

According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, even a modest scenario would result in the loss of 6.2 million to 24.3 million jobs across the country. As a small business owner who benefited from private equity when growing my business, I know the value of these types of organizations that provide support and really give a way forward for companies trying to grow.

BRINGING ATTENTION TO HUNGER AND HOMELESSNESS DURING NATIONAL HUNGER AND HOMELESSNESS WEEK

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, each year during the week prior to Thanksgiving, communities across the country come together to bring awareness to the problems of hunger and homelessness.

Today, I want to recognize the Collin County organizations that work to end hunger and homelessness throughout our community.

Today, there are 42 million Americans facing hunger on any given night, and more than 194,000 people will sleep on the street.

While these numbers are sobering, we are incredibly grateful for those in our community who work to ease the suffering of others, organizations such as the Collin County Homeless Coalition, the Family Promise of Collin County, North Texas Food Bank, Minnie's Food Pantry, and Hope's Door New Beginning Center, Allen Community Outreach, and many, many others who work year-round to take care of those less fortunate.

Through these organizations, volunteers, businesses, and faith communities come together to provide necessities like shelter and nutritious meals. They go above and beyond to ensure those in need have access to basic medical care and hygiene products and even provide training and placement resources for those struggling with homelessness.

PEOPLE ARE TIRED OF CONGRESS SPENDING TAX DOLLARS ON A POLITICALLY MOTIVATED IMPEACHMENT CHARADE

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

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, yesterday's public impeachment hearings produced some noteworthy facts. Representative MIKE TURNER's question of Ambassador Volker took apart the Democrats' entire case. Volker confirmed that President Trump never said that Ukraine must investigate the Bidens in order to receive defense aid from the United States.

Further, Representative ELISE STEFANIK's questioning of Tim Morri-

son showed there was no quid pro quo, no bribery, no extortion, and no mention of withholding aid in exchange for investigating the Bidens.

Witnesses have repeatedly stated that no quid pro quo, no bribery took place. These facts, which indeed clear our President, do not change. Meanwhile, President Trump continues to be denied basic due process rights.

Democrat leadership continues to put politics before the people obsessing over impeachment and refusing to work on policies that would actually benefit the American people: ratifying the USMCA, permanently extending the 2017 tax cuts for families, and lowering the cost of prescription drugs.

The people are tired of this Congress spending their tax dollars on a politically-motivated impeachment charade.

□ 1230

WE SHOULD WORK TOGETHER TO COMBAT CANCER

(Mr. KELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, November is Lung Cancer Awareness Month, an important time for us to highlight the need for more research and better community awareness on this disease.

The statistics surrounding lung cancer are astounding. Approximately 541,000 Americans living today have been diagnosed with lung cancer at some point in their lives. While the rate of new lung cancer cases over the past 4 decades has dropped 36 percent for men, it has risen 84 percent for women.

That is why I am proud to cosponsor H.R. 2222, the Women and Lung Cancer Research and Preventive Services Act. This bill would evaluate and identify opportunities for more research, preventive services, and public awareness campaigns.

Research shows that there is a disparate impact of lung cancer on women, especially women who have never smoked. More research is needed to understand why this is happening and what can be done to stop it.

Preventing cancer should never be a partisan issue. We should be working together to combat the scourge of cancer for the benefit of patients, families, and survivors. H.R. 2222 is a bipartisan effort that would do just that.

STOP IMPEACHMENT FOCUS TO DEAL WITH BORDER

(Mr. GROTHMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I stand first of all to thank President Trump for the work he has done at the border and for something that has been almost unpublicized since the mainstream media is busy focusing solely on impeachment.

In May of this year, over 100,000 people were processed at the border and placed in the United States. In September, that number has fallen to under 1,000, solely because of the efforts of President Trump to keep people who come to this country seeking asylum south of the border and because of agreements reached in countries in northern Central America.

However, we must ask this body to stop solely focusing on impeachment and deal with the southern border, making permanent the policy changes of President Trump. My fear is that if President Trump ever leaves, then the real motivation of this impeachment hearing will become apparent, and that is to return to the days of open borders.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WILD) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 20, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on November 20, 2019, at 10:39 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1838.

That the Senate passed S. 2710.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 4258.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1309, WORKPLACE VIOLENCE PREVENTION FOR HEALTH CARE AND SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS ACT; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM NOVEMBER 22, 2019, THROUGH DECEMBER 2, 2019; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 713 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 713

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1309) to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires covered employers within the health care and social service industries to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against

consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-37, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from November 22, 2019, through December 2, 2019—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. Each day during the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar or legislative day for purposes of clause 7(c)(1) of rule XXII.

SEC. 5. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of November 21, 2019, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consider-

ation of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a structured rule, House Resolution 713, providing for consideration of H.R. 1309, the Workplace Violence Prevention for Health Care and Social Service Workers Act. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor, makes in order all 10 amendments submitted, and provides for a motion to recommit. It also provides standard recess instructions for next week's district work period.

Madam Speaker, there is an epidemic of violence against healthcare and social workers in the United States. Last year, Department of Labor statistics showed they were nearly five times as likely to suffer a serious workplace violence injury than workers in other industries.

The Government Accountability Office found that rates of violence against healthcare workers in hospitals, nursing homes, and residential care facilities are 5 to 12 times higher than the estimated rates for workers overall. Between 2011 and 2016, 58 hospital workers died as a result of workplace violence.

For me, this matter strikes close to home. In 2010, a Napa State Hospital technician in California, Donna Kay Gross, a constituent, was killed outside the State hospital by a patient under psychiatric care. Donna entered the profession to honor her mother, who battled mental illness and was a patient at that very hospital. She was the mother of three grown children and was raising her granddaughter. Her colleagues described her by saying: First and foremost, Donna was a human service-type person and loved being with people and working with people.

Donna's life was cut short when a patient brutally murdered her to steal jewelry and cash from her.

This story is just one of thousands of incidents that are on the rise. Sadly, violence has become so commonplace for healthcare workers that they think it is part of their job, resulting in only 30 percent of violent incidents being reported.

Some States have stepped up to enact laws to require employers to establish a plan to protect against workplace violence. Donna's story, for example, inspired action in California that I was proud to be a part of when I was chair of the senate labor committee. That action in California served as the basis for the bill before us

today in the rule and tomorrow on the floor.

These workers deserve national action, and they deserve it now. At the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, these workers are not receiving the urgent attention they need. OSHA takes at least 7 years to put out a standard, but in some instances can take up to 20 years.

People like Donna Kay Gross cannot wait that long. To protect the people who dedicate their lives to caring for us, we need to move now. The longer we wait, the more people will suffer.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, today, we are considering a bill that requires the Secretary of Labor to issue a rule on workplace violence prevention in the healthcare and social service sectors.

According to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, workplace violence is any act or threat of physical violence, harassment, intimidation, or other threatening disruptive behavior that occurs at the worksite. It may be surprising to hear that acts of violence are the third leading cause of fatal occupational injuries. Of these incidences, approximately 8 percent were intentionally caused by another person.

When Americans go to work each and every day, they do not expect to face violence or other harm. The risk is especially high for healthcare providers and social workers. These caregivers can be subject to patients who may not be in control when under the influence of medications, or they may have a mental disorder, upset family members, ongoing domestic disputes, and even gang violence.

The rate of workplace violence resulting in days away from work for healthcare providers is, on average, four times higher than other professions. In addition, healthcare providers and social workers are less likely to report incidents. This may partly be due to the pledge to do no harm and the inclination to forgive patient-caused injuries as accidental. Regardless of the situation, all workers deserve a safe workplace.

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration is responsible for setting the standards to ensure the safety of American workers. Under the general duty clause of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, employers must provide employees with a safe work environment. Currently, there is no mandatory standard on workplace violence prevention. However, in calendar year 2015, OSHA published

"Guidelines for Preventing Workplace Violence for Healthcare and Social Service Workers" and is currently working on a workplace violence prevention rule.

H.R. 1309 would require the Secretary of Labor to issue a rule on workplace

violence prevention based on OSHA's 2015 guidelines. An interim standard is required within 1 year of the passage of this legislation, and a final rule must be issued within 2 years.

While the goal of this legislation is laudable and important, the timeframe imposed on the Department of Labor and OSHA does exceed the norm. Between 1981 and 2010, the time it took OSHA to develop and issue safety and health standards ranged from 15 months to 19 years, but the average was more than 7 years. While no one believes we should continue to delay worker protections, OSHA has already begun the rulemaking process and is gathering stakeholder input.

According to the OSHA rulemaking process, a rule should take 10 years to complete. There are 7 stages comprised of 48 different steps. For example, one step is listed as "continue discussion with stakeholders." The penultimate stage requires OSHA to send the final rule to the Small Business Administration before submitting the rule to Congress.

□ 1245

This last stage involves developing a small entity compliance guide responding to legal action.

This is bureaucracy at its finest. While it is important to ensure that any rulemaking does not adversely affect the people and industries it is meant to assist, the length of this process far exceeds other administrative rulemakings. Perhaps, rather than pass a bill to require the issuance of a single rule, we should be considering reforms to the entire OSHA rulemaking process. It seems like that may be overdue.

Despite the lengthy process of OSHA rulemaking, as written, this bill truncates established rulemaking procedures. But that is up to us. Until Congress changes this process, OSHA will follow the established framework to develop its workplace violence protection rule.

H.R. 1309 requires covered employees, including hospitals, outpatient facilities, residential treatment facilities—which includes nursing homes—and any other medical treatment or social service clinic at correctional facilities to develop and implement a written workplace violence plan within 6 months of the issuance of a rule. The plan must include identification of violence risks and prevention practices and incorporate reporting and emergency response procedures. In addition, the plan must delineate violent incident investigation procedures and training programs for employees.

Again, the importance of such a plan is undeniable. Six months may be a short timeframe within which to determine all of the required components. In order to produce the most effective plan to ensure employee safety, employers really should be granted adequate time to fully evaluate their workplace, gather input from employ-

ees, and identify the best procedures to ensure a safe environment. It is possible that, given the short timeline, workplace violence prevention plans could be hasty and, therefore, incorrectly assembled.

Here is the good news. There is middle ground. While OSHA's rulemaking process is lengthy, this bill's timeline is short. OSHA is currently gathering feedback from stakeholders and requiring an expedited rulemaking that will limit their input.

While OSHA rulemaking would ensure enforcement of workplace violence prevention policies, according to a 2018 American Hospital Association survey, 97 percent of respondents reported already having a workplace violence prevention policy in place. In 2009, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention stated that additional research was required to identify effective strategies to prevent violence, particularly in healthcare settings.

In addition, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the cost to private entities will be well over \$2.5 billion the first 2 years of implementation and almost \$1.5 billion annually thereafter. The rule self-executes a manager's amendment that will bring this cost down to \$1.3 billion for the first 2 years and \$700 million annually thereafter.

This mandate may make it difficult for rural hospitals and healthcare providers to continue effectively serving patients in their more rural locations.

Extending the implementation timeline of this bill may help reduce some of these concerns. We had an opportunity to work on a bipartisan basis—this is not a partisan issue—to solve a problem that we all agree needs to be solved. We are, instead, considering a bill that circumvents the established rulemaking process in favor of a swift outcome.

We can all agree that there is a need for OSHA to issue proper workplace violence prevention regulations to protect healthcare providers and social workers. I hope we are able to accomplish this goal, but we should recognize that we are placing burdens on entities through an expedited process that may require modification in the future to ensure a safe and effective workplace for all Americans.

Madam Speaker, for these and other reasons, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), who has put so much work into this effort.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule.

I would just note for the Record that Mr. DESAULNIER and Chairman McGOVERN deserve great credit because this is basically an open rule. There were eight amendments which were offered to the Rules Committee, and all eight amendments were made in order, including a Republican amendment, which is somewhat in line with Dr.

BURGESS' comments from Mr. BYRNE from Alabama, who is on the committee.

Again, I would just say this shows that the Rules Committee was serious last January when they said we are going to have a new era of bringing down the number of closed rules as much as possible. This is a perfect example of it.

In fact, Politico this morning wrote a story saying that this is actually the first bill to come to the floor that was a completely open rule that accepted every amendment that was offered by Members. I don't know if that is true, but certainly it is true that all amendments were made in order with the rule that is presented. I guess sometimes you sort of wonder: When do people take "yes" for an answer in this Chamber?

Again, Mr. BYRNE can have ample opportunity to make his arguments. I look forward to opposing it on the floor as I did in committee. And again, to me, it seems like a rule that all Members should really support.

So again, just to begin with Mr. DESAULNIER's description of the problem—and, again, Dr. BURGESS certainly did not quibble about the fact that this is a real problem that we are talking about. In 2013, former Congressman George Miller and I asked GAO to look at this problem. They took 3 years to study it. They used Bureau of Labor statistics, Justice Department statistics, they did surveys, and they found, in fact, that we have a really very scary problem in terms of the 15 million healthcare workers who go to work every single day: They are five times more likely to be the victims of intentional assault than any other sector in the U.S. economy.

And what is most alarming is the trajectory is going up. This is not a problem which is sort of level normal operations. It is something that is actually getting worse.

There is no secret why it is getting worse. The heroin-opioid epidemic and the behavioral health problems that exist out there in society make every ambulance call that EMTs are going out for an overdose, every emergency room patient who is coming through the door, every rehab patient who is going into a facility for treatment, all of these now are high-risk situations.

And, yes, there are some hospitals that have taken proactive steps. They have used the OSHA voluntary guidelines; they have looked at the Joint Commission on Hospitals, which has endorsed those guidelines and has, again, written strong advocacy in favor of having a national standard for this problem out there for many workers. And that is why we need to act.

Again, just so we are clear, OSHA, in 2017, as the Obama administration was leaving, put it on their regulatory agenda. They took too long.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I would be happy to stipulate they took too long.

Since the Trump administration has taken over, in 34 months, they have not held one hearing in terms of stakeholder input. Yes, they scheduled two small business reg review hearings, canceled both, and they have not rescheduled. So, 34 months into this administration, there is nothing happening.

This bill, fundamentally, is about Congress, as it did with bloodborne pathogens, which addressed a crisis in hospitals back in the 1990s and early 2000s—which a Republican Congress, by the way, supported—put a deadline on OSHA to get a rule in place. We are a safer country because Congress took that action. That is what this bill does.

It is 42 months, by the way, in terms of the deadline for the rule and it is 1 year for the interim rule.

We accommodated Republican objections in the committee, made sure everybody gets a comment period on the interim rule, and we also carved out doctors offices, dentists offices, anybody who is not part of the healthcare facility. We shrunk the scope of this bill to healthcare facilities 200,000, which is going to reduce the mandate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, the cost per facility, which Dr. BURGESS referred to, which was reduced because of the reducing of the scope of the bill, is \$9,000 per facility per year.

So when we talk about the healthcare sector and how much money gets spent in it, how many patients come through the door—and these are not the small independent practice doctors offices. These are healthcare facilities. The fact of the matter is it is \$9,000 a year for 2 years, then it goes down to \$3,000 a year in terms of cost and expense.

What is the benefit? Lower workers' comp cost, less absenteeism, and trying to improve the morale of the people who are doing the right thing in this country in terms of providing care for those who need to be healed, consoled, and cured.

We need to pass this bill.

Again, we made Mr. BYRNE's amendment in order, but we need to reject that amendment which throws it back to OSHA, whose batting average is really a disgrace in terms of getting rules through the process.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Speaker, just so that we are technically accurate, the resolution in front of us today, point number one, it is a structured rule for H.R. 1309. This is not an open rule. I have served in the

United States House of Representatives when we had open rules, and it is a different environment.

Mr. COLE last night in the Rules Committee did make a motion for an open rule on this, saying: If you are going to accept all these amendments, maybe we should open the floor up to all Members. This is an important topic. Let's get their input.

But the request for an open rule was voted down in the Rules Committee. It wasn't really a suspenseful vote. The Republican side lost 4–9, which is generally the way that works out in that committee.

I am grateful that so many amendments were made in order. I think that is important. But I also feel obligated to point out that under no circumstances should this be regarded as an open rule. It is anything but.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE).

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, healthcare and social workers are some of the most dedicated, least appreciated workers in this country. They are the workers caring for the sick, the elderly, and the most vulnerable Americans, while usually making just barely enough to get by.

A tough job is made even tougher by the fact that these workers who are treating workers in stress, often in private settings, are five times as likely to be the victims of workplace violence.

What does it say about our country that we can't protect those workers who have dedicated their lives to protecting our most vulnerable citizens? It is unfair, and the bottom line is this: No person should feel unsafe in their place of work.

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration, or OSHA, has the authority to protect American caregivers and healthcare workers from workplace violence, but the reality is that there is no nationwide OSHA standard for how employers are supposed to protect their employees from workplace violence. Not just that, but in 24 States, nearly half the country, public-sector health and social service workers are not covered by OSHA protections.

We have the responsibility and we have the authority to protect America's workers, but we have not given our government or our businesses the tools they need to protect hardworking Americans from workplace violence. The underlying bill of this rule will change that.

The Workplace Violence Prevention for Health Care and Social Service Workers Act would require OSHA to implement a standard for workplace protections for healthcare and social workers. It provides protections for public-sector workers where none existed before, and it identifies risks, so-

lutions, training, and, importantly, protections from retaliation for those workers who report violence in the workplace.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this underlying bill and uphold our duty to keep every American safe.

□ 1300

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, Republicans will amend the rule to immediately consider H.R. 1869, the Restoring Investment in Improvements Act. This bill, which has 271 bipartisan cosponsors, would fix a technical error in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act to allow qualified improvement property to depreciate over 15 years and be eligible for immediate expenses.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of this amendment into the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) to further explain the bill.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise to vote down the previous question.

If we defeat the previous question, Republicans will amend the rule to include the restoration of the 15-year schedule for qualified improvement property, or QIP, as part of H.R. 1309, the Workplace Violence Prevention for Healthcare and Social Service Workers Act.

Madam Speaker, there is strong bipartisan support to fix QIP, which affects restaurants, retailers, and other leaseholders in every congressional district in this country. There are 271 bipartisan cosponsors split nearly evenly between Republicans and Democrats on H.R. 1869, which I helped introduce to resolve this issue.

Fixing QIP is a commonsense solution that would unleash investment, create jobs, and help small businesses grow. However, it also requires urgency, and Congress must do everything in our power to address this issue as soon as possible.

I hope that we defeat the previous question to ensure that restaurants, retailers, and other small businesses are able to unlock the full benefits of tax reform and continue driving our Nation's economic growth forward.

Failing that, I sincerely hope that all sides can come together before the end of the year to enact this bipartisan, commonsense piece of legislation.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just a couple of points to my friend from Texas. He is correct on the open process. However, we did allow for all 10 amendments that were submitted to be accepted, and the final vote was 2-9, understanding that that was a foregone conclusion to many of us.

I would just say that this is such an important issue in the urgency, and I would like to join with my colleague to fix the standard and the practice, and to add funding so that the Department can do it.

There is an urgency for problems like this to be solved. We can save money in the long run. When I was in local government, I was on the governing board of our county hospital. Two of our five floors were psych wards. We spent hours and hours in closed sessions dealing with liability issues on those wards.

So when I read this bill, I think that so much of what is in this bill, many of us have already done, at least from California at the local level and at the State level, and it is good business practice.

As somebody who is a former small business owner that had high workers' compensation in the restaurant business, cost avoidance is a good thing. My workers' compensation carrier came out at least once a year to inspect our facilities and see where we could avoid these incidents. So it is just a good business practice.

When I look at this, it makes so much sense. There is a cost to start this, but there is, clearly, in my mind, a fiscal savings and an emotional savings when you think of the lives lost. This is not new, but the demand in the changing trend lines say to me that this is urgent.

So I would like to agree with my friend from Texas and I would be happy to work with him, but with incidents like this, this Department really needs to be ramped up. It is a national embarrassment that it takes 20 years, or 7 years for the Department to do these rules, understanding that you have to work with stakeholders.

So I think there is an element of opportunity here for us. I do think that it is unfortunate, as we talked about in the Rules Committee last night, and Mr. BYRNE talked about, that we couldn't get across the finish line and come together completely as a bipartisan bill.

Having said that, as my friend from Texas alluded to, this is a bipartisan bill. We do have supporters, including Mr. COLE.

Madam Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I understand that the gentleman has no additional speakers, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his comments, and I would agree that the effi-

cient functioning of any Federal agency should always be our highest priority. The efficient use of the taxpayer funding that goes into those agencies or branches of agencies should require our constant attention. We should always be looking to improve the service and the protection that those agencies provide.

I will also predict that this bill is likely to pass with a large margin and it will be bipartisan and will raise the question of why we are not considering it under a suspension of the rules. Nevertheless, that is what the majority has chosen to use their time doing this week, so we have the bill in front of us today.

Workplace violence is a threat that no American should have to face. The threat is particularly high for healthcare providers and for social service workers. These workers dedicate their lives to taking care of others, and they deserve to be taken care of in return.

I support the goal of this legislation. I believe it would benefit from further discussion to ensure that the timeline for issuing a rule and developing a workplace violence prevention plan will produce the most effective and safe outcome for American workers.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question and a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Texas for his comments.

Democratic and Republican administrations have sat idly by while healthcare and social service workers are being beaten, abused, and killed. The problem is not going away. It is getting worse.

In the words of the ranking member of the Rules Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, he will be voting for the bill because it is better than what we have got. I certainly agree.

This bill does far better for our frontline workers who we ask to care for us every day. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the previous question.

The text of the material previously referred to by Mr. BURGESS is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 713

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 1869) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore incentives for investments in qualified improvement property. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except:

(1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking mi-

nority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and

(2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1869.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1333

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. WILD) at 1 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

EXTENDING AUTHORIZATION FOR CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE ADVISORY COMMISSION

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 182) to extend the authorization for the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 182

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

SECTION 1. CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE ADVISORY COMMISSION.

Effective September 26, 2018, section 8(a) of Public Law 87-126 (16 U.S.C. 459b-7(a)) is amended in the second sentence by striking "2018" and inserting "2028".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLELLAN) each will control 20 minutes.