I would like to highlight the story of one such couple, Mary Leigh and Charlie Blek, from Orange County, California. These loving parents led the fight in my district and in California, for commonsense gun legislation.

Mary Leigh and Charlie's son, Matthew, was only 21 years old when he was shot and killed. He was a victim of an armed robbery by teens using a small handgun, also known as a ''Saturday Night Special'' or a ''junk gun.''

In memory of their son, the Bleks founded the Orange County Citizens for the Prevention of Gun Violence in 1995. For five long, hard-fought years, they advocated for safety regulations that would rid California of the type of gun that killed their son, and they succeeded.

California used to produce 80 percent of the junk guns for the Nation. California no longer produces these junk guns, and has enacted safety standards for handguns that are working to reduce gun violence deaths.

Still today, the Bleks are vigilant in preventing the gun lobby from finding new ways to sell dangerous handguns in California. They now lead the Orange County Chapter of the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence, and I am personally very grateful for their efforts, their leadership, and their courage.

No family should ever have to go through what the Bleks suffered, but too many in our own communities have. Since the beginning of 2014, in California, over 14,000 people, 14,000 people, including 120 law enforcement officers, have been injured or killed from gun violence. Forty-seven of those people hurt or killed were in my district, the 45th district. We have lost 34 members of our communities in just 4 years, all to gun violence.

This is a public safety problem, and, Mr. Speaker, doing nothing is unacceptable. This issue affects all of us, young and old alike.

Just last week, I received 60 letters, 60 letters from constituents living at Heritage Point, a senior community, each letter asking me to take action to prevent so many senseless deaths. These letters said: ''Most of us have families, children, grandchildren, and even great grandchildren. We have much anguish due to the recent and terrible shootings taking place almost in our own backyard.''

Gun violence destroys families and communities. We must work together to keep dangerous weapons out of the hands of dangerous people.

We cannot allow the frequent news of gun violence to desensitize us into believing it is the norm. It is not the norm, and it is not unavoidable. There is something we can do to prevent gun violence.

If Congress puts people first, people ahead of the gun lobby, we can save hundreds of lives each year. Our role, as elected Representatives, is to prioritize and fight for the well-being of our constituents and our communities, not the score we are assigned by the gun lobby.

Standing up to powerful special interests is a radical transformation of how Congress operates, but that change is long overdue.

We need commitment and action by Congress to pass commonsense gun laws like H.R. 8, to expand background checks. We need to fund CDC research on firearms and the impacts of gun violence.

Without Congress' action, if we simply offer thoughts and prayers, but do nothing, our children, our families, our communities, will increasingly suffer from preventable injuries, preventable suicides, and preventable homicides, preventable shooting massacres, and the fear and trauma associated with gun violence.

Gun violence is an epidemic, and we can no longer afford to point fingers or to place blame. We must act. On both sides of the aisle, we must have the courage to fight gun violence for the common good of the American people.

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

## BORDER SECURITY AND COMPROMISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the current committee meeting on our immigration problems and problems connected to the wall. I would like to spend a few moments updating the American people on the key issues and the status of the key issues that we ought to remember as that committee does its work.

I have spent some time talking with constituents in the Sixth Congressional District and, one more time, want to address their concerns, or maybe address some misconceptions that are out there regarding this issue.

The first thing I will address is the need to compromise. And it is true that, in this body, again and again, we must compromise. But I want to point out that prior to this committee, President Trump, has elected to—more than any other issue—deal with the immigration crisis, has compromised considerably.

First of all, on the issue of whether we need a wall—and we will talk about that wall. At various different times, various different people have suggested different amounts on the wall. Initially, people talked about 20 to $25 billion. The most recent or accurate estimate it would take—not to build an entire wall, but just to build parts of a wall in areas in which one could cross the border; in other words, areas in which the terrain does not form a natural border, would cost about $8 billion.

And I hope the negotiators who are Republicans will remember that $8 billion figure. I got it from the gentleman who was the head of the Border Patrol under the Obama administration.

President Trump, in an effort to reach some sort of compromise, has already gone down from $8 billion to $5.7 billion. I find that unfortunate, in that I toured the border about 3 weeks ago and, at the time—I know some of the wall that we so desperately need near Sasabe, Arizona, areas in which MS–13 has gone across the land, trampled across the land—and I have talked to the ranchers there, they will have to be told, sorry, we are building part of the wall, but not enough of a wall for you.

So already, that $5.7 billion figure is a big compromise.

I also want to point out with regard to time. People wonder why we are shutting down the government right now. Actually, we could shut down the government whenever people disagree on what should be in, what we call, an appropriations bill, but I think what people back home would call a budget. And every budget up here is a compromise. It contains hundreds of provisions. Every provision gone over, and maybe the Democrats want more of this; the Republicans want more of that.

In his first 2 years here, President Trump got budgets that contained very, very little for anything like a wall. This is unfortunate. President Trump, in particular, in a budget passed about a year ago, what we call an omnibus bill, complained what a bad bill it was. It was a horrible bill, but he signed it because he didn't want to shut down the government, which happens when both sides disagree.

So President Trump agreed to cave in to people that wanted to spend a lot more money on other things, in the interest of keeping the government open. But President Trump only gets a 4-year term.

For the first 2 years he signed appropriations bills without adequate money for the wall. Finally, in the third time around he said, look, I would be happy to sign a third year of appropriations, but this time, I would like money for a wall. He has compromised for over 2 years.

We had a government shutdown just 3 weeks ago because some headstrong Democrats, despite being happy to spend billions of dollars on other things, refused to give a little bit of money for the wall.

President Trump also extended the DACA program for another 2 years. And I will point out, that as well is something the Border Patrol was not thrilled about, because whenever you talk about extending the DACA program, it is kind of a magnet for people south of the border, because they believe we are not going to enforce our immigration laws anymore.

But, in an effort to compromise, President Trump agreed to extend the DACA extension for two more years. So there have been plenty of compromises already.

And my suggestion to the committee is that they bring in experts on how much it would take to really secure the border, and not be afraid if what President Obama's head of the Border Patrol said was right, and if we need $8 billion, then we spend $8 billion.

The next issue I am going to deal with is the cost of the wall; $5.7 billion or $8 billion—we will talk about the $5.7 billion President Trump has come down to—is a lot of money. But Congress spends a lot of money.

We should remember that the $5.7 billion President Trump wants is one-seventh the cost of foreign aid that this country spends every year. It is well under one-half of 1 percent of the overall Federal budget. It is actually about one-tenth of 1 percent.

President Trump has increased defense spending as President because our defense budget was too low to adequately protect our population. But the amount where he is asking for the wall is about one-twelfth of the increase that we will spend year after year after year on defense.

So you can see, when it comes to spending on anything but the wall, Congress has no time appropriating much more money; seven times the amount that we spend on foreign aid, and almost nobody objects.

All of a sudden, with the wall, oh, maybe it is too expensive.

The next thing I would like to address is, do we need a wall? What would happen if we don't have a wall?

Remember, I am talking about $5.7 billion for a wall. It really should be $8 billion.

□ 1830

First of all, about 90 percent of the heroin in this country comes across our southern border. Now, some people like to point out that the vast amount of heroin caught is at the points of entry, which is true. We have Customs at the point of entry, and they catch people.

In places where there is no wall, and I point to this area behind me near Sasabe, Arizona, people are not checked. We do not check vehicles. We do not check how much they have.

Occasionally, we are fortunate enough to catch people otherwise, but if you were going to sneak drugs across our southern border, would you try to go across a normal point of entry with plenty of Customs agents or out here in the middle of nowhere? Of course, in the middle of nowhere.

We are not serious about dealing with the heroin problem in this country or the fentanyl problem in this country unless we look to our southern border. We are not serious about securing our southern border until we get a wall.

Right now, at least 12 million people are in this country illegally, but the Border Patrol tells us they really have no idea how many people are in this country illegally because they don't count the number of people who are coming across in these open areas. They have told me it is entirely possible there are 20 million people in this country illegally.

Obviously, having so many people who are breaking the law just by being here is an unstable situation. When I talk to the Customs agents, they find evidence of EBT cards and evidence of Medicaid cards when people are walking across the border. Some of the people who are coming here illegally and, quite frankly, legally are illegally taking advantage of our welfare system.

If they are sick, they are certainly going to our hospitals, going to our emergency rooms, and running up the cost of healthcare for people who are here legally and paying their own way.

We believe, from the percentage of people who are here illegally in our Federal prisons, well more proportionately than the native-born population, that they are disproportionately committing crimes in this country.

Quite frankly, when you add up the cost of all these things—they show up; their kids get free education—The Heritage Foundation estimates that it costs more than $50 billion a year for illegal immigrants in this country. $8 billion for a wall, one-time money, as opposed to $50 billion year after year after year?

I am sometimes asked: Can America afford to build a wall? If we are losing $50 billion a year, we can't afford not to build a wall. Think how much stronger our economy will be when we are making sure that every immigrant who comes into this country is a good, productive immigrant.

Another reason we need a wall is that, for people who come across this sort of territory near Sasabe—and this isn't really the best picture—frequently, it is in desert, and rocky desert, not sandy desert, rocky desert. Thousands of people have been found around the Arizona-Mexico border after having died trying to get across this territory.

We are told that the cartels, which help people get across the border—in fact, are required to be dealt with to get across the border—mislead people when they get to the border. They point them and say this way to Phoenix, this way to Tucson, and it is maybe hundreds of miles further to get to Phoenix than they estimate. So the people are left to die of starvation or die, more likely, of dehydration.

It is a humanitarian crisis to continue to allow people to think that sneaking across the open parts of the current wall that has been built is the way to get in the United States.

In any event, we need a wall. We will continue to bleed money; we will continue to get people in this country illegally; and we will continue to get people who can only sneak into the country illegally rather than go across the normal points of entries unless we build that wall.

The next question that some people will ask is: Does this mean that we are anti-immigrant, because America is a country of immigrants? Yes, America is a country of immigration, but it is a country of legal immigration.

I will remind people that, every year in this country, 700,000 people are sworn in legally. Nobody is talking about cutting that number. A little under 4 million people come into this country on work visas every year, and a little under 2 million come in on student visas. Nobody is talking about cutting these numbers. Dozens of millions additional people come in on tourist visas.

With regard to the work visas or people who literally come in here legally and wind up being naturalized, what we are asking is, for the people who are trying to sneak off the border without checking in with the Border Patrol or Customs agents at the designated areas, we are just asking them to get in line and go through what everybody who is trying to come here legally is doing.

It is the height of irresponsibility to say that we are anti-immigrant when we are letting almost 4 million people come into this country every year on work visas and having 700,000 new people sworn in in this country, naturalized in this country. That is not the sign of an anti-immigrant President. That is the sign of a President who understands very clearly how important immigration is to our country.

By historic levels, it is very favorable to immigrants. We are going to have more foreign-born people in this country than at any time over the last 90 years. Again, that is not the sign of a President who is anti-immigrant.

The next thing I will point out, some people think: But can't people come into the country another way? Well, it is true. I suppose no system is 100 percent effective. But the one thing I am going to say is that we do have a lot of walls, and walls do work in other places we put the walls.

We have some pictures here of walls. Here are some walls in Sasabe, Arizona. There are spaces in the walls that aren't good, but when they build this sort of wall, whether they build the wall between Juarez and El Paso or a wall between San Diego and Tijuana, the walls have been very effective.

Here you see the wall between San Diego and Tijuana, a very effective wall. People are not getting around that wall. It decreased illegal crossings at that place over 90 percent.

Here is a wall in Israel between Israel and Egypt, because Israel was having a problem of people sneaking into their country illegally. So Israel built a wall. Well over 95 percent successful, nobody is getting across the wall anymore between Israel and Egypt, showing that the wall is successful.

Other countries with successful walls, a wall that was largely built with U.S. taxpayer money—which I will point out people who are not going to vote for this wall had no problem voting for—is the wall along the Jordan-Syria border and part of the border

with Iraq, because it is important for Jordan not to let terrorists into their country. That wall has been highly successful in keeping Jordan safe.

Another country that built a wall is Hungary, which shares a border with Serbia. They were afraid of other people coming from south of Hungary, in essence invading their country like people right now are trying to invade the United States. So they built a wall. Hungary has found that that sort of wall has been very successful in keeping out immigrants who they don't want to have in their country.

There is a reason why President Clinton wanted a wall between Tijuana and San Diego, and there is a reason why Israel and Hungary and nine other European nations have walls. It is because walls work, and that is the clearest way to prevent people from crossing into the country illegally.

There is another benefit to walls, too, that people don't take into account. It sends the message that the United States is serious about our immigration laws.

We will talk for just a second about border security and the degree to which we have to build a wall to send the message that the United States is serious, because you hear from time to time in this body that certain people say everybody wants border security. Well, that is funny, because there are all sorts of politicians in this country of both parties—I will include President Bush in this—who do all sorts of things that would indicate that we do not intend to enforce our borders.

Both the Governor of California and the mayor of New York have said that we should be providing free medical care to illegal immigrants. Does that sound like they want border security? It sounds more like they want to be a magnet for illegal immigration.

Dozens of sanctuary cities and sanctuary counties, and in the case of California, a whole State, set themselves up as areas in which local officials will not ask whether people are here legally or illegally. That is like a magnet to people south of the border as they hear American elected officials, in essence, say: Don't worry about the immigration laws being enforced in our city or our county or our State.

Those people do not want border security.

Keith Ellison, a former Congressman, now attorney general of Minnesota, says that natural borders create an injustice. In other words, there is a larger crowd out there who doesn't even know we have a country. They say everybody can come in. Who cares.

These are powerful people, and the people south of the border who want to come here illegally are listening to them.

The Oakland mayor, another powerful person, when ICE tried to wrap up over 100 people, criminals, in the Oakland area to send them out of this country, she alerted the public to the fact that ICE was in the area trying to enforce our immigration laws on criminals. Why would a mayor undermine ICE, which is trying to evict criminals from this country? The reason is simple: They don't care about border security.

Americans have to realize, for are a lot of elected officials out there, it is come one, come all. It is not let's pick our million or 2 million or 3 million people who are coming into the country every year. It is let's let everyone come into the country.

Those people are increasingly powerful, and their message is to ignore immigration laws, which is another reason why we need a wall.

Putting up a wall everywhere where we need a wall, there are a few natural barriers in which it is not necessary, but I would say we need at least another 300 miles of wall. To put up that additional 300 miles of wall and improve the wall we already have sends the message that people like the mayor of Oakland or the Congressmen who want to get rid of ICE do not speak for the American Government. We are serious about enforcing our immigration laws.

Now, the question is—and I don't want to tar all Democrats; I have a lot of Democrat friends. But why is the vast majority of Democrats not willing to compromise on this wall? Why are these Democrats who in the past had no problem voting for a wall when President Clinton was President, and they had no problem voting for additional wall when President Bush was President—and a lot of that appropriation when President Bush was President wasn't spent until President Obama was President and he was improving our walls. But why is a wall now immoral when the wall wasn't immoral under President Clinton or President Bush or President Obama?

The answer is twofold. One, sadly, is political. A couple of weeks ago, eight Democrats voted in a way that I think they would be okay with a wall, but that is not enough. Part is, sadly, political. Some people don't like President Trump, and they don't want to see him succeed.

Worse, we have an increasing radicalization within too many elements of the Democratic Party. I have been around long enough to remember when I think Democrats in this Chamber—I wasn't here for it—but like I said, where they would have quickly voted for appropriations for a wall under President Clinton. But this Keith Ellison new breed of Congressman type is quickly getting a vise grip on some members of the Democratic Party.

For that reason, votes that they would have taken in a heartbeat in the 1990s, or in the first decade of this century, or even 7 or 8 years ago, they will not take anymore. They genuinely believe in some sort of world in which anybody who wants can come here, and it won't affect the long-term safety of our Nation.

□ 1845

That is preposterous, but we have to remember, that is more and more common.

And I would look for the Democrats or anybody who comes down here to speak as to why it wasn't mean-spirited, it didn't send a bad message to build a wall under these other Presidents, but it does now.

So to, one more time, go over the points that have been made for people to remember:

President Trump has compromised and not built a wall for over 2 years—really breaking the heart of a lot of his supporters.

He has dropped the amount he wanted from, originally, $20 billion all the way, now, down under $6 billion, such a small amount that there will be big gaps in that wall because of his effort to compromise.

President Trump has even tried to bring other issues into the debate by extending DACA, hoping that this sweetener would cause other people to move a little bit on their negotiating point. It didn't.

I will digress for just one second while I talk about that DACA.

The third thing to remember is that that wall is one-seventh the cost of foreign aid in this country.

Is that too big of an amount? Is that something we can't handle? That is not true.

The next thing to remember is, when other Presidents were building the wall, there were no objections around here. All of a sudden, in 2019, when President Trump is President, in part due to the radicalization of some Members of this body and in part due to personal dislike of President Trump, too many people are willing to continue to allow people to stream across the border with drugs, violent people with disregard for their fellow citizens, not to give President Trump a win, and, in part, because their ideology has switched and they really don't need a wall at all.

The next thing to remember is walls work. If anybody questions, walls work.

Look at the wall between San Diego and Tijuana; look at the wall between Israel and Egypt; look at the wall between Serbia and Hungary. In all cases, these walls were working.

And if you talk to the Border Patrol today, as I have, the Border Patrol and Customs agents will tell you we need a wall. The people who are down there, who are experts on the topic, know that that wall will work—not 100 percent, but it will work a lot better than what they have now.

I should point out, they want a smart wall; they want a wall with some sensors on there; and they want a wall with a road.

One of the problems we have right now enforcing our southern border is that, without a road, given the rough terrain, even if we find out somebody is sneaking across the border, the Border

Patrol could not get there on a very timely basis because their vehicles can't move there.

Here, we have an example of a wall with a road that the Border Patrol can get up and down on.

Here, we have an example of a wall without a road, which makes it very difficult to stop people on a timely basis.

And then the other thing for people to remember, when people talk about their problems with the wall, there are a growing number of politicians out there, local or Federal, who really don't want border security. They would be pretty happy with coming across the border now.

Now, as far as looking down the future on this issue, one of the things that scares me is, with all these people fighting against the wall, it is going to take more resolve, because that is only one of the issues that has to be tackled for us to secure our borders.

Right now, our asylum laws are very flawed. People are trying to come into this country, sometimes with other people's children, knowing that if they say the magic words and that they are at risk, we will have to let them in this country until there is some sort of court proceeding that they almost certainly won't show up for.

So after we are done with the wall, or maybe as part of the wall negotiations, we have got to do something with our asylum laws to prevent anybody who either has a child or is borrowing somebody else's child from trying to come in this country.

Another problem we have: We have got a problem with people coming in this country for welfare. As I mentioned, the Customs agents see that.

We have people coming into this country because of relatives, what in most cases would even be referred to as shirttail relatives, but they are taking advantage of that to come into this country.

In any event, we have people who are becoming citizens on birthright citizenship. And people are coming in this country 8 months pregnant, having a child so that their family can come into the United States. There is another loophole that very few countries have that we have to close.

So this wall which President Trump has been fighting for for over 2 years is only the first step of many steps that we absolutely have to do to save our country.

I plead with the American public, ask people from both sides of the aisle: Remember that Bill Clinton built part of a wall. Remember that people had no problem voting for a wall under George Bush, and remember that even Barack Obama improved part of the wall.

And I ask the people on the other side—I hate to say ''on the other side,'' but people on the other side of the aisle, other than those who have already changed and said it is okay for a wall:

Pretend it is the 1990s or the first decade of this century and somebody else was President, when a little more old-fashioned values ruled the show and we wanted to be a country of laws, and vote like almost everybody on that side of the aisle would have voted in the 1990s or the first decade of the century. Vote for $5.7 billion—or better, a full $8 billion towards the wall so that we can secure our country, at least insofar as a border can secure our country. After that, we can tackle the problems with the asylum laws and other flaws in our immigration laws, tackle birthright citizenship so that we are determining who can come into our country in the future, because immigrants have been so valuable, historically, but we should aim for every immigrant being a good immigrant.

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

## PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE FOR THE 116TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
*Washington, DC, February 7, 2019.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I am pleased to submit for printing in the Congressional Record, pursuant to Rule XI, clause 2(a) of the Rules of the House, a copy of the Rules of the Committee on Agriculture, which were adopted at the organizational meeting of the Committee on February 7, 2019.

Appendix A of the Committee Rules will include excerpts from the Rules of the House relevant to the operation of the Committee. Appendix B will include relevant excerpts from the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. In the interest of minimizing printing costs, Appendices A and B are omitted from this submission.

Sincerely,

COLLIN C. PETERSON,
*Chairman.*

Enclosure.

RULE I.—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) *Applicability of House Rule.*—(1) The Rules of the House shall govern the procedure of the Committee and its subcommittees, and the Rules of the Committee on Agriculture so far as applicable shall be interpreted in accordance with the Rules of the House, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are nondebatable privileged motions in the Committee and its subcommittees. (See Appendix A for the applicable Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.)

(2) As provided in clause 1(a)(1) of House Rule XI, each Subcommittee is part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and its Rules so far as applicable. (See also Committee Rules III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII and XI, *infra.*)

(b) *Authority to Conduct Investigation.*—The Committee and its subcommittees, after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee, may conduct such investigations and studies as they may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of their responsibilities under Rule X of the Rules of the House and in accordance with clause 2(m) of House Rule XI.

(c) *Authority to Print.* The Committee is authorized by the Rules of the House to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the Committee and its subcommittees. All costs of stenographic services and transcripts in connection with any meeting or hearing of the Committee and its subcommittees shall be paid from applicable accounts of the House described in clause 1(k)(1) of House Rule X in accordance with clause 1(c) of House Rule XI. (See also paragraphs (d), (e) and (f) of Committee Rule IX.)

(d) *Vice Chairman.*—The Member of the majority party on the Committee or Subcommittee designated by the Chairman of the full Committee shall be the vice chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee in accordance with clause 2(d) of House Rule XI.

(e) *Presiding Member.*—If the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee is not present at any Committee or Subcommittee meeting or hearing, the vice chairman shall preside. If the Chairman and vice chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee are not present at a Committee or Subcommittee meeting or hearing the ranking Member of the majority party who is present shall preside in accordance with clause 2(d) of House Rule XI.

(f) *Publication of Rules.*—The Committee's Rules shall be publicly available in electronic form and published in the Congressional Record not later than 60 days after the Chair is elected in each odd-numbered year as provided in clause 2(a) of House Rule XI.

(g) *Joint Committee Reports of Investigation or Study.*—A report of an investigation or study conducted jointly by more than one committee may be filed jointly, provided that each of the committees complies independently with all requirements for approval and filing of the report.

RULE II.—COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETINGS—REGULAR, ADDITIONAL AND SPECIAL

(a) *Regular Meetings.*—Regular meetings of the Committee, in accordance with clause 2(b) of House Rule XI, shall be held on the first Wednesday of every month to transact its business if notice is given pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of House Rule XI. The Chairman shall provide each Member of the Committee, as far in advance of the day of the regular meeting as practicable, a written agenda of such meeting. Items may be placed on the agenda by the Chairman or a majority of the Committee. (See paragraph (f) of Committee Rule XI for provisions that apply to meetings of subcommittees.)

(b) *Additional Meetings.*—(1) The Chairman may call and convene, as he or she considers necessary, which may not commence earlier than the third calendar day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day) on which Members have notice thereof after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or after concurrence with the Ranking Minority Member, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such additional meetings pursuant to the notice from the Chairman.

(2) A hearing or meeting may begin sooner than specified in clause (1) (in which case, the chair shall make the announcement specified at the earliest possible time) if the Committee so determines by majority vote in the presence of the number of Members required under the Rules of the Committee for the transaction of business.

(3) At least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of a measure or matter the Chair shall cause the text of such measure or matter to be made publicly available in electronic form.