happen to know right now.

When we came in 2 years ago, the Democratic majority was 51 percent. So it was 51/49. But the Energy and Commerce Committee, on which I served, had a larger majority numerically for the Democrats than the Democrats had on the floor. Now, I am not saying Republicans haven't done similar things. I am not trying to pick on either side. I am just trying to get a system that works for everybody and does what our Founders and what the prior people wanted us to do, which is to respect that we are a Republic, but that we are based on democratic principles. What is better than that than saying the committee that is working on legislation and sending it to the floor is divided exactly the way the voters—or it is as close as you can get it to a whole person, the way the voters intended it to be done when they sent us here.

It is hard. But when we started this—and, of course, it changes as people retire or unfortunately pass away, as we have had mentioned both today of Don McEachin and Jackie Walorski. Those numbers shift. So you go with the beginning of the term and you figure out those proportions. And unless they shift dramatically, you leave them along during the term. I would say you leave them alone even if it shifts dramatically, but usually it is not going to be much.

We started it at 51/49. The Energy and Commerce Committee was 55/45. It is just not what the people back home expect us to do. If you asked them, what does common sense tell you to do? They would say, they knew about it, and they don't. I will borrow my friend's here line. He always says he is the 435th most important man in Congress.

Mr. BURCHETT. Most powerful man in Congress.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Powerful man in Congress. You ought to pay attention. I am feeling that way on this amendment. I am the 435th most influential on this issue. Probably not going to happen. But if you ask people back home if they knew about it, and if they said, do you think the committees ought to be divided up the way the voters sent us here for good, bad, or other, they would say yes. Yes, they would. Independents are also covered and they get counted in the majority number. If you have independents. I don't think we have any this time, but we will ultimately, I am sure, in the future have a few independents. And so that has taken care of in here as well.

That being said, that is a brief summary, as you can probably tell, and I didn't use my notes much. Because I am passionate about all of this stuff, I want this place—and it is not exclusive. There are lots of other amendments that you all are going to hear today that I would support. But I think that we need—that Washington doesn't function well. It is not a product of Republicans, it is not a product of Democrats. It is a product of years and years of piling on, of precedent, and nobody is examining things and saying, how could we do it better?

These are just a handful of ideas. Like I said, I know a lot of others that are going to be put in today that are good ideas as well.

These are a handful of ideas that I personally feel ought to be given careful examination and adopted. I don't speak for any group on these, although some groups may like parts of it. As I said, I put stuff in there that irritates everybody in one way or another, but I am trying to get Congress to operate better. And I hope that this in some small measure has helped.

I yield back.

[The statement of Mr. Griffith follows:]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Let me just give everybody the plan here because we have this rail bill coming up. So, Mr. Burchett, we are going to go to you next. And then we are going to do questions. And then we are going to go to the rail panel. And then hopefully that will be quick.

But for those who—if you want, you can go in the office. If you need to make—

Ms. ROSS. I can go back to my office.

The CHAIRMAN. Yeah. But for the people in the audience, if you want to go in the side office there to make calls or do whatever you have to do, feel free to do that.

So we will go to you next. Okay. All right. Welcome.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you all for allowing me to be here. It is sort of a significance—I know this isn't significant for you all, but it is for me. I wish my parents were alive to see me today that I am actually testifying before Congress. [Inaudible] I am not going to name those or anything. Pretty good option around here. Mr. Chairman. I am not even a suspect.

[Inaudible] Mr. Chairman, you may have heard of this thing called the Commitment to America, we promised the American people, the government that is accountable to them—

VOICE. Could you turn your mike on, please.

Mr. BURCHETT. Sorry. Do you want me to start over with my jokes? Did you get them all? You good? All right. I have some ideas on how to make that promise a reality, Mr. Chairman. Right now the American people don't trust us about as—they can only trust us about as far as we can throw the dome off the Capitol. And under this Democratic control of government, Americans I feel like have been lied to. They have been misled and left entirely in the dark on a legislation that made their lives worse. We need to earn back their trust. And it starts with real transparency and accountability on our part.

My rule proposals are based on a simple concept: America should always have access, easy access to information about what is happening in Congress. My first proposal rule requires us to use bills that titles that describe what our bills do. In the Tennessee State legislature, which was under Democratic control when these rules were enacted, and they stayed in when the Republicans took over, the State legislature already had this rule in place. And if a bill is called the Dog Catcher Act. And daggone it, the bill needs to be about dog catchers, not about pay raises, not about anything else. We have made a habit out of passing multi-trillion dollar spending bills. And I feel like they have been packed with woke wish lists. No one had any idea what was in them until after they were passed.

And take the so-called Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. It cost taxpayers \$1.2 trillion, but only about 11 percent from our figuring of the spending went to roads and bridges. We don't need to sneak secret pay raises or rogue climate equity programs in the bills behind our constituents' back. That is some Democrat nonsense, and it has no place here in Congress, Mr. Chairman.

I have another proposed rule. And if Republicans do it, I will be back up here next year saying it is Republican nonsense. I have another proposed rule which will require the Clerk of the House to read the bill's Congressional Budget Office score immediately after the title. In Tennessee we would call that a fiscal note. In Tennessee, we have the best run State in the Nation. We have zero debt. Zero debt, Mr. Chairman. Taxpayers should hear how much a bill will cost before it is passed in Congress. It is their money, and they should know what is in it.

I am also proposing rules that would prevent the House from passing bills using methods that are easier to hide behind. No more en blanc votes. No—and I don't know how to even pronounce en blanc. I am not sure exactly the pronunciation, enblanc. No more passing separate legislation in a procedural vote. No more amendments in nature of a substitute that substantially changed the bill's original purpose. I am also proposing a rule to prevent us from bringing a bill straight from introduction to the floor without going through the committee.

Bills should not be written by a few leaders behind closed doors. They should be a discussed amendment before being brought to a vote. If Americans can easily find out what bills were passing and how much they are costing them and whose voting for them, then daggone it, they are going to pay a lot more attention, Mr. Chairman. And I think that is a good thing. If more Americans are in tune with what is going on here in the people's House, then we are doing something right.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit, for the record, my letter to Republican leader, Kevin McCarthy, that outlines my rules, proposals. I am hopeful we can start to rebuild some trust with the American people, and these rules are a good place to start.

Mr. Chairman, I want to close with one thing. The Democrat Speaker of the House is a man named Jimmy Naifeh, and he is still a dear friend of mine. And he was very strict. He was very fair. But he had a rule. He said, if you didn't want to work, you shouldn't have hired on.

Mr. Chairman, we need to start working, because we have hired on. And I think these rules are a good move in that direction. So thank you all for allowing me to be here.

[The statement of Mr. Burchett follows:]

Mr. Chairman, in our “Commitment to America,” we promised the American people a government that’s accountable to them. I have some ideas on how to make that promise a reality.

Right now, the American people trust us about as far as they can throw us. Under a Democrat-controlled government, Americans have been lied to, misled, and left entirely in the dark on legislation that made their lives worse. We need to earn back their trust, and that starts with real transparency and accountability on our part.

My rule proposals are based on a simple concept: Americans should always have easy access to information about what’s happening in Congress.

My first proposed rule requires us to use bill titles that describe what our bills do. The Tennessee state legislature already has this rule in place. If a bill is called “the Dog Catcher Act,” then that bill needs to be about dog catchers and ONLY dog catchers.

Democrats made a habit of passing multi-trillion-dollar spending bills packed with woke wish-lists, and no one had any idea what was in them until after they passed. Take the so-called “Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act.” It cost taxpayers \$1.2 TRILLION dollars, but only about 11% of the spending went to roads and bridges.

We don’t sneak secret pay-raises or woke “climate equity” programs into bills behind our constituents’ backs. That’s some Democrat nonsense, and it has no place here.

I have another proposed rule which would require the Clerk of the House to read a bill’s Congressional Budget Office score immediately after the

title. Taxpayers should hear how much a bill will cost them BEFORE it's passed in Congress. It is their money, after all.

I am also proposing rules that would prevent the House from passing bills using methods that are easier to hide behind.

No more en bloc votes.

No more passing separate legislation in a procedural vote.

No more "Amendments in Nature of a Substitute" that substantially change the bill's original purpose.

I'm also proposing a rule to prevent us from bringing a bill straight from introduction to the floor without going through committee. Bills should not be written by a few leaders behind closed doors. They should be discussed and amended before being brought to a vote.

If Americans can easily find out what bills we're passing, how much they're costing, and who's voting for them, then they're going to pay more attention. That's a good thing!

If more Americans are in-tune with what we're doing here in the People's House, then we're doing something right.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit for the record my letter to Republican Leader Kevin McCarthy that outlines my rule proposals.

I'm hopeful we can start to rebuild some trust with the American people, and these rules are a good place to start.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. You know, let me just say, Mr. Griffith, I appreciate your Holman rule explanation. You mentioned something to do with the organizing the CDC. You know, I just have to say that in my experience, the Holman rule has been used to attack staff. That is how my friends have used it in the past. But I have a question about your committee ratio proposals. If you believe in a fair ratio reflecting the House, why would you exempt the Rules Committee, one of the most, you know, powerful committees in the House, I understand the Ethics Committee. But on the Rules Committee, under your proposal, I mean, if we were not exempted, we would be seven to six up here. I could live with that. You know, but why is the Rules Committee exempted, because it seems to me that is where—

Mr. GRIFFITH. Typically, in most legislative bodies the Rules Committee is a little bit different makeup than the rest.

The CHAIRMAN. But the Rules Committee in the legislative body is not like the Rules Committee in the House of Representatives.

Mr. GRIFFITH. I know, but if you adopt all my rules, it would be more like most of the other legislative bodies because I am taking away your ability to do anything with bills that come directly from a committee of—a primary committee without a substitute or a different bill coming from a different committee. So I am actually taking power away the Rules Committee by sending things straight—

The CHAIRMAN. But you specifically made an exemption from the Rules Committee so—

Mr. GRIFFITH. I did. Because of the history and legislative—in most legislatures, the Rules Committee is, in fact, generally more leaning towards the majority so that they can work their will. I would recognize—if somebody wanted to make a charge, I am not saying I would be against it. What I am saying is I am recognizing the facts that usually the majority wants to be able to control what happens. But if you adopted the entire package, on any bill that came out of the primary committee, the Rules Committee would have to just forward it on. They are just a conduit. They are not taking action. They don't do amendments on a bill that comes from the primary committee unless you got multiple differing versions coming from differing committees.

The CHAIRMAN. But it sounds like every bill—but it sounds like what you are describing is every bill would be a closed rule.

Mr. GRIFFITH. No. Everything would go to the floor. In my world, it would go to the floor under the rules of the House. No need for a rule at all. Rules just sends it forward.

The CHAIRMAN. So just an open rule for everything?

Mr. GRIFFITH. For everything that comes out of a primary committee, everything that comes out of a primary committee without a competing bill from another committee in the same area. In other words, if House resolution 1234 was sent to—or House bill 1234 was sent to six committees, then rules would have a role to play. If it is sent to one committee, it goes straight to the floor. The Rules Committee can just figure out, okay, we have got 10 days—10 legislative days to get it on the floor, it makes sense that we do this on Thursday. That would be the Rules Committee's job; send it forward to the floor. That is it. It would be a conduit. It

is basically the patrolman directing traffic in a case where the bill comes straight out of committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, look, I appreciate both of your testimony. And, look, I mean this is—the purpose of this hearing is to have everybody express their ideas in how we can improve the operation of this House. And so I, again, appreciate you being here.

Mr. Cole.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Griffith, I want to thank both our witnesses. I have got some reservations on the vacate the chair idea.

Mr. GRIFFITH. I understand.

Mr. COLE. And I would be less than honest to say that. And I like your committee ratio thing a lot more 2 years ago than right now. So it has less appeal to me than it did in the past.

Mr. GRIFFITH. That is why it is fair.

Mr. COLE. Well, we will have that discussion I am sure tomorrow at great length.

With that, I will yield back, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Torres.

Mrs. TORRES. May I suggest a change to your changes—

Mr. GRIFFITH. Sure.

Mrs. TORRES [continuing]. Proposal that next time you actually bring papers so that we can follow along.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Oh, I sent them in advance.

Mrs. TORRES. We have them. We do not ask you to come here at a specific time. So our notes are not in a specific order that, you know, you are presenting. You have some interesting comments, and I would have liked to follow along with you.

Mr. GRIFFITH. I apologize.

Mrs. TORRES. But thank you for being here.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Because I have not only specific proposals, but I actually drafted the rules as I believe they should appear and the location they should appear inside of the rules package.

Mrs. TORRES. Thank you.

Mr. GRIFFITH. I will leave a package here.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Burgess.

Dr. BURGESS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And, Mr. Griffith, I am compelled to ask you if the Holman rule as currently applied, has it worked? Has it actually rescinded spending in a particular area? I appreciate that it has been around since 1876.

Mr. GRIFFITH. There have been, I would say, a half dozen, maybe a dozen—somewhere between a half dozen and a dozen times when it has worked. One of those actually went to the Supreme Court, I want to say, about 1940, give or take a couple of years. And the Supreme Court upheld that this was proper within—proper process within the House.

Dr. BURGESS. Well, I also think it is an important tool to return power to the people who are supposed to represent their districts. And it has been a shame that we haven't had it available. I recognize that it is sometimes difficult. It is unwieldy. But at the same time that is probably for a purpose as well.

I do have to say, and I may completely agree with Tom, with the Ranking Member on the ratios on the committee. I mean, it was—it was offensive to me, and you remember this, we sat through those reconciliation bills in committee, dutifully listening, and hold-

ing the votes, and we would lose the majority in the committee was six votes. The majority on the floor was five votes. And that was always particularly disturbing to me. Not that we would have won any more votes. How could there be greater proportion on the committee than there was on the floor of the House? And I do think that is something that really should be given some consideration.

As far as the number of people on the Rules Committee, Mr. Chairman, if I remember correctly, Sam Rayburn, when he was Speaker, actually enlarged the Rules Committee. He wanted to replace some Democrats on the Rules Committee, but his conference wouldn't permit that. So he expanded the Rules Committee in order to overcome the no votes of his recalcitrant Democrat Members who were going to stand in the way of JFK's rather progressive agenda that he was going to institute after the 1960 election. And it was a very close vote on the floor. It changed the ratio.

So I guess we could have that discussion. But as we kind of sit here on the dawn of the next Congress, I would rather like the 9:4 ratio. It has a certain appeal to it. Just an observation for you. But I do think we really ought to pay attention to the ratios on committee. You are right. If the people at home knew what was actually taking place, they would be concerned that there could be such an imbalance of power when the people spoke and elected Representatives in a certain proportion, the committees actually should reflect that.

Mr. GRIFFITH. And while we haven't been perfect and we have never had a rule, I will say that over the last decade or so, it has gotten worse. Historically, over decades and centuries, Congress has been pretty close on the committees. Maybe off by one person. It is only within the last decade or so that we started to get away from that, which is why I feel it is important that we start to put it in the rules and codify that is what we are shooting for.

Dr. BURGESS. Well, I thank both of you for your participation today. It is going to be a long day. So, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Perlmutter.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Thanks. Mr. Griffith, I appreciate your different comments on these rules. Colorado has—follows a lot of the same things that Virginia does, but we do operate very differently here. Whether we are supposed to be like a State legislature or not, that is the sort of the 64-dollar question. Germaneness, though, really is a roadblock.

We have got a bill coming up today when you all finish on railroads and strikes. I want to add, I have got some cosponsors of my bill, safe banking, where I want to add some compensation, improvements for us as Members of Congress to that bill. And I know I am going to run head-long into germaneness. So it does ultimately come down.

Now, you talked a lot about single subject. In Colorado, we have a single subject rule. And you have a tight title or an open title. And you can add things like crazy. Having been in front of the parliamentarian on a number of things that I have wanted to get in the bills, I know that there is a germaneness element to this.

So I appreciate a lot of the things that you talked about. And I do think it would make us in the Congress look more like a lot of

the State legislatures if that is what we want to do. And I think your point is, well, that is what people expect.

So that will be the conversation that we have. You know, I appreciate that you want to bring all these things up as we head into a Republican House. It will tie your hands a little bit and, you know, I appreciate that. And we have talked a lot about a number of these points in the Modernization Committee of Congress so that we empower individual Members and not so much leadership. And I think that is one thing you are trying to do. So I appreciate your comments. I don't think you are right on the germaneness, but I do understand a lot of what you are suggesting.

And I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Resenthaler.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to just thank both of the witnesses for coming in. I know there is a lot of other members who would like to speak, so for brevity, I am going to yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Mr. Raskin.

Mr. RASKIN. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Fischbach.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. I yield back, Mr. Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Morelle.

Mr. MORELLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate both gentlemen and their thoughtfulness about how to proceed. I just want to make one observation. I think a part today that I would, I think, generally disagree with relative to passage of bills out of committee—and I did serve, like many of you, in the State legislature in New York for a long time. And there are different bodies. I mean, Congress is much, much different. And the breadth of such diversity in the Congress and geographically and all kinds of ways that I think just makes it a different place.

But the idea that a committee discharges a bill, and it immediately goes to the floor within a period of days, it seems to me too simplistic. There may be many reasons that you report a bill out of committee. You may want encourage debate with the Senate. You figure by moving a bill, you can get a real conversation. You may not want the bill to go to the floor for consideration as the committee chair, as the Members. There may be a whole host of reasons to do that. And, frankly, I think it eliminates some of the judgment which I hope we collectively make as 435 Members. And to turn this into sort of a series of if this happens, then this happens, then this happens, then this must happen, I think it removes so much judgment from us and, frankly, creates an enormous, I think, bottleneck that the Rules Committee is intended to help address.

I just think—that is my general observation of it that there needs to be room for judgment here. The Members of the majority, whoever that majority is, the leadership ought to play a role, the Rules Committee ought to play a role. I think this is the oldest committee in the House. And it was intended to be sort of the traffic cop to help make judgments about what bill goes to the floor now.

You know, we are going to change in a few weeks, and maybe the new majority will think that these are the ways to proceed. But

I suspect they are going to want the leadership in the Rules Committee, and Rules Committee chair and others will want to have the ability to weigh in and measure whether every single bill that gets out of committee is worthy of going to the floor, just as it is reported out of committee. I guess they won't think that that is a great idea, but we will see.

The other—and, finally, I just say that you pointed to these elements around surprise billing. And one of the—I don't know what committee you were referring to reported out. I know that was a bill that had jurisdiction in multiple committees. That must have been—was that Energy and Commerce.

Mr. GRIFFITH. It was. It was.

Mr. MORELLE. But what you said is that the committee leadership chose to ignore the point that had been raised or said it would get fixed. And whether or not it was fixed, I don't know. But I am not sure that is an argument for doing this then. That because you might have the same dynamic where someone who says, well, we will get an amendment at some point to fix it. Whether that ends up happening, I don't know. But the waiting period or the time to go through another committee to exert, to consider the elements of it or the provisions of it would be lost. There would be no sort of barrier. There would be no way to slow it down under the example you used, which I thought was frankly an odd use of the example.

It was, again, an imperfect bill when it came out of committee. I wouldn't want that to go to the floor. I would want additional steps to look at whether or not there was a mechanism to make it more perfect or make it better.

Mr. GRIFFITH. And my point is that it shouldn't be lost forever. And that the committee ought to have—the committee ought to have the discipline to make sure they answer all the questions, because they are supposed to be the experts in that particular area to answer all the questions necessary to get that bill ready for prime time.

Mr. MORELLE. Yeah, I—

Mr. GRIFFITH. If it gets out of here, it is going to be on the floor, and it could become the law of the United States. Let's make sure we have it right. But particularly when you have—there was not a political—there was no political mischief. And that is the reason I use that example. You have got a Republican, a conservative Republican and a liberal Democrat who generally don't agree, but both recognize that in their States where both of them were licensed to practice law at one time in their lives recognized that this bill had a glitch in it. And it should have been fixed before it left our committee. And I don't think the chairman was saying, you know, oh, we don't care about it. I think what he was saying was, oh, the process here is they will get staff to look at it, and we will fix it somewhere along the way.

Mr. MORELLE. But isn't that a better approach than—when I served as majority leader in the State Assembly in New York, people would—bills would get reported out of the committee and come to our Rules Committee, and then they would have to come to me to determine whether or not we put the bill on the floor. And I would say to my legislative counsel when it came to us we were playing with live ammunition now because the bill could actually

pass out of the House. I am not sure that the committee chair took that responsibility to heart—I am not sure given human nature, I think people liked the idea this has to go through multiple levels of review. And so you can catch a provision or a problem with a bill that is about to go out of committee, which legitimately has support to get out of the committee. There are some technical issues. Let's make sure that the Rules Committee or Ways and Means Committee, or wherever it needs to go, is aware of those changes so we can make them. I think the multiple reviews are actually one of the things that makes it a better process. So, anyway, I just make that observation. I don't want to belabor the point.

Mr. GRIFFITH. When I was the majority leader in the Virginia legislature, I would catch those things, and the floor would send them back. They came straight to the floor. I would look at the calendar for the day. I would read the bills. If I caught something, we would ship that thing back to the committee and said, you all, don't have this ready yet. Get it ready for prime time. It makes your chairman and your committee more accountable for the stuff they are putting out and sending to the floor.

Mr. MORELLE. Well, I don't disagree that they should do that. I mean, I think every time you put out a bill you should, particularly if you are committee chair and you are reporting the bill, affirmatively you should do so with the expectation it could get on the floor and could become law. So let's make sure it is as good as it can be.

I don't think the multiple levels of review—and, frankly, it would be harder to find those changes to be made if there were suddenly dozens of bills coming all at once to the floor, and each of them had the okay of the committee chair. But there wasn't a process in between to start looking at them and make sure that they were in the proper form. So, anyway, I didn't want to belabor it, but I did want to share my concerns about doing it that way.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. DeSaulnier.

Mr. DESAULNIER. I have nothing to add.

The CHAIRMAN. Ms. Ross.

Ms. ROSS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just for thought, and I have nothing to add. I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Any other questions for this panel? If not, you are—thank you for being here. You are free to go.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just the lack of comment on my thoughtful legislation being total endorsement, is that what I understand?

The CHAIRMAN. I am not going to write this.

[Recessed for bills hearing.]

The CHAIRMAN. At this time we are going to close the hearing portion of this meeting and recess our Rules Committee and reconvene our Members' Day Hearing.

And so now I want to call up the panel: Ms. Bourdeaux, Representative—Representative Bourdeaux, Representative Radewagen, Representative Davidson, Representative Timmons, Representative Latta. So come up, and—

And, Representative Bourdeaux, we will begin with you, so wherever you—just make sure your mike is on. Yeah, okay. Okay. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. CAROLYN BOURDEAUX, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Ms. BOURDEAUX. Thank you.

Good afternoon, Chairman McGovern, Ranking Member Cole, and members of the House Rules Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today regarding the potential rules changes for the 118th Congress.

While I will not be here, I am here to express my support for strengthening Pay-As-You-Go rules and restoring a sense of fiscal discipline in Congress.

Prior to running for Congress, I spent most of my professional career working to advance fiscally responsible policies at the local, State, and Federal level. Over the years I have worked on a number of projects, evaluating State fiscal discipline and budget processes. And for years I have taught public budgeting. And from 2007 to 2010, I served as director of the Georgia Senate Budget and Evaluation Office, where I worked with members from both parties to balance the State budget during the Great Recession.

At the State level, States work under balanced budget requirements, which means that budget choices involve tradeoffs. An increase in one part of the budget requires a revenue increase or spending decrease in another part of the budget.

While researchers often invoke the balanced budget requirements as the reason that State budgets are balanced and the Federal budget is not, in fact, the State budget balance requirements are quite easy to violate. They are enforced not so much because of the letter of the law but because many State governments have developed a culture of fiscal responsibility that honors the spirit of the law.

What I saw in Georgia during the Great Recession was that legislators, despite enormous political pressures, generally adhered to good fiscal practices and would invoke policies like the balanced budget requirements to push back against policy proposals that would have had the effect of undermining fiscal stability.

We need to restore both the rules and culture that support fiscal responsibility in Congress. The paygo rule is a key check on congressional spending. However, at this point, it seems like it is waived so often that it is not even a speed bump in the face of each party's spending or revenue priorities.

As we face historic inflation, it will become important for the long-term economic health of the Nation that future Congresses restore regular order around decisions that increase the deficit and, by extension, add to our national debt.

There are several ways in which the 118th Congress can re-enforce and strengthen our commitment to fiscal responsibility.

First, remove the broad paygo exemption categories, like exceptions for tax cuts or COVID or climate spending, as has been done by both parties in recent Congresses.

In the Inflation Reduction Act, we showed that we can responsibly pay for and offset critical investments to lower the cost of

healthcare and address the effects of climate change. We just have to choose to do so.

Require a standalone vote to waive paygo. Too often bills are passed under rules which waive paygo and remove the need for the House to debate the fiscal cost of legislation we are considering. Requiring a standalone vote to waive paygo would mean that Members have to debate and consider the cost of legislation that we have to pass.

Finally, require bills on the consensus calendar to be deficit neutral. The consensus calendar is a tool for Members to bring widely supported, noncontroversial bills to the House for consideration. However, this Congress we have seen several bills added to the consensus calendar which would have fiscal impacts in the tens of billions of dollars.

Requiring the consensus calendar to be deficit neutral is a simple way we can ensure that legislation that adds to the deficit can be appropriately considered and debated in Congress.

We know that Congress can act in a fiscally responsible manner and improve and expand upon paygo rules and principles because we have done it before. Statutory paygo was created in 1990 as part of the bipartisan budget agreement which sought to address the large deficit our Nation was facing.

Shortly thereafter, I came to Congress as a staff member. And during the ensuing years we made great progress towards getting our Nation on a more sustainable fiscal trajectory, even enjoying budget surpluses in some years, all the while allowing for new investments in CHIP, the Child Tax Credit, and the Earned Income Tax Credit.

As you know, the paygo rule was later created in 2007. Rather than statutory paygo, which looks at aggregate spending each year, the paygo rule requires Members to consider the fiscal impact of individual legislation as it is considered and passed.

If you enhance the paygo rule and other important budget constraints, this forces a debate about priorities and tradeoffs for any piece of legislation, and in my long experience, working at the local, State, and Federal level, generally leads to better policymaking.

Thank you again to Chairman McGovern, Ranking Member Cole, and the members of the House Rules Committee for the opportunity to discuss this important issue with you today.

I yield back.

[The statement of Ms. Bourdeaux follows:]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Representative Radewagen.

**STATEMENT OF THE HON. AUMUA AMATA COLEMAN
RADEWAGEN, A DELEGATE IN CONGRESS FROM THE TERRITORY
OF AMERICAN SAMOA**

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. I want to thank you, Chairman McGovern, and Ranking Member Cole—

Mr. LATTA. The mike is not on.

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. I want to thank you, Chairman McGovern, and Ranking Member Cole, for allowing me to testify today.

Today I come to testify in support of keeping the House rule that allows a Delegate and Resident Commissioner to vote in the Com-

mittee of the Whole. This has been a right that delegates have had since the earliest days of our Republic. In fact, our ninth President, William Henry Harrison, was a delegate for the Northwest Territory and was able to chair the Committee of the Whole at times. And as you know, the Northwest Territory later turned into the States of Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin.

The bottom line is a committee is a committee, whether it be a standing committee that we most frequently engage with, a special committee for one purpose or another, or the Committee of the Whole which allows votes for amendments just like a standing committee.

This matter was litigated 30 years ago, and I take no issue with the fact that the House indeed has complete right to make its own rules under the Constitution.

The current rule is not an encroachment on States' rights, nor does it dilute Members' voting rights or apportion them from States voting as decided by the Federal courts. Consistency, plain and simple, is all I ask for the constituents of the territories, to have a consistent vote in all committees, and not have to explain to puzzled constituents why we have this vote in some Congresses but not others.

Thank you for hearing me out on this, Chairman McGovern and Ranking Member Cole. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. I yield back.

[The statement of Mrs. Radewagen follows:]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Representative Davidson.

**STATEMENT OF THE HON. WARREN DAVIDSON, A
REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO**

Mr. DAVIDSON. Thank you, Chairman. And I appreciate the members that are here and online from the Rules Committee.

And I think it is great that you have this Member Day. And I think personally we like to think that the Rules Committee is maybe the most important thing we decide, because the House sets its own rules and those rules are supposed to apply to everyone. Of course, we have a well-honored tradition of waiving the rules for virtually every vote.

So in the spirit that we want the rules to matter, I guess I am here to offer that we might actually be able to operate the place, you know, more productively. And I think it is great to see that so many colleagues took the time to draft rules that offer their take on how we might actually, you know, operate this place more productively.

So I provided, you know, to Mrs. Torres' comment to Mr. Griffith, a summary of my amendments here that I am offering today. And they are numbered. I guess I have offered 125 amendments as of the one I am going to speak to you about first in this Congress.

This first amendment would require us to have a recorded vote on a budget resolution that balances. Since I have been in Congress, I have only voted on one budget that ever balances. And, of course, that was not an aggressive bill. I think it balanced in 10 or 15 years. Members of both parties called it an austerity plan,

and we moved forward to continue to spend well beyond what we were collecting in tax revenue.

So to be sure, both parties would have different approaches. You know, in general, stereotypically, Democrats would tax our way to a balanced budget and Republicans would cut our way to a balanced budget, and the compromise is going to be bipartisan solution that is bankrupting our country.

So I don't know that we could get yet to a point where we are going to bind ourselves that we have to balance the budget, but at least we could vote on a budget that balances. It doesn't say it has to balance in 5 years, 10 years, or 20 years. It doesn't say how you have to do it, but you do have to have a recorded vote before you can go on to appropriations.

And it is important that our country has this constraint on government because, you know, fundamentally, the willingness to pay the taxes at the end of the day is supposed to be a restraint on the size of government. People shouldn't get more government than they are willing to pay for, and right now they are overdosing on too much government or at least overdosing on too much spending without offsets.

So this is a step in that direction, and I hope that it becomes part of the rules for the 118th Congress.

The next is an acknowledgment that earmarks are popular with many of our colleagues. I don't personally think we should have earmarks. We could debate about what those are. I don't think it is wrong for Congress to say that, you know, we are going to direct the Army Corps of Engineers to prioritize works on locks or dams or something. But I do think that when we decide that Congress should fund a Gandhi museum in Houston, Texas, for example, that probably meets everyone's definition of an earmark.

And the only requirement here for my amendment No. 126 is that it has to have a standalone measure. You can't attach it to appropriations bills. So if you are proud of the Gandhi museum, you want us all to build from Ohio and Houston, Texas, then put it on the floor, and we will be glad to vote for it. Of course, I would vote no, and I suspect everyone else would. And that is why they don't go with the transparent path on earmarks.

So I don't know if anyone's mind would be persuaded on that. But it is a way to say, sure, by all means, offer your earmark. Just do it transparently and give us a straight up-or-down vote on it.

Rule number—or my amendment No. 127 I think would be one of the most consequential amendments for Congress and for solving a problem for the country, which is this body needs a healthcare committee. Healthcare is one of the most broken problems in our country. It is clearly divisive in terms of how we approach it in a partisan way.

But when I looked at—before I really got to Congress, I don't think I appreciated how much committee structure explains why so many solutions are kind of half measures at best. And a lot of it is because committees of jurisdiction can only go so far to solve certain problems.

You know, the Energy and Commerce Committee has a massive jurisdiction, as does Ways and Means. But, historically, the House Financial Services Committee was part of Energy and Commerce.

But Financial Services became a substantial and very specialized area and it emerged from Energy and Commerce and became its own committee.

Healthcare is, you know, right around 20 percent of GDP at this point. If you look at most households, if it is not the largest expense in the household, it is the second largest behind rent or mortgage. It is one of the leading, if not the leading, causes of bankruptcy in the United States. For small businesses, it is crippling them.

And every year goes by, we see Democrats in lockstep, in general, saying we are not going to fix anything because it takes away from the momentum for single payer. And we see Republicans continue to be divided.

In general, any organization you are going to be a part of that is meant to solve problems aligns responsibility and authority so that there can be accountability. And I suspect that if we would align responsibility and authority, although we would initially come into the meeting with different perspectives, given the partisan nature of this, we would at least have ownership. The chairman of that committee would own the responsibility for making healthcare in America better each Congress.

And so I think we should do that. I respect that it would change things a lot. And, frankly, that is what the American people want. It is not necessarily what the lobbyists want. They have donated generously to preserve the status quo, and it is pretty broken. Everyone in the country realizes it is broken, and I think the clear signal we could send that we hear you is that we are going to create ownership over that and create a healthcare committee.

My amendment No. 128 would allow a staffer from each personal office to have a top secret/SCI clearance. Right now it stops at top secret. It does not get to the SCI level. And, you know, we often run into things in every Member's office that, frankly, we should probably know a lot more about. That is a different problem. But, in theory, there is not a cap on the level of classification we can be read in on. But we all know how important it is to have staff support for that work, and often you can't have staff support from your own staff.

So this would just prioritize the work to get SCI clearances for every Member who wants them. There is no mandate that you have to get one. But if you are doing work for your committee that would regularly involve some sort of clearance issue, you should be able to get, you know, an SCI clearance. And the default should be that every Member has that kind of level of support.

Rule—my amendment No. 129 would require a recorded vote for spending bills. CBO scores any spending over \$500,000, or they are supposed to. They don't always. And so if you are going to spend more, you are going to spend something that has a CBO, it should require a recorded vote. So there are a lot of bills that go through here, spend a lot of money, and they just go without a recorded vote.

And then I think the last amendment that I have got is—doesn't have an amendment number, and it is called the CBO Show Your Work Act, because it doesn't amend the rules, it just incorporates a bill that I have had into the rules.

And this deals with how the Congressional Budget Office, whenever they publish a score, the one thing we know is that it will be wrong. We don't know for sure how wrong it will be, but it is meant to be an approximation. It is an estimate. Sometimes it is wildly wrong.

When the Federal Government took over education funding as part of Dodd-Frank, they said it would save us 60-some billion dollars. The reality is we know it is going to cost us closer to half a trillion dollars when we count up all the defaults.

The question is: How do we remedy that? We are having a debate. The public never gets to see the models for these. Every now and then selectively they will reveal this. Often when we are in the midst of the debate, regular Member offices can't even get the CBO model so that you could say, well, I have an idea for amendment. How would I do it? Well, you can't even get in the queue, especially if you are not on the committee of jurisdiction.

Some of these bills are hugely consequential. If they were required to publish their models and, you know, protect proprietary-sensitive information but publish their models, then they could get input, not just from every Member in this body, but from anyone that wants to participate, you know, whether it is academics or professionals, that would build models that would say, you know, I think you have a flaw in your model. You have got an assumption that we are questioning. We would have a better model. We would make more accurate decisions, and I think it would be an important way for us to improve the function of the body.

This is a long list. I could go longer, but I narrowed it down to these. Thanks for the time of the committee.

[The statement of Mr. Davidson follows:]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Latta.

**STATEMENT OF THE HON. ROBERT E. LATTA, A
REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO**

Mr. LATTA. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member and members of the Rules Committee. Thanks today for having the Members' Day Hearing for the rules changes in the 118th.

Mine is a very, very short amendment that we do. It would prohibit having the ability to put a title in the—including in the short title and introduce legislation. And so you would only have just the bill number or the resolution number, and that is it. And for me and for others through the years, I think it is important because, again, I think a lot of things have changed. It used to be an area that you would be able to say, you know what, okay, this is an easy way for people to remember such-and-such bill.

But through the years, these titles and these acronyms, I am not sure how long some of our staff have to work on some of these things to come up with them, but they can be weaponized against other Members of the House.

And not only that, it confuses our constituents back home because all of a sudden they say, well, how could you vote against X piece of legislation, because they cite you back what the title is and say that is not what it was. And so I think it is important that a Member could go home and you can talk about your bill any way

you want to. You can call it anything you want, but you don't have it in the title of the legislation.

And so we just go back to just a simple way it is done. You just have your bill, then the bill number, the bill resolution number, and that is it. And that is all this would do, because I think it really would help us and our way that we operate around here.

You are not weaponizing, again, that piece of legislation. We are not confusing our constituents. We are not—also, and sometimes, you know, it makes it tough for Members to vote on pieces of legislation when they hear a certain bill title. They say, Well, how am I going to vote for that? How do I explain that? So you don't have to worry about that.

And the other thing it is going to do, it is going save us money, because if you are not voting for something that has got a lot of money attached to it and you say, Well, how could I vote against that, well, you don't have to because it is not in the bill title. So it is up—you know, it is up to the Member who would want to use it. They can go home. They could talk about their bill.

But in this case what this would do is, again, in this rules package, would just prohibit the inclusion of short titles and introduce legislation.

Thank you very much. I yield back.

[The statement of Mr. Latta follows:]

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Timmons.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. WILLIAM R. TIMMONS IV, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. TIMMONS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be very brief.

Over the last 4 years, I have been on the Select Committee for the Modernization of Congress, first two as a member, last two as vice chair. It has been some of the most rewarding work I have ever done in my life. Appreciate you loaning Congressman Perlmutter and Congressman Reschenthaler to us.

We have gotten a lot done in the last 2 years. We made 202 recommendations over the last 4 years, 132 of them have had substantial implementation. The one that I want to speak on is about committee calendars and schedules.

So, right now, the chairman of every committee is in charge of scheduling their subcommittees and full hearings and markups as they see fit. The recommendation that we made was not to require anything other than to just use one portal so you can see the conflicts. You don't have to—it is not instructive. It is not—you don't have to change anything that a committee chairman currently does other than to input them into this new portal so everybody can see conflicts.

For example, average, last Congress, 40.2 conflicts every day. Average Member serves on 4.5 committees and subcommittees. It is just a lot of chaos, and we are trying to find a way to just see conflicts. Hopefully that will facilitate conversations in the future regarding block scheduling that would allow us to deconflict committee schedules.

I said I will be brief, so I will leave it at that. But, again, we are not asking that Rules does anything other than force commit-

tees to put their schedules into this new portal so we can just see everything and go from there.

Thank you.

[The statement of Mr. Timmons follows:]

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you. And I want to thank you for your testimony, Vice Chair Timmons. And I want to thank you and Rep. Kilmer for the incredible bipartisan work that you and members on the select committee have, you know, have done.

And, you know, that was created as part of our rules package. And it was originally envisioned as just kind of a one-term thing, but we extended it to two terms because there is a lot of good work that gets done there. And it is in a climate where, you know, people can have discussions that don't kind of delve into partisanship.

And so I want to thank all of you and your hardworking staff for all the work that you have done. You guys have paved the way for enhanced and unified telework practices and key technology changes that have stood the test of time.

And, you know, as you mentioned, we have Mr. Perlmutter, who has—I think Ms. Scanlon has been on the committee and Mr. Reschenthaler.

And I just want to take the time to thank you for your incredible work. And I hope that the—that when the majority put their rules package together, that the work that you guys have been doing gets to continue.

And, Representative Bourdeaux, thank you for your service to the Congress. We are sad to see you go, and we appreciate your insight here today but your many contributions.

And, Representative Davidson, thank you for your exhaustive list of recommendations, but I know that they are all offered in the spirit of trying to make this institution better.

And, Representative Radewagen, I agree with you. That is why we extended in our rules package, you know, what you are requesting. And I hope that the new majority will do the same thing.

And, Representative Latta, thank you. I mean, I really haven't thought much about your amendment. But, you know—you know, I remember being in the minority. And some of the titles that the Republicans came up with for their bills I didn't think were necessarily accurate of what we were voting on—voting on but, nonetheless, were, you know, kind of, to the average person, you know, who is not paying attention to the substance of the bill but just the title, sometimes it is difficult to explain.

And I do think we ought to figure out ways to move away from this kind of "gotcha" mentality where we are constantly trying to put people into a corner rather than having thoughtful discussions about the substance of legislation.

So, again, I appreciate all of you being here.

Let me yield to Dr. Burgess.

Dr. BURGESS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank all of our witnesses. Very thoughtful suggestions you have brought forward.

Mr. Timmons, I am particularly intrigued by your deconflicting strategy. Fundamentally opposed to cloning, but there have been several occasions where I feel like I have to clone myself to be in two subcommittee hearings and a Rules hearing at the same time.

I don't know how it would work as a practical matter. Someone would have to pay attention to it and, I don't know, that may be a bridge too far. But I am intrigued that you have at least given it some thought and tried to give us a practical, workable solution.

Do you have any idea as to how it would actually be enforced?

Mr. TIMMONS. So right now the CAO and the Clerk's Office are working to—they have a number of requests for proposals out to give us the actual—essentially an app. And once the portal is created, it would create a common calendar that all the committees would have to put their information into so you could just see.

And, ideally, eventually we would get to the point where we would have, like middle schools do, block scheduling where certain committees meet during certain times.

Unfortunately, Rules is never going to be perfect. We are never going to be able to dictate. It is just not going to work. But the rest of the committees can make serious strides.

My big thing is evidence-based policymaking in a collaborative manner from a position of mutual respect. That is what we are supposed to be doing. We don't do that because we never actually go back and forth.

Four years in Congress, I have gone back and forth once, and that is with Perlmutter in a subcommittee hearing for financial institutions on Financial Services. And that was one time in 4 years. And we had a great experience and we learned a lot, but we sat there for 2 hours. I have only been in one committee hearing for 2 hours, and I was out because I have to go to all these different places.

So just putting it all in one place is step one. And once we see all the different conflicts, sometimes, I would imagine, a committee chair would say, Oh, well, it looks like three-quarters of my committee has a conflict right now. And it looks like we are better up here. We could just do that.

Maybe that happens. Maybe it doesn't. But if we get everything into one portal, we can then create possibly an algorithm or possibly block scheduling that will help deconflict.

That is the idea, and I just think this is the first step in exploring it. I think we all want to be in our committee hearings. This is just the first step in the right direction.

Dr. BURGESS. Well, I thank you for that.

And I am reminded, when I first got here, the Rules Committee, I think, met at 11 o'clock at night, which probably would be a step forward in this.

The CHAIRMAN. How lucky you are you have me.

Dr. BURGESS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Right.

Dr. BURGESS. Mr. Davidson, Show Your Work amendment on the CBO, perhaps as a corollary to that—and one of the things I have learned over the years—the answer you get depends upon how you ask the question. And took me a long time to learn that in many meetings with the CBO to figure out the inner workings of their process. So you are right, I think it could be a great deal more transparent and Members would actually get factual information that they could actually use. And that I think would be a step in that direction. So thank you for bringing that forward.

I will yield back, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me just add, I think another way that would make committee work easier is if we didn't call for roll call votes on every single noncontroversial bill. I hope that we don't follow the example that has been made by some people in this current session, because the bottom line is that it interferes with committee work, and committee work is some of the most important work that gets done around here. It is not what always happens on the floor. It is what happens in committee.

Mr. Perlmutter.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Thanks, Mr. Chair.

And I want to thank the panelists for your testimony. I serve on a lot of committees with all of you. We have got five members of the Modernization of Congress Committee in the room right now.

And one of the things that did come up constantly was scheduling conflicts, and so that I know that is why you highlighted that. But there are probably another dozen suggestions from our committee in the rules change requests that have been made.

I mean, everything—Mr. Davidson and I agree on a lot of different things. We disagree on some things. And the—one of the main points you brought up was the scope of healthcare on our budget, on our issues that we face here in the Congress, and whether or not, you know, there should be something just dedicated to that.

In my opinion, I think you are right, because it takes up so much time and space and costs from a Federal perspective but in everybody's lives. So I just appreciate the suggestions that have been made.

Mr. Latta and I differ on some questions concerning compensation, which I wish were in these suggestions that were made to the Rules Committee as to housing allowances and per diems and whether or not we have a dual-duty station which is something that only Congress faces.

And for those of you that don't understand what dual-duty station means, I didn't know what it meant until it was explained to us in our committee. And Congress, unlike anyplace else in the Federal Government or in the military, where you live is your primary duty station. And if you go outside of that, you are entitled to per diem, except with respect to Congress where we have a dual-duty station. It can make some sense but not really. It says you have two primary duty stations, your home and Washington. Therefore, you are not entitled to a per diem. But, obviously, gets expensive over the years, maintaining two homes, especially one of them being here in Washington, D.C.

So I appreciate all of the suggestions that are—have been delivered to the Rules Committee from the select committee. I wish we would have seen a little more on the compensation for Members. But we have, I think, till Christmas. I don't know. When are we supposed to get out of here, the 16th but probably more like Christmas?

The CHAIRMAN. Yeah, January 2.

Mr. PERLMUTTER [continuing]. To work on—work—January 2, okay—to work on some compensation matters that I think would benefit the institution.

And, with that, I will yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Reschenthaler.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want the record to reflect that that is actually my favorite flavor of Polar water.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. So Christmas is coming, not so—

The CHAIRMAN. It is actually made in Worcester, Massachusetts, where I come from.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Just shameless.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. You have got to have some fun.

And, Mr. Perlmutter, for the third time today I am going to associate myself with your remarks. Well said, my friend.

Mr. Timmons, I just have a quick anecdote. I don't know if you remember this, but real early when we got to Congress, you got really frustrated on the floor; you just threw your hands up and said, we have got to fix this. And I think it is amazing that 4 years later, you have actually fixed a lot of the things that you were complaining about within literally the first 2 or 3 weeks of us being here. So not everybody can say that, so congrats to you and everything you did on ModCom. It has been an honor to serve with you on that committee.

Mr. Latta, love your idea about the naming. Incredible idea.

Mr. Davidson, we are just not going to agree on earmarks, but I don't want to belabor the point.

So, with that, I am going to yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Mr. Morelle.

Mr. MORELLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I actually want to also associate myself again with Mr. Perlmutter. You know, I have the benefit of being an empty nester. In terms of financial compensation, it is really not an issue here, but I think for younger Members with small families, small children, particularly those who are traveling all across the country, I think the lack of congressional will to have a cost-of-living adjustment or somehow to compensate Members for cost. I know this is not very popular. No one is going to, you know, jump up and down about it, but I think this is a missed opportunity to do something to fix it.

I think when there are private sector jobs that are paying three, four times what Members make, and there is half, you know—some Members come here with an eye already on how they are going to monetize their service here. You are not going to get rich as a Member of Congress. That is not the point of it. But I think it is when you, you know, maintain two households and you don't get the benefit of a tax break. I really think in terms of modernizing and encouraging people who are mid-career to come here, to leave what they do as their chosen profession to represent communities with no guarantee that they are going to be able to stay here for a long time or that they will even want to, but to go back into their profession is a hardship.

And I think to really—you know, again, I know it is not popular, I know no one is going to jump up and down, we are not going to get a letter sign on with 300 Members calling for it, but I just

think we are going to make it harder and harder to attract talented people to come to Congress if you are not willing to compensate people for something that is not what they would make in the private sector but is commensurate with other Federal officials, Federal judges and others who make significantly more. And I don't think it is—I think this is a missed opportunity.

Again, I am not speaking for me personally. I have been blessed. But for a lot of other Members, I think it has got to be a real struggle. And you would want them to be able to serve without having to make significant financial sacrifices to be here.

As it relates to the amendments, again, I want to thank people for their thoughtfulness about what they bring here. Mr. Timmons and Mr. Kilmer and the committee have done, I think, a really solid job. I may not agree with all of the amendments and all of the thoughts, but I think it is really thoughtful about how to move us forward.

Also wanted to commend the idea of having a healthcare committee. I think that—you know, healthcare has now become such an important part of the American economy, frankly, you know, although there are 50 different States that all, you know, regulate it differently. When it comes to ERISA plans and a lot of what we do, it is now becoming a national agenda item. And I think dividing it up by multiple committees that have jurisdiction, whether it is Ed and Labor or Energy and Commerce or Ways and Means, I just think it is a disservice. It is really hard to have a thoughtful conversation about healthcare policy in the United States when you have multiple committees weighing in, and I just think given the growth in what it means to GDP.

And frankly, we are going to be—and I say this a lot back home talking about Medicare, Social Security, we are entering a stage in American life where two-thirds of baby boomers are now on Medicare. It is going to be the other third will be in in the next 6 or 7 years. It is going to put an enormous, enormous burden and responsibility on those programs. And to think about how to provide healthcare in a way that has better outcomes from a healthcare point of view, from a medical point of view, lower costs, how you make sure that patients have a—have a system that values them and also providers have a system that values them, the so-called quadrupling of healthcare. I don't see any meaningful efforts at getting to a better system here. And I think that is partly because the way we have designed the Congress and the way that we deal with these responsibilities.

So I, you know, I am sure my friends who are committee chairs of the jurisdictions that have it now probably wouldn't want to hear it, but I think it is something we really ought to give serious thought to, and I want to thank you for recommending it as well.

And I will yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Fischbach.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And I would just like to talk a little bit or just kind of add to what Mr. Morelle was talking about with the healthcare issue. I was shocked when I got here and there wasn't a committee just devoted to that, because it is such a gigantic issue. And so I agree. And, you know what I am going to do? I am going to associate my-

self with the remarks of Mr. Morelle. So, you know, we messed up the——

Mr. MORELLE. I urge you to continue that thought in the months and years ahead.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Well, I just wanted to mess up, you know, the trend, you know, associating myself with Mr. Perlmutter. So I am just kind of changing things up a little bit to keep people awake.

But, no, the other thing that I really, really like is the scheduling issue because, again, I was shocked when I got here that every—it seemed like every one of my committees met at the exact same time. I mean, there was never a chance to, you know, make sure that you got to them. And so that I think some kind of scheduling, if it is blocked or whatever or just some kind of coordination makes so much more sense, because it is disappointing when you are not able to stay at a committee the entire time because you are on the committee, because you are interested in the topic and you want to make sure that you are, you know, there. So I appreciate bringing that forward and the healthcare issue too.

Thank you. I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Any other question of this panel?

Seeing none, you are free to go. Thank you very much.

Representative Cammack, Representative Massie, Representative Joyce.

Do you want to go first? Mr. Joyce, why don't you go first? Okay. You know, people are coming and going, I am having a tough time keeping track of everybody.

You may begin. Yes.

**STATEMENT OF THE HON. DAVID P. JOYCE, A
REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO**

Mr. JOYCE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I have an amendment that would establish a bipartisan Ethics task force to conduct a comprehensive review of the Ethics rules and regulations and report the recommended improvements to the bipartisan leadership.

Why now you might ask. Well, it has been 30 years since the House established a comprehensive Ethics task force to improve its rules and regulations. The last time this was done in 1989 by then-Speaker Jim Wright and later Bob Michel. The 1997 and 2007 task force were process, not rules focused.

The rules should be improved to ensure Members are not personally profiting from their official position. If the current rules allow a Member to accept a \$35,000 charity event ticket for free, it is time to change the rules. If the current rules allow a Member to sell for any price his or her life story as intellectual property, it is time to change the rules. If the current rules allow a Member to accept a wedding gift of any value from a lobbyist and not disclose the gift, it is time to change the rules.

The rules should be improved to reduce the confusion and promote compliance. Example one: There is three different rules to apply to three different posts they may put out on social media. Now remember, 30 years ago, we didn't have social media. So from official press releases, the 72-hour rule applies before the same lan-

guage can appear on campaign social media without taking the original press release down from the official site. From press outlet videos, videos quoting, referencing, or featuring a Member of Congress, the exhausted use test applies and your office gets to decide when an interview or video has exhausted its official use and can be posted by the campaign, and this can be less than 72 hours. For social media posts, these posts, not in the form of a press release, neither the 72-hour rule nor the exhausted use test apply.

For another example: In September, the committee announced the guest policy for change in attendance at events. Before the change, the type of event you were attending determined the type of guest you could take, maybe a spouse, a staffer, adult child, or a minor child. We have a chart here that gives you the different examples of different events and all the different ways in which someone might or might not be eligible to be able to attend with you. I think the times have changed as well on that type of example. But it is confusing how a simple invitation to an event, now a Member can take any kind of guest to any of these seven different types of event.

Lastly, how would the task force be set up? Equally bipartisan, similar to the Ethics Committee, with three Republicans and three Democrats, current Members, and two bipartisan former members serving in an ex officio capacity, participating in the substantive conversation but not voting on the recommendations. Task force staff would include current Ethics and House Administration Committee staff, who would conduct a comprehensive review of ethic rules and regulations. The task force will complete recommended improvements—report the recommended improvements to the bipartisan leadership, and all will take a confidentiality oath on the things that they listen to, hear, see, or do during the time of putting together such a commission.

[The statement of Mr. Joyce follows:]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. JOYCE. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Cammack.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. KAT CAMMACK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Mrs. CAMMACK. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you to all of the members here today for the opportunity to speak.

Several of the amendments before you—

VOICE. Will you turn your microphone on, please?

Mrs. CAMMACK. Oh, there it is. I thought it was already on.

So I am glad the committee is hosting this hearing today as the rules of the House affects all Members in their ability to best represent their constituents. House rules probably isn't the most interesting topic for people back home, but, trust me, everything that we do here in the House—debate, offer bills, amendments, our committee activity—it is dictated by the House rules. And I think it is fair to say that many across this country feel that this place is broken. So we are starting here with rules.

The most important part of this job is casting a vote on each bill on the House floor on behalf of our constituents, deciding whether or not it should become law or not. This responsibility should never

be taken lightly, as each bill has the potential to impact Americans all across this country. Every Member should have the opportunity to know the content of each bill that is considered, its cost, and how it will impact their constituents. It is a very simple concept. That means every Member of Congress should, at minimum, have the opportunity to read each measure prior to consideration.

However, in current practice, we often find ourselves with mere hours to read the bills that are hundreds or even thousands of pages long. Lately, I have found that the longer the bill is, the less time that Members have to read it. Providing Members with sufficient time to read each bill is one method to ensure that every Member of Congress on behalf of their constituents has made the best decision.

In the 118th Congress, we should strengthen the rules of the House to give Members of this body time to analyze and read each piece of legislation. This rule should be upheld for every bill with no exceptions or waivers unless two-thirds of the majority support.

I strongly support this change to House rules and request its inclusion as part of the House rules next Congress.

And I would also like to touch briefly on single issue bills. In the same vein, I believe another necessary change to House rules that would strengthen Members' input in the legislative process is limiting bills to single issues. This change would bring much needed transparency to Congress for Members and the public alike, and it would ultimately expedite the legislative process.

Since I have been in Congress, the most expensive and consequential bills are massive and touch every single issue. In such bills, there are policies throughout that would have broad support of Republicans and Democrats alike, but each include riders that require Members to tacitly decide if the good outweighs the bad. I can't tell you how many times I have had to go home and say, it was all bad, but I had to decide which was worse.

Legislating in such a way is frustrating to me, to our colleagues, and certainly to our constituents. Each policy should be considered on its own merits separately. The House Rules Committee should require that every bill be single issue, focusing on one subject at a time. In doing so, Members can easily discern the policy being considered and cast their vote.

And on a personal note, I would say that I probably wouldn't be here in Congress today had it not been for a program created through one of these massive bills that was rushed through on the House floor.

In 2008, the affordable—the Home Affordable Modification Program, as many of you know it, HAMP, was included in a bill that was hundreds of pages long and modified numerous Federal policies. This program was a disaster and ultimately cost millions of homeowners across the country their homes.

However, this provision, like every provision we vote on in Congress, should have been considered on its own merits, and legislators should have had the opportunity to debate this program. But they didn't. The American people deserve representatives who have the opportunity to read, debate, and consider each policy on its merits. And had this been the case for the HAMP program, it is

possible that my family, along with the 6 million other families across the country, we might not have lost our homes.

Again, I believe that single-issue bills will bring much needed transparency to the legislative process and restore the broken trust in this institution. I encourage the committee to include this change in the 118th rules of the House.

Thank you again for the opportunity to speak on these recommendations today. And I would also like to associate myself with the comments that Representative Massie is about to deliver. So thank you.

[The statement of Mrs. Cammack follows:]

Mr. MASSIE. Boy, that is a good—

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Right.

Mr. MASSIE. Well, I am going to change the topic of what I was going to—

The CHAIRMAN. Yeah. You don't even know what he was going to say, but—

Mrs. CAMMACK. We are living dangerously.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Massie.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. THOMAS MASSIE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF KENTUCKY

Mr. MASSIE. I do want to associate myself with the remarks that Mrs. Cammack made, because we sat down here and realized that we were making the same proposal. Must mean it is a great proposal to change the rules.

The American people—and this proposal is for the American people. I haven't found a single American who disagrees with this proposal. In fact, I am a little bit embarrassed at how modest it is, because back home they are going say, that doesn't go far enough. Yet here, I am afraid, it is going to seem radical and take a lot of work to convince people to adopt it, but it would increase the integrity of this House, and the work product would be better that comes out of it.

My amendment is simple. We have a lot of rules here, very good rules; I just think we should follow one of these rules more frequently. And so what my amendment would do is require a two-thirds vote of the full House to waive the current 72-hour rule that gives us 72 hours to read the bill.

Now, a little bit of history on the 72-hour rule: It used to be 3-day rule under Republicans. And I would guess a lot of the reasons you were here at 11 o'clock at night is the text of the bill was not available until 11:50 on the first day, but the Parliamentarian said that counts as a day in our 3-day rule and so we could shorten it. And then on the third day, we would vote in the morning, so you could collapse the 3-day rule into maybe a 30-hour rule.

The Democrats, I have to give you credit.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. MASSIE. I will probably never do this again, but you changed it from a 3-day rule, which we cheated on all the time, into a 72-hour rule, which required an honest to goodness 3 days, 72 hours, between when the text was available and when we voted on it. And I was a little bit incredulous at the time because it seemed like such a good change to me, something that I had advocated for a

long time, but it wasn't but a few weeks until that rule got suspended and then regularly has been suspended for 4 years.

And so I think if we put this two-thirds requirement in before suspending that rule, that will help things. The two-thirds requirement on the 72-hour rule would include floor votes on bills that go through regular order, floor votes on bills that bypass committees and go directly to the floor, and conference reports as well.

I had a chairman of a committee that I served on once, and I will—he committed candor so I won't give you his name. He might be prosecuted for candor. That is a sin in Washington, D.C. He had a bill ready right before August recess, and we asked if we could—members of the committee asked if we could get a little peek at that bill because we were going to vote on it when we came back from August recess. And he said, legislation is like roadkill, the more it sits out, the more it gets picked apart. And so we didn't get to see the bill until we came back from August recess. He was being honest.

Now, that is the view from inside of Congress. I don't know why a chairman would call his own bill roadkill, but what he is conceding is that when you open a bill up to public scrutiny, the bad things in it will be found. And I am under no illusion that if you give us 3 months to read a bill that all of our colleagues will read the bills. I mean, you all are on the Rules Committee. You are probably the most informed of any of the Members of Congress, because you have to read the bill and know the bill to write the rules for it. But our colleagues aren't going to read all these bills, but their constituents, if we give them 3 days, 72 hours, the bill text goes up, the media can report on it. And then by the third day, we have that vote. And there is a chance to get this feedback mechanism going that is so important in a Republic like ours or a democracy, whatever you want to call it, representative democracy.

So this is what I am proposing. And in the spirit of my proposal, I am giving you a full month to review it before we have to vote on it. And the objections that I expect to encounter will actually be from the majority, regardless of which party is in the majority, because their argument will be from the majority that, oh, you are making us go to the minority's side of the aisle, you are making us go over there if we want to pass legislation quickly. And we worked really hard to get to majority, to get this power, and we are not going to give any of it up.

But I would suggest to the majority that if we take the high road, America will be better off, the institution will be better off. And we will produce better legislation, and we can set an example. If we buckle up and do this for 2 years, regardless of who has the majority next time, it will be hard to undo this, because the American people will get used it, and they will demand that, you know, maybe we don't read the bills, but we have time to read the bills, that they have time to read the bills before we take action on the part of 750,000 constituents back in our district.

So I urge the adoption of this amendment, and thank you for indulging me.

[The statement of Mr. Massie follows:]

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you all. Thank you very much for your testimony.

Mr. Joyce, I haven't really thought much about your proposal, but I don't think—it sounds okay to me. So I don't know what the Ethics Committee [inaudible] look into these jurisdictional, you know, it is my turf—but I mean—but I think simplifying the, you know, processes and rules and regulations around here, I think everybody would appreciate very much. And so, I mean, we can see.

And I appreciate the kind words about the McGovern rule, the 72-hour rule. And, you know, I think, you know, precisely because of what you just said is why we instituted it to begin with. And, you know, 90 percent of the bills considered pursuant to this rule and Congress have complied with that rule. So contrary to mythology that, you know, it is the other way around. I mean, that is the way it has been. And I hope that you will be successful in persuading the new majority to keep the McGovern rule in place. And, you know, if you have a real problem with the 10 percent that we waived it on and you want a better record by the Republicans, that you will press the leadership here to do that.

You know, I don't regret the few exceptions either that we had to waive the rule to move bills to the floor quickly to deal with emergencies, like the infant formula emergency for example, or Russia's unjustified war against Ukraine. And as I have said many times before, there are also some bills that, you know, no one needs that long of a time to review, but providing a few extra days to resolve any disputes or to answer any questions I think it important.

I also agree with you that we can have, you know, a 720-hour review process and that doesn't mean Members are going to read the bill. I don't know whether you have read the bills that we brought up before the Rules Committee today for consideration this week, but they have been available for over 72 hours. I am willing to guess that you haven't, but that is okay. But so, again, I hope that the new majority will keep the McGovern rule in place if, you know—and 90 percent is like an A, right? A minus. You want an A plus, then that is something you ought to strive towards. And I hope that we can—and I am happy to be supportive of that.

Yeah.

Mr. MASSIE. If I may, in the 10 percent where you had to subvert or short circuit the 72-hour process, I think there are cases in there where you may have had two-thirds of the vote and this wouldn't have been a hindrance, I think, on most of the Ukraine votes that got two-thirds.

The CHAIRMAN. And, you know, and maybe, you know, I mean, and these guys will have to weigh that and decide whether, you know, that is the right thing to do. You know, I am not here to speak against that. But I am just simply saying that we have tried to change this so that Members have more time, because you are right. I mean, I—you know, I mean, previously it was 3 days, and you could count at 11:59 p.m. as 1 day and, you know, then you could vote on it at 3 in the morning on the third day, and so no one has time to look at this stuff.

I just will also say, you know, and this is not necessarily a rules change, but it is a cultural change or an attitude change is that, you know, I don't think that every single bill has to have a roll call vote. There are some bills that we know are going to pass 435 to nothing, you know, noncontroversial post office bills, you know, or

something that, you know, is not terribly Earth shattering. Sometimes it is like less than a paragraph, and yet to demand votes on everything cuts into committee work time. And a lot of the best, most important work that is done here is done in committee. And it creates this kind of hostile attitude.

And by the way, I say that not just as a Democrat who has been subjected to endless roll call votes by some of my Republican friends, but I know a lot of Republican Members who come to me and say, why don't you fix that in the Rules Committee? Because they too want to spend their time debating important legislation in committee.

And so, I mean, you know, I think if everybody has the attitude of that our job here is to govern, is to get stuff done, and sometimes disagree when we don't agree on things, but just move the process forward, I think things could be a lot better here. But, you know—anyway, but I appreciate everybody being here and I appreciate your recommendations. I look forward to this rules package being put together.

You know, I will say one thing that I did, you know, when I was—first became the chair, is I went around to all the different caucuses, not only talking to Democrats, but also to a lot of Republicans, and solicited their input. And we actually had a bipartisan vote. We had a few Republicans actually vote for the rules package when we first passed it, which is unprecedented. You know, we had some stuff in there, like the consensus rule to bring bills to the floor. Someone suggested that we ought to modify that so that it is revenue neutral. I mean, that is something we ought to talk about so we have an offset on big spending bills. You know, this Modernization Committee, the committee on Diversity and Inclusion, all those things kind of came out of discussions I had with people on both sides of the aisle.

And so I hope that the process in the next few weeks, you know, follows, you know, that example. I am not saying we did everything perfectly. I am not saying that—you know, there were things that I would have liked in our rules packages that couldn't sell to everybody. But again, your being here, your presenting these ideas I think is very constructive.

So, Dr. Burgess.

Dr. BURGESS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank our witnesses for sharing their valuable ideas with us.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask unanimous consent to insert statements from Representatives Boebert and Steube—

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection.

Dr. BURGESS [continuing]. Into the record on their Rules suggestions. And I yield back.

[The information follows:]

The CHAIRMAN. Yeah. And let me ask unanimous consent to insert into the record statements from Representative Jackson Lee and Chairman Grijalva. Chairman Grijalva's statement is in support of remote committee proceedings, which I want to state for the record, I have heard from several Members that remote proceedings in committees have been helpful in obtaining witness testimony without the worry of travel or cost to the taxpayer.

So without objection.

[The information follows:]

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Torres.

Mrs. TORRES. I have no questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Resenthaler.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Perlmutter.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Just a couple of comments.

So, Mr. Joyce, on your Ethics review, I absolutely agree. I think we are up to 600, 700 pages of Ethics provisions. And there are some things that are going to be needed, and there are going to be some things that I think this commission or this group will find are redundant, are confusing, need to be cleaned up. And so I absolutely agree with that.

Mrs. Cammack, the thing I wanted to say to you and Mr. Massie, so in any Congress probably the two most important votes you make are, one, for the Speaker and, two, for the rules package, because the rule—and in this last Congress, for me, the three most consequential votes I have ever taken in my life, and I have voted on a lot of things, the Speaker, the rules package, and the certification of the Presidency of that. And the reason being and, I think, you know, our experience—you all are going to want to do this differently, I imagine, but you should learn from our experience. With a very tight majority, those rules are particularly important. And for us, the ability to operate during COVID by taking advantage of technology—and I know that you are probably going to reject any kind of proxy voting or remote voting even for committees. You know, you ought to think twice, especially about the remote voting and the ability to use witnesses remotely. It just allows you to conduct business around here in a way that is in the 21st century and not in the 18th century.

And so the 72-hour piece is really, you know, important, but on the other hand, I am going to tell you, you are going to have some emergencies where that is not going to be available, to your point, then two-thirds of the people ought to be able to move something forward.

So I appreciated all your comments. But particularly every Congress needs to really understand their rules package, because outside of the election of the Speaker, it is the most important vote you are going to take.

And, with that, I will yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mrs. Fischbach. All set.

Mr. Morelle.

Mr. MORELLE. I do. I just have a couple of thoughts.

First, I agree with you, Mr. Joyce. I have actually just I think last week, the week before, did one of the required Ethics trainings. And every time I go through it, I scratch my head about certain provisions. And I think to myself, why am—to give you an idea, I have a very well known food cupboard in my community, not for-profit 501(c)(3), they are doing a food collection. I think I was told I couldn't put a basket in my district office because that violates the House rules. I was like, okay, I don't know what possible benefit that gives me by having.

So, you know, it is a small, silly example, but there are so many times and I will say, that is an Ethics violation but this isn't? So without any prejudging what the results would be, I think it is just—it is incumbent upon us, particularly since you cite social media and some of the things that were not around probably when the original, maybe even the current ones were written, I think really it does behoove us periodically to look at where our Ethics standards are and to think about this. Does this make any sense and who is it intended to benefit, what is the intent of this.

So it is funny, I had this list of proposed amendments that I had written yes next to yours before hearing you speak, so thanks for offering that. I would certainly support it.

Sort of curious on the 72-hour issue. So part of this is based on my experience in the State legislature. So in New York, we had a rule, if a bill was introduced on a Monday, it would have to have what we call the order of third reading—first reading, second reading, third reading—and you couldn't vote on it till Thursday. Similar to 72-hour rule.

But in our legislature, if a bill was amended, the clock started again. So an amendment changes the nature of the bill. Right? If an amendment is agreed to, the bill is different than the original form. And every single time you amended a bill, it had to go through another 3-day waiting period. The only way we could get around it under the New York State Constitution is if the governor issued a statement to us that said, you know, you waive the reading. So in an emergency, the governor could do it. I don't think it works well here. You are not going to have the President sign it. But two-thirds, in my mind, is—so first of all, the question I was going ask is, if an amendment is passed on the floor that changes the text of the original bill, is there a 72-hour waiting period that you envision, then, with the new bill before it could be—have final passage?

Mr. MASSIE. I can't speak to Mrs. Cammack's text, but my text just takes all of the rules of the existing McGovern 72-hour rule. I will give you due recognition there.

The CHAIRMAN. I hope you will keep the name if you keep the rule.

Mr. MASSIE. We might just change it to "govern."

The CHAIRMAN. Okay.

Mr. MASSIE. It will be a nod to your chairmanship and your great contribution to this rule.

So how does the existing 72-hour rule work if the bill gets amended on the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. It doesn't apply to that.

Mr. MASSIE. Okay. So it wouldn't apply to that.

Mr. MORELLE. Which seems to me, then, kind of an end around on the—I mean, essentially—because an amendment could be the elimination of every word in the substitute of a—right? That is what we do when we have an amendment to the nature of a substitute. So it is not foolproof, because you change—effectively, by amending the bill you could change the nature of—

Mr. MASSIE. You are already looking for a workaround.

Mr. MORELLE. Well, I am just saying it exists. I mean, it is sort of like, you know—

Mr. MASSIE. No. I appreciate that.

Mr. MORELLE. Yeah. I mean, any fence with a gap in it isn't a fence; it is just like a series of posts. And so it seems to me like that—that is the end around.

The other thing that I would say is, while I would struggle to maybe find a way to pierce the 72-hour rule, I think two-thirds of the House is just a bar too high to get over. If you really had an emergency and you had to pierce the 72-hour rule, two-thirds of the Members having agreed to it, seems to me that would be such that you might find yourself in a position where you really need to do something and you are not able to because the two-thirds is just too high.

So, I mean, I think—I understand what you are trying to do, but I think the two problems are the two-thirds, it is too high a bar. And the fact that you can amend a bill and change the text of it really leads you with no 72-hour rule at all.

I don't know if you want to respond to that or just acknowledge that I am right on the second one.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Oh, bless your heart. That is what we say in the South.

Mr. MORELLE. I know. It is what my friend Louise Slaughter would say, bless you.

Mrs. CAMMACK. No. And to the point about the 72-hour rule, I know that there are other proposals on the table that go further than the 72 hours. There is—you know, the 3 business days, you have the 72 hours as a whole, you have even less.

I am not saying that 72 hours is the end all be all. But I can't remember the last time that we have had an open amendment process that we could participate in that would actually trigger a situation where—

Mr. MORELLE. No. But you could have a structured—well, we do a lot of structured rules here where amendments are on the—we are voting on amendments all the time. If you were to adopt three or four amendments, it might dramatically change the underlying text of the bill, in which case there is no waiting period for that. You are going to move to immediate passage, which seems to me sort of defeats the 72-hour rule.

Mr. MASSIE. I would ask this, please adopt the amendment and we will see if that is a problem. And if it is, we will take your recommendation and clamp down on that loophole.

Mrs. CAMMACK. I second the gentlemen's—

Mr. MORELLE. Well, I mean, the other way to do it to address it would be any time the bill is amended, it starts the clock again. I am just not sure people want to do that. That is the way to guarantee you the 72 hours. You would still have the question of how to pierce the 72-hour rule if you had a real emergency and you needed to get it done. And to that point, I think two-thirds is just too high a bar. It is a standard that you would almost never be able to achieve.

Mrs. CAMMACK. But to the point that Mr. Massie was making about the two-thirds rule, and, Chairman McGovern, you were saying, you know, there were situations where the 72-hour rule had to be waived, and Ukraine was one of the examples. Two-thirds of the conference voted in support of those pieces of legislation. So I

think that your point about the two-thirds is actually far more viable than what you have stated. So—

Mr. MORELLE. What did I state?

Mrs. CAMMACK. That it wouldn't be—that it is too high of a threshold.

Mr. MORELLE. Oh, yeah. I mean, well, there are certainly some instances where you could reach it, but I think there are many times one side might view it differently, but I acknowledge it.

Mrs. CAMMACK. I mean, if it is truly an emergency situation, two-thirds of the majority—I mean of the conference.

Mr. MASSIE. When I wrote this amendment, I anticipated we would have 60 percent of Congress, the big red wave. And I wanted to make sure it would be bipartisan, so I thought we should set it at—

Mr. MORELLE. You could always have a waiver of the leader of the other side, which doesn't require two-thirds but just waives the—

Mr. MASSIE. I don't trust the other side any more than I trust our leaders.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Well, there you go.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Well, and if I may, I just want to say, I do appreciate the remarks that you have made about some of the Ethics recommendations today. When Hurricane Ian rolled through, I immediately tried to do a supply drive of simple things like food and water—

Mr. MORELLE. No, you can't do it.

Mrs. CAMMACK [continuing]. And basics, we couldn't do it.

Mr. MORELLE. Right.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Which is absolutely absurd. So there are a lot of things that I think we need to fix within the Ethics rules.

And then also to your point about diversifying Congress. I am married to a firefighter. I come from a very blue collar, working class family. If we are going to develop more talent within the ranks of Congress, we need to be able to provide an environment that people can do that. Otherwise you are going to have one group of people that are independently wealthy that can do this job. So I appreciate your remarks.

Mr. MORELLE. Well, I appreciate you all being here and your thoughtfulness. And I will—

The CHAIRMAN. Let me just say, final things. One is, you know, the 72-hour rule is a good rule, you know. And to the extent that, you know, it needs to be waived, it should be sparingly and for emergencies. And if you guys decide that you want to—a vote to be able to waive it, that is up to you. But the idea of giving people really—3 days and, you know, midnight, 11:59, that is one day, you know, the next day, and then, you know, 1 a.m. in the morning and that is your 3-day, that doesn't work. It should be 72 hours.

For example, the rail bill that we are dealing with today, no matter what he said, I mean, we don't like where we are, but it is an emergency. I mean, you know—so, I mean, there is an example. I don't know whether it would get two-thirds to be able to either bring it to the floor earlier, but whatever.

But putting that aside, let me just say one other thing. The number of people excited about these single-issue bills, bringing bills to

the floor that are just on one particular topic, my experience here is that life is complicated. And if you really want to solve a problem, sometimes it doesn't fit into this neat little silo, you know. You know, I do a lot of work on food insecurity and hunger.

Mrs. CAMMACK. I know, we serve together.

The CHAIRMAN. Right. Agriculture Committee, right? But to solve that problem is not just SNAP, it is not just our food and nutrition programs; it is other things too. It is housing, it is whether people have a job, whether people get paid a decent wage. So sometimes these issues intersect with a whole bunch of other issues. The farm bill in and of itself, you can't really say that is just one topic. It covers a whole range of things. Not just aid to our farmers, but it covers our food and nutrition programs, it covers a whole bunch of stuff.

So I get this idea that, you know, people want to kind of simplify things and make things easier to digest, you know, for people who may be watching. But if you really want to solve some of these problems, sometimes it requires bringing in other topics. Again, not to confuse things but, you know, to actually effectively legislate and get something done. I mean, otherwise, you are talking about, you know, doing nine different bills for what you could do one bill for.

So as you figure out with your leadership what that—how you narrow down these topics, I mean, just I think we need to be cognizant of the fact that, you know, solving problems doesn't always fit into one nice, neat, little discrete category. It involves a lot of different things. And again, the bills like the farm bill is an example. It is multitopics.

And so anyway, does anybody else have any—

Mr. MORELLE. I just want to—I am sorry—speak on his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead, please.

Mr. MORELLE. I was going to close before I yield just to say that on the—I actually think that the 72-hour and a period of time for Members to look through it, have ample opportunity, I think is a great idea. I just wanted to raise the question about how you trigger when you go—when you need to pierce it. But I think it is a great idea.

And I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Massie.

Mr. MASSIE. I just want to thank Mr. Joyce for offering his amendment. I think the American public would be appalled if they saw our Ethics manual. I mean, it looks like it was written with a typewriter, it is so old. Predates the internet, it has got conflicts. And the real Ethics manual isn't really compiled. It is like a bunch of emails and addendums and hearsay. Like, we are operating under hearsay.

Somebody needs to take all that, compile it, and do a new Ethics manual. And it conflicts with some of the other stuff, like House Admin. So I would just speak in support of his amendment to update that manual.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Torres had a—

Mr. JOYCE. Thank you.

Mrs. TORRES. Yeah. I just want to say how much I have appreciated this—I wouldn't call it debate, but this back and forth, ev-

everyone using their indoor voice and everybody respecting each other's opinion. And I really hope that, you know, today's meeting of Members' input can really set the stage for how we conduct ourselves moving forward.

I really appreciated the three of you—or appreciate the three of you being here today and how we have exchanged ideas. Thank you.

Mr. MASSIE. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Any other questions of this panel?

Hearing none, you are free to go.

Are there any other Members who wish to testify on the rule change proposals?

Seeing none, that closes our Members' Day hearing. All right.

So, without objection, the committee stands in recess, subject to the call of the chair.

We are not quite ready yet, but we will probably meet here before votes.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Before 6:30 but after 5 o'clock?

The CHAIRMAN. Yeah. Like an hour or so. That is a good—that is a good—that is our hope.

And the Rules Committee is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 4:48 p.m., the committee was adjourned, subject to the call of the chair.]

TIM BURCHETT

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
1122 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-4802
(202) 225-5435

DISTRICT OFFICES:
809 Market Street, Suite 116
Knoxville, TN 37902
Phone: (865) 523-3772
Fax: (865) 544-8726

331 Court Street
Mayfield, TN 37094
Phone: (865) 894-5464
Fax: (865) 894-0221

<https://turchett.house.gov>

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-4202

COMMITTEES:

Committee on Foreign Affairs

SUBCOMMITTEES:

Asia, the Pacific, Central Asia and Nonproliferation;
Middle East, North Africa and Global
Counterterrorism

Committee on Transportation and
Infrastructure

SUBCOMMITTEES:

Aviation
Highways and Transit
Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials

November 28, 2022

Hon. Kevin McCarthy
House Republican Leader
H-204, The Capitol
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Leader McCarthy,

Thank you for your leadership of our Conference, both in the past and as House Republicans prepare to enter the majority in the 118th Congress.

I write today requesting your support for a number of changes to House Rules of Procedure for the 118th Congress. Those rules changes, proposed language for which is enclosed with this letter, include:

- Requiring that short and long bill titles be germane to the content of legislation, and that vague phrases such as “and for other purposes” cannot be used to circumvent this rule;
- Requiring the Clerk to read a bill’s CBO score immediately following the reading of the bill title on the floor and prior to any floor action;
- Requiring that a bill have a CBO score before it can be considered on the House floor;
- Prohibiting legislation, including suspensions but excluding amendments, from being considered en bloc;
- Prohibiting the passage of legislation within a rule bill (i.e., “deeming” legislation as passed upon the passage of a Rule bill);
- Prohibiting an Amendment in Nature of a Substitute that changes more than 50% of the underlying bill’s text, or that substantially changes the original scope and purpose of the bill; and
- Prohibiting consideration of any legislation on the House floor that has not been reported out of the appropriate committee(s) of jurisdiction.

Additionally, I and many of my colleagues appreciate your commitment to returning the House to normal operations as soon as our party takes control on Jan. 3. It is my hope that this return to normal will not only include easing access to the Capitol and surrounding facilities and eliminating proxy voting, but will also include a prohibition against virtual committee meetings. The people’s business should be conducted in-in-person and in the open.

Furthermore, our members and the American public deserve to have an appropriate amount of time to read legislation before Congress acts on it, which is why I respectfully request a stricter adherence to so-called 72-hour rule, which is ignored too often in our chamber.

House Republicans have an opportunity to show Americans that we are the party of fiscal responsibility, accountability, and rule-of-law. These common sense changes to House rules will demonstrate that we are serious about making Congress work once again for the people of the United States.

If you have any questions about these proposed changes or if I can be of assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tim Burchett", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Tim Burchett
Member of Congress

[DRAFT]

NOVEMBER 15, 2022

117TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. RES. _____

Amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the consideration of bills and resolutions whose long titles or short titles do not convey accurately and specifically the scope of their contents.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BURCHETT submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on _____

RESOLUTION

Amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the consideration of bills and resolutions whose long titles or short titles do not convey accurately and specifically the scope of their contents.

1 *Resolved,*

2 **SECTION 1. PROHIBITING CONSIDERATION OF BILLS AND**

3 **RESOLUTIONS WITH MISLEADING TITLES.**

4 Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representa-

5 tives is amended by adding at the end the following new

6 clause:

1 “13. It shall not be in order to consider a bill, joint
2 resolution, or resolution with a title which does not convey
3 accurately and specifically the scope of its contents, or to
4 consider a bill, joint resolution, or resolution whose text
5 includes a short title which does not convey accurately and
6 specifically the scope of its contents.”.

117TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 220

Amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require the Clerk to read the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate of any bill immediately after the reading of the title of the bill.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 11, 2021

Mr. BURCHETT submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules

RESOLUTION

Amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require the Clerk to read the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate of any bill immediately after the reading of the title of the bill.

1 *Resolved*, That clause 3 of rule II of the Rules of the
2 House of Representatives is amended by inserting at the
3 end the following new paragraph:

4 “(1) After the reading of a bill title, the Clerk shall
5 read the estimated cost, if any, of such bill as determined
6 by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office.”.

[DISCUSSION DRAFT]

NOVEMBER 16, 2022

117TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION**H. RES.** _____

Amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the consideration of any bill or joint resolution until a cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office has been available to the public, and for other purposes.

 IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BURCHETT submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on _____

RESOLUTION

Amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the consideration of any bill or joint resolution until a cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office has been available to the public, and for other purposes.

1 *Resolved,*

2 **SECTION 1. CBO SCORING OF LEGISLATION.**

3 Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representa-
4 tives is amended by adding at the end the following new
5 clause:

1 “13.(a) It shall not be in order in the House to con-
2 sider a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto
3 (including an amendment offered in the Committee of the
4 Whole House on the State of the Union or an amendment
5 adopted pursuant to the adoption of a rule providing for
6 the consideration of the bill or joint resolution) or a con-
7 ference report thereon, until an estimate of the costs of
8 carrying out such measure prepared by the Director of the
9 Congressional Budget Office has been made available to
10 the public on the Office’s public website.

11 “(b) It shall not be in order to consider a rule or
12 order that waives the application of paragraph (a).”

[DISCUSSION DRAFT]

NOVEMBER 16, 2022

117TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION**H. RES.** _____

Amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the consideration of en bloc bills or resolutions under suspension of the rules, and for other purposes.

 IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BURCHETT submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on _____

RESOLUTION

Amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the consideration of en bloc bills or resolutions under suspension of the rules, and for other purposes.

1 *Resolved,*

2 **SECTION 1. PROHIBITION AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF EN**

3 **BLOC BILLS OR RESOLUTIONS UNDER SUS-**

4 **PENSION OF THE RULES.**

5 Clause 1 of rule XV of the Rules of the House of

6 Representatives is amended by adding at the end the fol-

7 lowing new paragraph:

1 “(d) The Speaker may not entertain a motion that
2 the House suspend the rules with respect to the consider-
3 ation of en bloc bills or resolutions.”

[DISCUSSION DRAFT]

NOVEMBER 16, 2022

117TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION**H. RES.** _____

Amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit a resolution providing for the consideration of a measure from including a provision that, upon the adoption of the resolution, the House shall be considered to have passed a bill, joint resolution, resolution, or conference report.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BURCHETT submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on _____

RESOLUTION

Amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit a resolution providing for the consideration of a measure from including a provision that, upon the adoption of the resolution, the House shall be considered to have passed a bill, joint resolution, resolution, or conference report.

1 *Resolved,*

1 **SECTION 1. PROHIBITING RULES FOR CONSIDERATION OF**
2 **MEASURES FROM PROVIDING FOR PASSAGE**
3 **OF LEGISLATION BY HOUSE.**

4 Clause 6 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of
5 Representatives is amended by adding at the end the fol-
6 lowing new paragraph:

7 “(h) The Committee on Rules may not include in a
8 resolution reported by the Committee which provides for
9 the consideration of a measure a provision that, upon
10 adoption of the resolution, the House shall be considered
11 to have passed a bill, joint resolution, resolution, or con-
12 ference report.”.

.....
 (Original Signature of Member)

117TH CONGRESS
 2D SESSION

H. RES. _____

Amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit an amendment in the nature of a substitute or a manager's amendment to a bill or joint resolution from revising more than half of the text of the bill or joint resolution or from otherwise making a substantial change in the scope or purpose of the bill or joint resolution.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BURCHETT submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on _____

RESOLUTION

Amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit an amendment in the nature of a substitute or a manager's amendment to a bill or joint resolution from revising more than half of the text of the bill or joint resolution or from otherwise making a substantial change in the scope or purpose of the bill or joint resolution.

1 *Resolved,*

1 **SECTION 1. PROHIBITING AMENDMENTS IN THE NATURE**
2 **OF A SUBSTITUTE AND MANAGER'S AMEND-**
3 **MENTS FROM SUBSTANTIALLY CHANGING**
4 **TEXT, SCOPE, OR PURPOSE OF BILLS AND**
5 **JOINT RESOLUTIONS.**

6 Clause 7 of rule XVI of the Rules of the House of
7 Representatives is amended—

8 (1) by striking “No motion or proposition” and
9 inserting “(a) No motion or proposition”; and

10 (2) by adding at the end the following:

11 “(b) If an amendment in the nature of a substitute
12 to a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment to a bill
13 or joint resolution which shall be considered to be agreed
14 to upon the adoption of a resolution reported by the Com-
15 mittee on Rules to provide for the consideration of the
16 bill or joint resolution, revises more than half of the text
17 of the bill or joint resolution or makes a substantial
18 change in the scope or purpose of the bill or joint resolu-
19 tion under consideration, the amendment shall be consid-
20 ered to be on a subject different from that of the bill or
21 joint resolution for purposes of paragraph (a).”.

G:\M17\BURCTN\BURCTN_134.XML

.....
 (Original Signature of Member)

117TH CONGRESS
 2D SESSION

H. RES. _____

Amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the consideration of any bill or joint resolution that has not been reported by a committee, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BURCHETT submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on _____

RESOLUTION

Amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the consideration of any bill or joint resolution that has not been reported by a committee, and for other purposes.

1 *Resolved,*

2 **SECTION 1. PROHIBITION AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF**
 3 **MEASURES NOT REPORTED BY COMMITTEE.**

4 Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representa-
 5 tives is amended by adding at the end the following new
 6 clause:

G:\M\17\BURCTN\BURCTN_134.XML

2

1 “13. It shall not be in order to consider a bill or joint
2 resolution that has not been reported by a committee.”.

Rep. Lauren Boebert (CO-03)
Members' Day Hearing on Proposed Rules Changes for the 118th Congress
November 29, 2022

Chairman McGovern, Ranking Member Cole, Members of the Committee: we have a sacred obligation to the American people to make this House reflect the interests of the nation. Over the past two years, we've witnessed rogue bureaucrats and self-serving Democrat politicians take advantage of a beaten down America – these insidious efforts have been marked with unjust mask and COVID-19 vaccine mandates, mandatory school lockdowns and business closures, perversion of school curriculums, a zero-affordable energy policy, reckless spending, an open border agenda, and a slow, unrelenting attack on the resiliency of the American spirit.

The Speaker's gavel will now transfer hands, as will the gavel on this Committee and every Committee in the House – these midterm elections were an opportunity for the American people to decide if Democrats should continue their proverbial March to the Sea, burning down our national experiment and every good fruit that has emanated from the pursuit of freedom and liberty. Well, the people have spoken, and the Democrats have lost. The very same politicians responsible for our national malaise have been held accountable: we must now address the many sins of the Democrat Party's bureaucrat enablers.

It is long past time that we amend House Rules to allow for the revival of the so-called "Holman Rule", a procedural tool that would allow Members of Congress to introduce amendments to general appropriations legislation for the purpose of reducing the number and salaries of federal employees. It can also be used for the purpose of retrenching the compensation of any person who receives payment from the Treasury of the United States.

The Holman Rule was last instituted in the 115th Congress before it was unceremoniously scrubbed; as a result, we've all witnessed the rise of a political environment in which Congress has willfully and severely diminished its Constitutionally mandated charge of oversight in favor of rewarding unelected bureaucrats with comfortable salaries and impressive job security. Republican efforts to obtain reports, documents, data, and other important information from federal agencies have fallen on deaf ears; it's clear that without some level of coercion, the Congress cannot effectively exercise its Constitutional obligations. The Holman Rule needs to make a comeback.

This amendment to House Rules should be welcomed as an opportunity to restore transparency and trust in our government, but it isn't the only measure that ought to be considered by this Committee. It's beyond time for the Congress to focus on good governance in every facet of the legislative process.

For instance, Members should have at least 72 hours to review a bill – and require a 2/3 majority to waive that provision. Legislation should be focused on a single subject if it is not an appropriations or defense bill, and House Rules must require a comparative print of all legislation to assess how a bill under consideration will alter existing laws.

Bills placed on the Suspension calendar should be required to be fully paid for using tangible offsets, which would exclude using the Medicare Improvement Fund and extending increased VA home loan fees. Members on both sides are guilty of using these budgetary gimmicks to avoid making the hard decisions about where to cut spending. The willing extension of increased VA home loan fees is a particularly morally bankrupt approach that is as wrong-headed as it is disingenuous.

The House must also become more Member-focused; in that spirit, Committee Members must be able to elect their own Chairman, rather than having well-connected individuals make those determinations. The Motion to Vacate the Chair that existed for more than 200 years should also be reinstated to provide a necessary check for Members on House leadership.

The Republican Majority should further consider adopting a House rule that gives a floor vote to any amendment if it has at least 25% of the GOP conference in support – this will ensure that popular ideas from the rank-and-file have an opportunity to be debated and voted on. It is a rule change currently being debated to Conference rules and it should enjoy widespread support among the new majority.

Finally, the House Rules of the 118th Congress must also include a ban on earmarks. If legislation cannot earn votes on its own merits, bribing Members of Congress should not be the institutionalized backup plan.

I am grateful to the Members of this Committee for the opportunity to speak on behalf of these common-sense measures to restore accountability in our federal bureaucracy and stability in our legislative process. The American people have indicated their desire for change in Congress, and it is our obligation to carry out the charge we've been entrusted with. I look forward to the adoption of these recommendations in the Rules of the House of Representatives for the 118th Congress.

MEMBER DAY HEARING
COMMITTEE ON RULES
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Statement for the Record

Representative W. Gregory Steube

I appreciate the opportunity to come before the Rules Committee on behalf of the Republican Study Committee and Chairman Jim Banks to support the inclusion of the RSC's Truth in Testimony Reform Resolution to be added to House-rules. I am proud to be an original co-sponsor of the RSC's resolution which would help drain the swamp of foreign corrupt influence by fixing the loopholes in current rules which allow witnesses to testify before House-committees while being employed by entities which take money from foreign governments or foreign political parties, most worryingly the Chinese Communist Party.

The U.S. China Security and Economic Commission has noted that a number of Washington D.C. think tanks and universities have received funding from the United Front Work Department of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP). One study has found at least \$174 million in foreign funding to D.C. think tanks from 2014-2018 alone. Two years ago, the State Department, under former Secretary of State Mike Pompeo's leadership, required all think tanks speaking before the State Department to disclose foreign funding.

With the backing of conservatives, the House first adopted the Truth in Testimony rule in the 105th Congress to require witnesses appearing before House committees to disclose federal grants and contracts received during the present and previous two fiscal years. The rule was designed to give Congress insight into potential conflicts of interest of witnesses advocating for an increase in government spending. In 2015, a Republican Congress strengthened the rule by requiring witnesses to also disclose any foreign funding that they or their organizations had received after a 2014 New York Times investigation found that 64 foreign governments, entities, or officials contributed at least \$92 million to 28 major U.S.-based think tanks over a four-year period. At the beginning of this Congress, the rule was again updated to require witnesses to disclose affiliations with organizations and entities with interests in the subject of the hearing

Despite these updates to the rule, significant loopholes still exist. As was outlined in a recent piece by the New Republic, witnesses appearing before committees are often able to skirt disclosure requirements by claiming to testify in an individual capacity or self-assessing that foreign government funding they received is not related to the subject of the hearing. This is problematic considering Chinese Communist Party's (CCP) disinformation operations in the United States include funding Washington D.C. think tanks.

Forty-five of my colleagues have signed onto H. Res. 805 which would require maximum transparency so Congress and the American public understand exactly how foreign agendas may be influencing the public policy discussion that takes place before House committee. The resolution would require witnesses to disclose all foreign government, foreign political party, and foreign state-owned entity payments, grants, or in-kind contributions, to any nonprofit entity at which the witness is employed or working as a contractor for over \$5,000 a year, regardless of

whether or not the witness is testifying on their own behalf. It would also encompass agents and subsidiaries of foreign governments, foreign political parties, or foreign state-owned entities. In addition, the resolution would remove requirements that foreign funding only be disclosed if it were related directly to the subject of the hearing and instead require disclosure of all foreign government or foreign political party funding to an individual or his or her nonprofit organization employer. The resolution would also require paid advisers or consultants to foreign governments, foreign political parties, or their agents or instrumentalities, to disclose such information, as many such advisers or consultants do not register under the Foreign Agent Registration Act (FARA).

People paid by the CCP should not be testifying before Congress without disclosing that to the American people. I urge the Rules Committee to update the Truth in Testimony form requirements pursuant to the reforms outlined in the RSC's resolution.

MEMBER DAY HEARING
COMMITTEE ON RULES
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Statement for the Record

Representative W. Gregory Steube

I appreciate the opportunity to come before the Rules Committee. My proposed rule change is simple and common sense. It would create a system of random and mandatory testing for illegal drugs for Members and employees of the House. This is the same standard we apply to executive branch employees and military personnel. Our constituents have a right to know that their representatives in Congress come to Washington to work, not abuse drugs. Our constituents deserve to know that their representatives are not holding themselves above the law while writing the nation's laws. Specifically, my rule would direct either the Speaker or the Sergeant at Arms to create a system comparable to the executive branch drug testing system created through Executive Order 12564. Such testing will ensure the security and fitness to serve of Members and staff. I urge my colleagues to uphold the integrity and good name of the House of Representatives by adopting this rule change.

SHEILA JACKSON LEE
18TH DISTRICT, TEXAS
COMMITTEES:

JUDICIARY
SUBCOMMITTEES
Chair
Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and
Intelligence
Immigration and Citizenship
Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties

HOMELAND SECURITY
SUBCOMMITTEES
Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security
Technologies

Counterterrorism and Intelligence
Emergency Preparedness, Response, & Recovery

BUDGET COMMITTEE

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

STEERING AND POLICY COMMITTEE

WEE CHAIR
CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE
CAUCUS

CHIEF DEPUTY WHIP
DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

FOUNDER AND CO-CHAIR
CONGRESSIONAL CHILDREN'S
CAUCUS

CONGRESSWOMAN SHEILA JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Statement in Support of
CHAIRMAN JIM MCGOVERN'S ACTION TO END HUNGER IN AMERICA
AND SUPPORTING THE RULES COMMITTEE DRAFT REPORT ABOUT
ENDING HUNGER IN AMERICA: CHALLENGES, OPPORTUNITIES AND
THE POLITICAL WILL TO SUCCEED

November 14, 2022

9

Chairman McGovern, Ranking Member Cole, and members of the committee:

As a senior member of the House Committees on Judiciary, Budget, and Homeland Security, a longtime Member of the House Hunger Caucus, and as the Representative for Texas' 18th Congressional District whose progenitors are iconic leaders who fought to end hunger in the U.S. and globally, I am proud to support your effort, Chairman McGovern, and the efforts of the entire Rules Committee to address and solve the epidemic of hunger in America. In so doing, I am continuing the historic legacy of Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, who was a champion for human dignity and fought for the rights of all people regardless of race, gender, heritage, or economic status, and Congressman Mickey Leland, who worked tirelessly to raise awareness of, and fight for, policies to end hunger around the globe and who, tragically, died in a plane crash while working to end world hunger on a relief mission in Ethiopia.

I stand with each of you and with the advocates in your consolidated report who are working to solve the epidemic of food insecurity. I am committed to doing my part to make sure that everyone has enough food to eat and nutrition to thrive.

It is hard to believe that hunger exists in America, the land of plenty and agricultural preeminence. However, according to the USDA, more than 34 million people, including 9 million children, in the United States are food insecure, which means they don't have reliable access to enough nutritious food to lead a healthy life. In Texas, more than 4.5

million people struggle with hunger, and in South Texas, one in five households report some type of food insecurity, lacking consistent access to food. The pandemic has only exacerbated food insecurity among families with children and communities of color, who already faced hunger at much higher rates before the pandemic. These statistics are alarming, but they are also a call to action.

The fact is that no one in America should go hungry. In America, the term food desert should be nonapplicable. To achieve this end, we must address the structural barriers of hunger and investigate how to create better systems, supply chain and otherwise, that will ensure access to fresh and healthy food in every local community. We must tackle this problem legislatively and administratively. We must continue to invest in programs like Special Supplemental Nutrition Program (SNAP) and Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) that provide critical assistance to families in need.

Among the many legislative programs I have initiated, advocated for, and supported include funding at the highest level for SNAP, full funding for WIC, \$330 million for Emergency Food Assistance Program, \$30 million for Healthy Food Financing Initiative (HFFI), \$22 million for Senior Farmers' Market Nutrition Program, and \$55 million for Hispanic-Serving Agricultural Colleges and Universities (HSACU). The hearings that Chairman McGovern led have elevated these programs on the national agenda, and today's report coalesces efforts to raise the issue of hunger in America to the forefront where it belongs until we find a solution.

In my district, the organization Urban Harvest has developed an innovative model that uses refrigerated vans to bring fresh produce directly from local farmers to local communities most in need. Glen Miracle of Laughing Frog Farm says "Urban Harvest offers those of us who grow food the opportunity to connect with the small, but growing, number of people that want to improve their relationship with food, and its inevitable effects on our health." We need to support and grow these local solutions in order to make an impact on food insecurity.

Numerous organizations throughout my district operate community gardens. Community gardens not only provide an opportunity for people to connect with their food source, learn how to grow it, and share the harvest, they also create a sense of community and provide fresh produce. I am committed to supporting these efforts and will continue to work with my colleagues to find practical solutions that make healthy food accessible to all.

Technology can play a key role in the process as well. By using data and analytics, we can map out the most efficient supply chains and uncover any mismatches in supply and demand, in real-time, and redirect essential or excess food to those areas most in need. Earlier this year, when baby formula was in short supply nationwide for months due to pandemic-related supply chain issues, as the founder and Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I worked to address the needs of women, families, and children by directing baby formula to places where demand was surging and unfulfilled. There is no

reason that a crisis at one baby formula plant should create a shortage throughout the system. We must ensure food security through redundancy as well. We must create a system that ensures all those who are hungry can get access to the best available food when they need it.

We must never lose sight of the fact that each individual, through determination, has the power to help alleviate hunger, making a difference in their neighborhood and city. We can each do our part to help reduce hunger in our communities by donating food to local food banks or volunteering our time at a soup kitchen or food pantry.

Good and healthy food should be a right, not a privilege. It is our duty as a nation to ensure that all our citizens have access to the basic human need of nutritious food. We know that quality nutrition is the foundation for good health, academic success, and employment. It is also an essential element of our national identity. It is a fundamental right that should not be determined based on where one lives, one's race, or one's economic status. Chairman McGovern is doing the hard work of government to bring together the necessary stakeholders, identify the gaps, and elevate the most effective solutions.

Ultimately, as Americans, the effort to defeat food insecurity is a reflection of our values. President Biden has stated that "we are in a fight to restore the soul of our nation", and, in this context, that includes recommitting ourselves to recognizing the common humanity in each other and acting on that common humanity to ensure we all are food secure. This Administration is committed to working tirelessly to ensure that all Americans have access to the nutritious food they need in order to live happy, healthy, and productive lives. I am proud to collaborate with President Biden's administration and leaders like Chairman McGovern, and I pledge my full support to the efforts to solve the hunger crisis and fix food insecurity.

This is a fight we can and must win. By acting on our shared values through the work of this committee, and by the heroic work being done by food security advocates featured in the committee's report, "Ending Hunger in America: Challenges, Opportunities and the Political Will to Succeed", we will make great strides to ensure that no one in America goes hungry.

I know that my predecessors Barbara Jordan and Mickey Leland would be proud of the work that is being done in the United States House Rules Committee. I am sure that with sustained effort, we will find solutions to the hunger crisis, drastically reduce food insecurity, and enable all Americans to thrive.

###

Chair Grijalva Remarks
Committee on Rules Member Day Hearing
November 29, 2022

Thank you, Chair McGovern and Ranking Member Cole for the opportunity to testify. I would like to propose two changes to the standing Rules of the House for next Congress.

Earlier this year, I submitted remarks to the Rules Committee supporting the continuation of remote proceedings. Today, I am here to echo those sentiments and request that the standing rules of the House grant permanent remote and hybrid authority for Committee proceedings.

The Committee on Natural Resources has benefitted greatly from a remote option. Since its implementation at the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, remote and hybrid proceedings have made our events more accessible and increased the diversity of our witnesses.

For many Americans, the costs of traveling to Washington, DC, can be prohibitive. For example, before remote proceedings, many of our witnesses from the U.S. Territories would spend multiple days and thousands of dollars travelling to testify in-person. This was especially burdensome considering that our hearings typically last two to three hours, while round-trip travel from Guam can take more than two days. Now with a remote option, witnesses can share their testimony from their communities.

In addition to flight and accommodation expenses, witnesses often pay to testify in-person in the form of childcare arrangements, missed work, rescheduled appointments, and other unseen costs associated with travel. These burdens of in-person participation typically fall hardest on witnesses from impoverished and historically marginalized communities. In many cases, these are the people from whom we need to hear most.

The possibility of remote participation has lowered barriers significantly. Over the past two years, we have had multiple witnesses share that they would not have been able to testify if they'd had to do so in-person. This has been the case with events focused on environmental justice, issues faced by tribal communities, the U.S. Territories, and many more. Thanks to the remote option, we have been able to hear perspectives on important issues facing the American people — the value of which cannot be overstated.

We have already done the groundwork to make remote proceedings a success, and we have felt their benefits firsthand. Now is not the time to walk back this progress. For those who wish to maintain an in-person presence, hybrid events still provide that option without raising barriers to participation.

While there is always more to improve, I believe that continuing this practice is a necessary step in meeting Congress' responsibility to base our laws and

oversight on public input. I urge the Rules Committee to include this vital option in our standing rules next Congress.

In addition to remote authority, I would like to ask that the Rules Committee change the name of the House Committee on Natural Resources to the *House Committee on Natural Resources, Indigenous and Insular Affairs*.

This change would more accurately and respectfully reflect the Committee's jurisdiction and responsibilities toward Indigenous peoples and toward Insular communities in the U.S. Territories and Freely Associated States.

Depending on how you interpret the current name of our Committee, the name either omits these important functions entirely or, worse, it implies that these populations are themselves "natural resources" to be managed and exploited by the federal government.

I believe our Committee has a solemn duty to uphold the federal government's trust obligation toward tribes in a government-to-government relationship. I also believe that we have a similar responsibility to serve the historically marginalized and often disenfranchised people who are Indigenous but not federally recognized as tribes, such as Native Hawaiians, and the communities who live in the U.S. Territories.

The Committee's name should properly reflect these commitments, and I hope that this change can be implemented in the 118th Congress.

Thank you again for the opportunity to be here today. I yield back.