

into it, and now they are having to shoot their way out. Unfortunately for most of them, they don't have guns, so they are pretty empty-handed in fighting a government that has the guns.

□ 1300

It is a tragic situation. It should be one of the most prosperous countries in the world. It was until socialism took over. And again, as Rick Manning is trying to point out, that is where we are headed.

"It makes one wonder if Ono," he said, "has given up 100 percent of her songwriter royalties to the song to the government as a show of solidarity for the dream.

"And here is what they don't say," he says, "in order for the world to 'live as one' with no possessions, someone is going to have to take all the stuff and hold it collectively for the common good.

"In order for there to be stuff to take and most importantly eat in the future, someone is going to have to do the hard work to produce it. Someone is going to have to figure out how to produce it, and someone is going to have to get it from where it is produced to where the brotherhood is living. And then someone is going to have to distribute it, being certain that everyone gets the same amount of gruel."

And I saw that, too, in the stores back in the Soviet Union. If you were part of that elite ruling class, they would keep back a really nice pair of shoes, maybe the only pair they got, for the highest ranking person that they dealt with.

In the stores, the Soviets would tell me: We never find toilet paper; they hold it in the back for the ruling class. We never find good, fresh vegetables. They hold that back for the ruling class.

It is really tragic the way people are treated, ultimately, in a socialist or communist society, or now called progressivist.

So, good article by Brad Polumbo, February 26, How Socialism Destroys Private Charity and Hurts the Poor. It is tragic.

Between what we see destroying the rule of law in America, coming across our southern border illegally, overwhelming our schools—how fair is it? If you really care about children, how fair is it to this big group of children in school?

And as teachers have pointed out to me: I love my kids. I love the kids that come in and don't speak English. But they throw them into a class of English speakers because we are required to educate them, and we have to stop teaching, basically, the English-speaking citizens and residents and go to teaching the new kids that just got thrown in, no fault of their own. But those that suffer are the kids.

They have dreams, but, unfortunately for them, they were either born here or came here legally and speak English. But their dreams are going to

be put on hold. They are not going to be able to be educated as well because we have not secured our southern border. And children who don't speak the same language are thrown into their classes, and they are harming the dreams and the hopes of the children who were here.

So is the solution to welcome in 30 million or so people from Mexico? No. It would overwhelm this country, and there would be no place for people to flee to when they are trying to find real asylum from danger.

The better thing is just enforce the law. Secure the border. Cut off the flow of money to the drug cartels, and allow people to live freely here, without worrying about extra crime that wouldn't be here if people weren't here illegally.

It is about preserving the Republic that the Founders gave us. It is about acknowledging that we have, as a nation, been more blessed than any nation in the history of the world. Solomon's Israel didn't have the individual opportunities, the individual assets, the freedoms that we have.

When a majority of Americans fail to recognize that we have been blessed by God and His protective hand has secured our Nation, then those blessings and that protective hand will disappear; and we will be the once-great Camelot, where people could live free, and they could work and keep what they grew, built, earned, that once-great country where people were treated the same, whether poor or rich. They were treated the same under the law.

That once-great country. Wow, what a dream. How did it go wrong?

Well, we just talked about it, and it is time we did something together to stop it.

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

STATEHOOD FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, this week was, for all intents and purposes, D.C. Statehood Week in the Capital. I am pleased that, today, Senator CARPER has announced that he is introducing the Washington, D.C. Admission Act to make the District of Columbia the 51st State. I am grateful to Senator CARPER, who garnered a record number of Senate cosponsors last year and has been a most vigorous champion of statehood for the District of Columbia.

I come to the floor for my first time this session to discuss D.C. statehood because we have many new Members who may be under the mistaken impression that the 700,000 people who live in your Nation's Capital are treated in the same rights that your own residents are. I beg to differ.

In this city, the citizens do not have each and every right in this Congress. To be sure, we have what is called home rule, and I will later indicate that even that is limited.

The reasons for this unique place, for our Capital, left without the full rights of other citizens, has to do with a quirk, an accident, where the Framers came to believe that the Capital should not be part of a State because they were, in the beginning, parts of various States, and they felt that they could not then control what the Capital would do.

Well, of course, they don't want a Capital to be part of a State, but they didn't really envision statehood, the Capital as a State, because they were thinking of the Thirteen Colonies. And since every city had to be in a State, they could only envision putting the city in a State.

We are about 218 years beyond that, and it is time, way past time—shall I say, overdue in time—to understand how the Nation's Capital of the greatest nation in the world should be viewed and what rights its citizens should have.

So I am very grateful to Senator CARPER for the work he has done and for his introduction of the bill in the Senate this week, the counterpart of the D.C. statehood bill, which I have already introduced in the House.

The bill I have introduced already has 198 cosponsors. I bet—I haven't looked closely, but there is probably no bill in the hopper that has more cosponsors than the D.C. statehood bill. It is not bipartisan yet. That will happen, because this is how we make progress on matters in the House of Representatives. We go one House at a time.

Remember, the District doesn't have any representation in the Senate; yet we have gotten a distinguished Senator introducing the statehood bill, and he has been most energetic, getting the majority of the Democratic Senators on the bill last session.

I am particularly moved today because of the record number of D.C. residents and their colleagues who came to the Congress yesterday to demand that they have equal rights with all other American citizens. I greeted a room full of residents who had visited every office to tell Members what they don't know.

I am grateful particularly that the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, has strongly endorsed D.C. statehood. I believe that means that D.C. statehood will be on the floor this session. I want to thank our Speaker for making D.C. statehood a priority, and indicating in her own words how important it is that every citizen be treated equally.

In the same way, Oversight and Reform Committee Chairman ELIJAH CUMMINGS has committed to holding a hearing on D.C. statehood, and I will predict this afternoon on the floor that that bill will get out of committee and come to the floor of the House for a vote.

The progress we are making on D.C. statehood is also seen in the inclusion of our statehood demands in what is called H.R. 1. That is an all-democracy bill that tries to improve and make sure that full democracy in every form is present in the United States. In H.R. 1 are extensive findings for D.C. statehood.

I thank the Democratic majority for including the District of Columbia and its plea for statehood in this all important pro-democracy bill. It is called the For the People Act, and H.R. 1 was the first bill introduced.

Most Members who come to the Congress come knowing only that the Nation's Capital is where all these wonderful memorial buildings are. They know that it is a tourist mecca. Many may have come as children or even as adults, as tourists. They probably don't know that 30 million visitors from all over the world visit our Nation's Capital.

In other words, most Members of the House who, by the way, will spend more time in the District of Columbia than they will spend at home, still don't know very much about their own Capital City. They probably don't know that only in America does the legislature not grant full representation to their Capital City.

Well, I have just voted on the House floor. I vote on amendments, but I did not vote on the final bill. I do vote in what is called the Committee of the Whole. The reason I am able to vote there is that, when I first came to Congress in 1991, I saw that I could, indeed, vote in committee, and I knew there was something called the Committee of the Whole.

Well, what is the difference between voting in committee, like the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, for example, where I have always served and voted, what is the difference between that and the Committee of the Whole? No difference.

□ 1315

Both are committees that were created by the Congress, not the Constitution.

So, since I vote in committee, I asked for the right to vote in the Committee of the Whole. It was granted.

But only in America, again, could the following happen: my Republican friends sued the House for allowing the vote in the Committee of the Whole.

The courts looked at that, pronounced the right of the Congress to give that vote in the Committee of the Whole, just as the District has the vote in committee, and my Republican friends then appealed.

At the Court of Appeals, the verdict was, yes, the District of Columbia can vote in the Committee of the Whole, as they vote in committee.

And my good Republican friends didn't quite have the nerve to appeal that one to the Supreme Court, but what they did do, when Democrats lost the House 2 years later, was to take

away a vote, that the courts had said was legitimate, from the residents of the District of Columbia, who are number one per capita in taxes paid to support the government of the United States. And therein lies the outrageous anomaly.

Those who pay the most taxes per capita have the least rights. That is why we are determined to get our rights.

Yes, I have just voted on two gun safety amendments that were on this floor today. I couldn't vote on the final bill, but I could vote on those amendments. They were important amendments relating to background checks.

By the way, something like 97 percent of the American people in one poll were shown to favor background checks. That means you check to see if a person has a criminal background and shouldn't have a gun. What is the controversy in that one?

So I was able to vote on those two amendments.

This is all by way of self-help, thinking through what is it I can do to make sure the people I represent have the maximum of representation they can. I sure am not crying about what I cannot do, when you consider what I can do.

I am chair of the most important subcommittee now in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Through that committee, I have been able to rebuild whole parts of the District of Columbia: The Wharf, the Southwest Waterfront as it is called; the southeast waterfront, Capitol Riverfront; parts of Washington, like NoMa.

I have been able to do a great deal. That is not the issue.

The issue is equal. Not equal for me personally; equal for those I represent, who have paid their dues without getting their rights.

When I say, "pay their dues," I want to elaborate on that. The city I represent has one of the strongest economies in the Nation. It has a budget of about \$14 billion. That is larger than the budget of 12 States. Many States are crying poor, trying to tax or not tax their residents, embroiled in that controversy.

The city I represent has a \$2 billion surplus. Its per capita income, the per capita income of the Americans who live in your Capital City, is higher than that of any State.

Now, we are about the equivalent in size of seven states. Our per capita income, though, is higher than that of any State. Take your biggest States, Texas and New York and California: higher per capita income. That tells you about how much economic activity there is in your Nation's capital.

This city, which is something of a city state, has residents whose personal income is higher than that of seven States; we do not cry poor.

Our population growth is among the highest in the Nation. People want to live in your Nation's capital. It is one

of the most pleasant, livable cities in our country.

What do they pay per capita in taxes? \$12,000 per resident in taxes to support a government that does not give them equal rights.

Our Armed Forces—Armed Forces with representatives from every State, it should be known—has always had residents of the District of Columbia who fought and died in every war, including the war that created the United States, the Revolutionary War. You, of course, are aware of that war, the war that was fought for taxation without representation. No wonder District residents are demanding that our Congress live up to that great slogan and standard.

Now, as I indicated, it is not as if we don't have any rights. The Congress passed the Home Rule Act in 1974—I will speak later about the deficiencies of the Home Rule Act—but that means that the city does have its own elected mayor and its own elected legislature, its council.

How did we get that? Well, first of all, it took over 100 years after the Civil War. The first home rule was given to the Capital City by Republicans in the 19th century who had fought and won the Civil War, where those in my party the Democrats had fought on the side of slavery.

Republicans fought on the side of freedom, and when it saw it had a capital that did not have freedom, it gave the District home rule.

Now, the Republicans had rather much lost their way, as the Democrats certainly had, for more than 100 years, but when Richard Nixon was President of the United States, the Home Rule Act was passed.

I would just like to read a few of his words. He said, in signing the bill: "As a longtime supporter of self-government for the District of Columbia, I am pleased to sign into law a measure which is of historic significance for the citizens of our Nation's Capital."

He went on to say: "I," that is Richard Nixon, now, "first voted for home rule as a Member of the House of Representatives in 1948, and I have endorsed the enactment of home rule legislation during both my terms as President."

This was bipartisan, finally. And Republicans, that party, that post-war party, post-World War II party, deserves credit for understanding that the time had come for the Capital City to have home rule.

That home rule was not complete, in the sense that, and most importantly, the District budget has to come here, and it becomes a foil on which to press amendments to overturn laws that people may not like.

I have been able to defeat most of those riders, as we call them, or attempts to take down D.C. laws, but the D.C. budget shouldn't come here at all.

I recognized that while pursuing statehood, I could get close to statehood by simply finishing the Home

Rule Act and making it whole and complete, and so I embarked on a two-track road. One, of course, is the one I have just discussed: D.C. statehood.

The other is what I call free and equal D.C. bills, bills that together bring us close to statehood. I started with a congressional review amendment. This one is really nonsensical.

The District passes a law. Ultimately, most of those laws matter not to the Congress and certainly aren't overturned, but the Home Rule Act says that the law shall not become final for 30 days, and that is 30 consecutive days.

The House is not in session consecutive days. This is Thursday, for example. We are out, so I don't know if it is 3 or 4 days this week that would be counted, but you have to count up till you get to 30 days, and then, of course, the bill can become law.

Well, it always does. No one uses this particular power at all. If they want to overturn D.C. laws, then they simply try to attach it to appropriations as they come.

So this is completely unused, but it is terribly burdensome on the city, because you simply have to keep renewing these bills that have been passed in the District until you get finally through the 30-day period. It is ridiculous: not used by the Congress, burdensome on the city, should and could be gotten rid of without anyone noticing it in the Congress or caring about it. So I began with that one, which the Congress can't possibly care about, because it doesn't even use it ever.

But look at some of the other things that could be done even without statehood, which is leading me to embark on this two-track system.

For example, the District of Columbia does not have a local prosecutor, like a district attorney, for example, or a state's attorney.

The U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, a Federal official, not chosen by the District of Columbia, but by the President of the United States, is essentially the district attorney for the District of Columbia. We have no say in this.

And that U.S. attorney has a jurisdiction that has nothing to do with what U.S. attorneys do in other States. It is local law. 90 percent of what the U.S. attorney has as jurisdiction is local law, like the law a DA would enforce. About 10, sometimes 15 percent of his work is Federal.

We want to send him back to all of his Federal work, give him time to do all of that so that we would have a local prosecutor.

That is one of the bills that this Congress could pass, House and Senate, and hardly think about it, because it is certainly uncontroversial that the city have its own law enforcement officer to enforce its criminal laws.

And there is a National Guard rule act. Now, that is the equivalent of what I am speaking of when I say that the Congress should have no interest, only the District.

The National Guard cannot be called out in the event, for example, of a hurricane or a huge snowfall or a flood, only the President of the United States can.

□ 1330

The President of the United States does not need to be bothered with tasks related to ordinary emergencies in the District of Columbia. Somehow, the Mayor would have to find the President and say: Please call out the National Guard. That is the local National Guard.

We don't want jurisdiction over the National Guard when it comes to national matters. We want the same jurisdiction that the States have. The States have the right to call out the National Guard to protect their residents when there are natural disasters. That is, essentially, what we are asking for. So that, too, is part of my Free and Equal D.C. series.

Again, there are 20 of these bills. Let me just indicate one other: the District of Columbia Home Rule Clemency Act. I investigated how often clemency is allowed or has been afforded, and I found only one instance. I will tell you why.

The President of the United States alone can offer clemency to someone who has broken local law. Do you think he bothers or, for that matter, should bother? That is why they don't post anyone who gets clemency in the District of Columbia.

These are the kind of local matters that are holdovers, absolute holdovers, from the days when the District had no home rule. We can't possibly hold our heads up as a democracy and have matters like this that cannot be attended at the local level.

Occasionally, someone comes forward with the notion: We understand, Congressman. We want to make sure that the residents of the Nation's Capital have the same rights as other places. Here is what we would like to do. You come out of a portion of land, contributed by the State of Maryland, so why not return the District of Columbia to Maryland, then you would get your full and equal rights?

Well, the first thing you ought to do is ask Maryland about that. Then you might ask the District of Columbia. And here I have the answers, I think.

Statehood is endorsed by 86 percent of D.C. residents. Retrocession, as it is called, has no constituency either in Maryland or in the District.

This is how I know that.

There was a poll taken in Maryland asking whether or not they thought the District of Columbia should be returned to Maryland. Now, understand, Maryland is a very progressive jurisdiction, but it only has one big city. That is the city of Baltimore. It apparently is not welcoming of another city which has formed its own identity as a State and, for that reason, has an identity as a big city.

I am not surprised that a poll of Maryland legislators found that 92 per-

cent of Maryland Senators oppose retrocession of the District to Maryland, and 82 percent of Maryland Delegates—that is their lower house—oppose retrocession.

What I think this points up is that there are no easy answers: taking a city that is almost as old as the Nation itself—the District became the Capital City in 1801—and somehow finding some easy answer, which turns out to be even harder. It is hard enough to get the Congress to recognize statehood.

Now, suppose we have to go to Maryland, in the case of retrocession, and D.C. to get that answer. That is a harder road to climb. It is not democratic, because that is not what Maryland wants and that is not what the District of Columbia wants. It is a very mechanical answer to a very deep problem.

I indicated that I just voted in the Congress in the Committee of the Whole, and I have voted now, in this new Congress, which is about 8 weeks old, two or three times. Each of those votes are of such great significance to the people I represent. It encourages them to believe that they will have a vote not only in the Committee of the Whole, but they will have a vote where every other American has a vote.

For them, I can only say that they have overpaid, in every conceivable way, for equal rights—yes, by fighting and dying in every war and, yes, in Federal taxes paid, per capita, a larger amount than any residents.

For me, of course, this is a labor of love because I was born and raised here. I am the daughter of a runaway slave who ran away from Virginia.

It is interesting that he ran away and found himself and settled in the District of Columbia as an illegal immigrant, I suppose—a runaway slave—but there was work here. He found work in the city and began to raise work helping to build the city because they were building the roads of the city at that time in the 1830s.

It was no part of his vision that the District would ever have the same rights as other Americans, certainly no part of his vision, as then still a slave, that he would have anything to do with it.

So, this afternoon, as I think about my city and strive for its equality, I think of my great-grandfather, Richard Holmes, who sought freedom for himself and his family the only way he could: by simply walking off of a plantation and making his way to the District of Columbia. In his name, I am honored to seek more of that freedom and equality for the 700,000 Americans who now live in our Nation's Capital.

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

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE
RULESRULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
FOR THE 116TH CONGRESSHOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, February 28, 2019.Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to Rule XI, Clause 2(a) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I respectfully submit the rules of the 116th Congress for the Committee on Foreign Affairs for publication in the Congressional Record. The Committee adopted these rules by voice vote, with a quorum being present, at our organizational meeting on Tuesday, January 29, 2019.

Sincerely,

ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman.

1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The Rules of the House of Representatives, and in particular, the committee rules enumerated in clause 2 of rule XI, are the rules of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (hereafter referred to as the "Committee"), to the extent applicable.

(b) A motion to recess and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are privileged non-debatable motions in Committee.

(c) The Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall consult the Ranking Minority Member to the extent possible with respect to the business of the Committee. Each subcommittee of the Committee is a part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules, to the extent applicable.

2. DATE OF MEETING

The regular meeting date of the Committee shall be the first Tuesday of every month when the House of Representatives is in session pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XI of the House of Representatives. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman as the Chairman may deem necessary or at the request of a majority of the Members of the Committee in accordance with clause 2(c) of rule XI of the House of Representatives. The determination of the business to be considered at each meeting shall be made by the Chairman subject to clause 2(c) of rule XI of the House of Representatives. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no business to be considered.

3. QUORUM

For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two Members shall constitute a quorum, and the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee shall make every effort to ensure that the relevant Ranking Minority Member or another Minority Member is present at the time a hearing is convened. One-third of the Members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action, except: (1) reporting a measure or recommendation; (2) closing Committee meetings and hearings to the public; (3) authorizing the issuance of subpoenas; and (4) any other action for which an actual majority quorum is required by any rule of the House of Representatives or by law. No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House of Representatives unless a majority of the Committee is actually present. No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the full Committee by a subcommittee unless half of the subcommittee is actually present. A record vote may be de-

manded by one-fifth of the Members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one Member.

4. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE
PUBLIC

(a) Meetings

(1) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the Committee or a subcommittee shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public, because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person or otherwise violate any labor rule of the House of Representatives. No person, other than Members of the Committee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as the Committee or subcommittee may authorize, shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public. This subsection does not apply to open Committee hearings which are provided for by subsection (b) of this rule.

(2) The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter, or adopting an amendment. The relevant Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time. When exercising postponement authority, the relevant Chairman shall take all reasonable steps necessary to notify Members on the resumption of proceedings on any postponed record vote. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(b) Hearings

(1) Each hearing conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day should be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony—

(A) may vote to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or violate paragraph (2) of this subsection; or

(B) may vote to close the hearing, as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(2) Whenever it is asserted by a Member of the Committee that the evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate the witness—

(A) such testimony or evidence shall be presented in executive session, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, if by a majority of those present, there being in attendance the re-

quisite number required under the rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, the Committee or subcommittee determines that such evidence or testimony may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person; and

(B) the Committee or subcommittee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if the Committee, a majority being present, determines that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(3) No Member of the House of Representatives may be excluded from non-participatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee unless the House of Representatives has by majority vote authorized the Committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings, on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members by the same procedures designated in this subsection for closing hearings to the public.

(4) A Member of the House of Representatives who is not a Member of the Committee may not be recognized to participate in a Committee or Subcommittee hearing except by the unanimous consent of Committee Members present at such hearing. Participatory recognition of a non-Committee Member shall occur only after all Committee Members seeking recognition, both majority and minority, have had their opportunity to participate and question any witnesses.

(5) The Committee or a subcommittee may by the procedure designated in this subsection vote to close one (1) subsequent day of hearing.

(6) No congressional staff shall be present at any meeting or hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee that has been closed to the public, and at which classified information will be involved, unless such person is authorized access to such classified information in accordance with rule XX of the House of Representatives.

5. CONVENING HEARINGS AND MARKUPS

(a) Hearings

(1) Notice. Public announcement shall be made of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee at the earliest possible date, and in any event at least one (1) week before the commencement of that hearing. If the Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee, with the concurrence of the relevant Ranking Minority Member, determines that there is good cause to begin a hearing sooner, or if the Committee or subcommittee so determines by majority vote in the presence of the number of members required under the rules of the Committee for the taking of action, the Chairman of the full Committee, if concurring, shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. No change shall be made to a publicly announced hearing title until after consultation with the relevant Ranking Minority Member and notice to previously announced witnesses.

(2) Member Day Hearing. During the first session of each Congress, the full Committee shall hold a hearing at which it receives testimony from Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner on proposed legislation within its jurisdiction.

(b) Markups and Other Meetings to Transact Business

(1) Convening. The Chairman of the full Committee or a subcommittee may call or convene, as the relevant Chairman considers necessary, meetings of the Committee or subcommittee for the consideration of a bill or resolution pending before the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, or for