

Nothing wrong with removing the name of a self-proclaimed white supremacist from a building paid for with tax dollars.

Nothing wrong with saying that these companies, mega companies, nothing wrong with saying that these mega companies which profited enormously from the slave trade—nothing wrong with saying they should atone.

Good Christians understand atonement. People of good will understand atonement. All religions address atonement in some way. Nothing wrong with atonement.

Wanting to reconcile? Having a department of reconciliation, how does that hurt a country wherein we see circumstances necessitating reconciliation, our moral imperative?

Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor, it is a privilege, to have this freedom of speech. Freedom of speech may be the hallmark of our democracy. We don't have to agree. That is what freedom of speech is all about, freedom to say and not be persecuted for having said.

I am grateful to have this opportunity to speak without fear of persecution. I could be wrong, but I am not afraid. I am not afraid, and I am grateful.

I love my country. I try to conclude by saying this. I love my country. I salute the flag. Yes, I say the Pledge of Allegiance. I sing the national anthem. I stand when I sing it. I place my hand on my heart when I sing it. I place my hand on my heart when I say the Pledge of Allegiance. But I also defend those who choose not to.

That is the greatness of America. The greatness of America is not in my standing and saluting and singing. The greatness is in allowing those who choose not to. That is the greatness of the country, that we can accept those who would not do what others do, those who would say, "Look, I am not an automaton. I am not going to march in lockstep. I choose to take a different path."

I defend their right to do so. I do so because I love my country.

God bless you, Mr. Speaker. God bless the United States of America.

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

IMPORTANCE OF FREE SPEECH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to use the full 60 minutes, but first, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the wonderful chairman of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

DENOUNCING SOCIALISM

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my great friend from Wisconsin, who serves on the Education and the Workforce Committee, and is a very valu-

able member of that committee, as well as the Oversight and Accountability Committee.

Mr. Speaker, today, the House rightfully condemned and denounced socialism in all forms and resolved to oppose socialist policies.

As the Bible says in Proverbs 14, "All hard work brings a profit, but mere talk leads only to poverty."

Socialism is mere talk. Socialism is the idea that if you work hard, your neighbor will enjoy the fruits of your labor.

Socialist regimes, in just the last 100 years, have impoverished, enslaved, starved, and even killed over 100 million people. This is a horrific cost borne by far, far too many.

Socialism, no matter its form, will never have a place in our Republic.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I guess, after hearing the last speaker, I should kind of readjust my remarks and comment about the importance of free speech and the current flight from free speech which we have going on in the United States.

I have here a little graph, which I viewed with total alarm when my staff was able to come up with it. Of course, freedom of speech takes many forms in our society: the ability to write books, the ability to get on the radio, and now the ability to post things you want on the internet.

I hope my good friend from Texas looks at this—he left the floor right now—and sees how precarious the right to free speech is in America today.

We look here, and there is a question: The U.S. Government should take steps to protect false info online, even if it limits freedom of information.

Of course, we all can disagree about a lot of things. We can disagree on politics. We can disagree on elections. We can disagree on medical facts. That is why when we have something wrong with us medically, we sometimes get a second opinion, because one doctor thinks different than the other.

Of course, we all know people, you know: Should I take the shot? Should I not take the shot? Should I get surgery? Should I not get the surgery? Should I get remdesivir? Should I not get remdesivir? A lot of questions are up in the air.

There was a time when it could have had an effect on an election if the people found out that Hunter Biden took a lot of money from people in other countries and maybe had an underlying goal.

The question is, is free speech what this country is about or not?

With the Democratic Party—and this alarms me because I was a Democrat until I was 20 years old, and I thought Democrats were out in front on free speech and Republicans were the staid people.

We have a situation right now, over the last few years, in which 65 percent of the Democrats, a clear majority, almost 2 to 1: The U.S. Government should take steps to restrict false info

online even if this restricts freedom of information.

Only 28 percent of Republicans do.

Now, this graph shocks me. This weekend, I am going to be speaking to some Republicans back in the district. I will tell you, I am going to tell them how disappointed I am that 28 percent of the Republicans responding to the poll apparently don't want freedom of information.

I would hope my colleague from Texas goes back home and explodes at the people back home that 65 percent of the Democrats, or people leaning Democrats, want to restrict the free flow of information.

You could say they only want to prevent false things from being put out there, but, of course, who determines what is false and what is true?

If you look at the next one, another sign of if you believe in free speech or not: Should tech companies take steps to restrict false info online even if it limits freedom of information?

We all know things that some people agree with and some people don't agree with, and sometimes things we once thought were false turn out to be true.

Here again, it scares me. The Democrats when I was a Democrat and 20 years old, I will tell you, wouldn't have thought this way, but the Democrat Party has changed a lot. Seventy-six percent think tech companies should restrict false info even if it limits freedom of information. Only 37 percent of the Republicans feel that way. That is a very scary thing, scary for our country.

It comes down to what I think is the scariest thing of all: the way people think. It is not even things that the governments do. I don't know if we have bad schools out there or whatever, but the way people think is kind of scary.

□ 1445

We know in Canada, to the north of us, which we thought was kind of a country like America, right now, they crack down on churches, if maybe they disagree with the party line on sexual behavior.

We mentioned in the last election, things began to come out about Hunter Biden taking money from foreign outfits, presumably just being given money because of the access he had to his dad. Oops, better not let that out there online, better not talk about that on TV. Oh, my goodness, that might affect the way people think.

So we have this restriction going on right now, like I said, on the COVID stuff. I don't know the degree to which it is influenced by campaign contributions from companies like Pfizer. I don't know whether it is the pride of the public health establishment.

But we are entering into an era in this country in which we are not going to be able to say certain things unless the American public realizes that the First Amendment is borderline absolute. The fact that such a huge party,

overwhelming majorities, have no problem with know-it-alls in the government restricting what you can find online, is very scary.

I hope and pray that the American public wakes up on this dangerous trend. I know we are late here on Thursday. I hope my friend who just got done speaking weighs in here.

I will talk to Republicans this week-end, but I really hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle come down strongly with their rank and file that apparently is against free speech and tell them the importance of free speech.

THE SITUATION WITH UKRAINE AND RUSSIA

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the next thing I am going to address is Ukraine. Again, I don't think the American public or the American press, the mainstream media, are asking the right questions on this vitally important topic.

It would be better for Ukraine, it would be better for Russia, certainly their young people, and better for the stability of the world, if a peace agreement was reached. But there are too many people in this Capitol who I don't think, for whatever reason, consider peace a priority. Among those people, I will label the Biden administration.

Eventually this war is going to come to an end. All wars come to an end eventually. The only question is: Will the war come to an end in 2023, 2024, 2027?

As the war goes on, obviously more and more people die, more and more people are injured, more and more property is destroyed. You create hard feelings such that more and more people in both Ukraine and Russia will have anger toward each other for years and years in the future.

Nevertheless, the Biden administration, I get when I talk to them, is not aggressively looking for peace. Now, the United States has obviously weighed in very heavily on this war. It is hard for anybody to believe that we would be an impartial broker. But there are countries like Turkey, like France, like Israel that can be encouraged to step in and put an end to the war going on here.

I have said before, war between any two countries, they should want to look for peace. But between these two countries, that is particularly so. It is not talked about enough.

Ukraine has the second lowest birthrate in the world. I mean, if you have the second lowest birthrate in the world, you ought to be doing all you can to protect the few young people you have for the next generation. So among all countries, Ukraine especially should be saying they want this war to end.

Russia also has a very low birth rate. If my district is any indication, I think a lot of the young Russians that are there are leaving Russia for other countries, I think in part because of the bad economy they have in Russia and because we still, despite all our foi-

bles, have a free market economy in the United States and a much more honest government.

I have no problem finding Russians in my district. Over a year ago now, when I was in the San Diego sector on the southern border, during that 2 or 3 weeks I was down there in just solely the San Diego sector, the second most common nationality coming from Mexico were Russians. Which means not only does Russia have a low birthrate, but they have a lot of their younger people with their children coming to the United States to get away from Russia.

So we have two countries that their number one priority really ought to be making sure we have as many young people as possible and making sure they have more children, or these two great cultures, Ukraine and Russia, are going to end. Instead, this war goes on.

Like I said, for these two countries, it ought to be especially easy to find some sort of compromise and stop the killing.

It is especially important, to not only just stop the killing right now, but we have got to remember, Russia has hypersonic capability and they have nuclear weapons. Maybe you can say things will go on for years and years and they will never use the weapons. I am not sure that is true. There are obviously people in this Chamber who hope that Vladimir Putin is going to be forced to step aside. There is no indication that his replacement will be more to our liking, and there is some indication that it will be worse.

So I hope the American press corps, the comatose press corps of the United States of America, spends more time asking all of the principals in that war: Are you for peace or not?

Would you negotiate for peace or not before any more people die?

And I would hope people on all sides of the aisle would be in favor of that.

There is another one that is kind of funny. When I was a Democrat, before I was 20 years old, I thought the Republican Party was the party of war. But now it is kind of the other way around. You talk to these Democrats, and they have no desire to have this thing wrap up. I hope maybe the Democrats who were around when I was in high school can step forward and say: Hey, wait a minute here. The Democrats used to be the party of peace, or at least they fancied themselves the party of peace. Maybe they never sincerely were.

THE PLIGHT OF AHMADIYYA MUSLIMS

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the next thing I would like to talk about is, in my district, I have a mosque of Ahmadiyya Muslims. They believe things different than a lot of the mainstream Shiites and Sunni Muslims believe. But that is not the major reason I bring them up today. I bring up their plight because worldwide other Muslim groups are persecuting them and sometimes killing them.

Recently, in Burkina Faso, nine men were murdered before the women and

children there. They are frequently persecuted in Pakistan. There are probably about 15 million Ahmadiyya Muslims in the world. About 4 million of those are in Pakistan. Pakistan is not exactly the most forgiving, tolerant country in the world, and it is no surprise that Ahmadiyya Muslims are sometimes murdered there.

Algeria is another country in which we have mosques, and they are not treated that well.

It is one of the wonderful traits of the United States that while we not only believe in free speech—or at least we did until recently—particularly speech is protected when it is religious in nature. It is important for all Americans to learn the lesson of what goes on in Algeria or Pakistan or Burkina Faso, that there are countries in which not only is religious speech suppressed, but people are killed for saying things that are disliked by other groups of people.

I wish my best for my friends who are Ahmadiyya Muslims. I wish the best for the mosque that they currently have in Oshkosh, Wisconsin, and I hope the rest of the world is supportive of them in their plight.

THE TOPIC OF IMMIGRATION

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken many times from this platform about immigration, and I am going to speak about it again today, because I think it is even more important, if that is possible, than what is going on in Ukraine.

In the last month that we have information, we hit another all-time record in the number of people coming in the country. I think whether it is because they don't care or whether it is because they are for unlimited people coming here, the American press has kind of fallen asleep on this topic more than they should have.

More than a year ago, in kind of the final month, December of 2020, the final month that we had a different administration, there were about 21,000 people who came here. That was a big deal, 21,000 people coming across the southern border who probably shouldn't be here. We are now at 238,000. The all-time high, 238,000 people coming across the border. Of that 238,000, 67,000 are got-aways.

So our listeners are aware, there are two groups of people, when you hear about the number of people coming across the border. There are the people who check in with the Border Patrol. They look for the Border Patrol. "We want asylum in the United States." They probably don't have a valid asylum claim, but once we let them into the country, they disappear into the country.

There are other people called got-aways that don't check in with the Border Patrol. They are probably more dangerous, because they are more likely to have drugs with them, since they aren't turning themselves in to the Border Patrol. They are more likely to have criminal records because we don't

have an opportunity to do a background check on them and see whether they have committed crimes in the U.S. or see if they have committed crimes in Canada. The number of got-aways, more likely to have drugs with them, has gone up from 21,000 2 years ago to 67,000. It tripled.

And what do we hear from the Biden administration? Nothing.

There is another subgroup called “unaccompanied minors.” There was a time early on in the Trump administration when people were worried about families being separated, even though they were trying to keep them separated for a minimum amount of time and only when people broke the law. We have now gone from 2,000 unaccompanied minors every month to 8,000 unaccompanied minors.

Now, isn't that amazing? Minors are coming here without their parents' protection, without their parents knowing where they are?

I mean, if our goal is to keep families together, isn't the first thing we ought to do, if we find a child, is spin them around and send them back to their country of origin rather than allow them to negotiate the trip from wherever, El Salvador or Brazil or wherever, to somewhere in the United States?

I hope the American public—somebody has got to look to find it on the internet, because the mainstream media is not going to tell you—I hope they familiarize themselves with the growing number of people who are coming here who are not adequately vetted.

I want to point out something else. When we talk about the number of people coming here that aren't vetted, the other side of that coin is, once people come here and once we find out we made a mistake, once we find out that they are perhaps committing crimes, how many of those people are we kicking out of country?

That should be fairly automatic, right?

If we have people who aren't American citizens coming here and committing crimes, out they go. I mean, really nobody should be let in here illegally. But if they commit crimes, wow.

Well, what do we find? In the last year before COVID, 267,000 Americans were deported. A fair number, close to that, were deported even under Barack Obama. But about a quarter million a year illegal aliens were deported, primarily because they broke a law of some nature.

In the most recent year—and this is well into COVID, so it shouldn't have as big an effect—we are down to about 72,000. So at the same time, the number of people coming here illegally has gone up by like a factor of 10. The number of people that are being deported has dropped by about 3 quarters, there we are dealing with people who broke the law.

I was talking to a guy who was a U.S. attorney that I ran into, and he was stunned. He was a U.S. attorney at the

time. We have changed administrations. He was stunned at the new guidelines from the Biden administration, the degree to which people in the past would have been deported. It is no big deal.

So this must be a priority. The American public should wake up. I am going to blame my Republican friends, too, for a little bit.

In the last election, I think the Republicans should have spent more time talking about illegal immigration, an area where there is such a stark difference between the parties. But for whatever reason, I don't think they talked about it enough.

Now, there are so many reasons I talked about people who are criminals coming here. I am one more time going to talk about all of the illegal drugs coming across the border. There are 108,000 Americans a year dying from illegal drugs, primarily fentanyl, almost all of those coming across the southern border. Sometimes big numbers glaze over. The number of people who die of illegal drugs—I am old enough to remember the Vietnam war. Every year, the number of people who die of illegal drugs is twice the number of people who died in 12 years in Vietnam. Think about that.

I am old enough to remember the Vietnam war. I am old enough to remember all of the students protesting: Oh, too many people are dying, too many people are dying. And too many people were dying. But now, of illegal drugs, twice as many people die every year as died in the 12 years of the Vietnam war.

Those college students at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, they ought to be marching up and down State Street, around Bascom Hall, protesting the 108,000 people who are dying and wondering what in the world their government is doing to prevent it.

Now, I think a lot of it is there is something wrong if you are taking a drug that is so powerful you could die.

□ 1500

But in any event, 108,000 deaths are too much. I suggest to all my colleagues, over the weekend, if they run into their district attorneys, if they run into their sheriffs, ask in each county how many people died last year of illegal drug overdoses.

We are way over the number of people who die in car accidents and homicides combined—way more. And if somebody dies in a car accident, it makes the paper. If somebody dies in a homicide, of course, it makes the paper. But way more people die every year of illegal drug overdoses. You don't read about that at all.

To a certain extent, I blame these 100,000 deaths not just on the politicians, and particularly President Biden who do nothing, but on our comatose press corps who are not ringing the bell, saying it is time to do something about this illegal immigration and time to do something about these illegal drugs.

Now, my final little area that I am going to address today is a bill I am introducing called the Responsible Borrowing Act.

One of the crises we have in this country is the huge number of amount of student loan debt that is out there. It is much worse than it used to be years ago. I guess a lot of the blame has to go on the universities who are selling college degrees or maybe admitting people who weren't going to get a college degree anyway, and they wind up with these huge student debts.

If you plan on paying off your debt, maybe you delay having children, maybe you never have children—what a tragedy—maybe you put off buying a house or your student loan debt is so great that your credit rating is such you can't get a loan given the amount of student debt.

I have what I would think is a minor bill, but I am shocked that it is going to be considered controversial if we bring it to the floor.

There was a time in this country—in the 1990s, I don't know if it was legal or they just weren't enforcing the law—if you were a student loan officer at a university and a student was taking out a student loan, that person was able to say, I think you are taking out too much of a loan. Maybe they would say, I think you ought to get another job. Maybe they might say, you are living too high on the hog. You are spending too much money. You do not have to take out a \$5,000 loan; you should make a go on a \$2,000 loan. Maybe they could say, given the major you are getting, you cannot expect to make enough money to pay off this loan.

Today, believe it or not, it is against the law for these loan counselors or these financial aid counselors to say, you ought not take out this loan. That is almost beyond belief. We began this little lecture by talking about free speech, and now we have a situation in which we bar loan counselors from saying you ought not take out a bigger loan.

By the way, I think across the board way too many Americans are in debt on a variety of things.

My bill will go back to the days in which financial aid administrators are able to tell students, this is going to be too much of a loan. It may feel good to get that big check in your hand when you are 20 years old, but when you are 30 years old, that debt is not going to be so great.

If you would not spend so lavishly in Congress, or would get a better degree, or maybe delay going to college for a couple years to make sure you are confident that you are going to complete a degree.

This was brought to my attention from somebody who runs a university. They were appalled with it. They have been running the university since the early 1990s and remember the good old days when they prevented students from taking out excessive student

loans by telling them, what a dumb financial decision. The good old days are gone.

Now, when supposedly we are concerned about excessive student loan debt, we tie the hands of the financial aid officers, and tell them, you cannot discourage people from taking out debt. At a minimum, shouldn't that bill just fly right through here?

I bet it won't fly right through here because, for whatever reason, too many of the universities don't like to rain on the students' parade, and tell them, oh, maybe you shouldn't go out on so many Saturday nights or maybe you should get another job bartending or waitressing or what have you. Some universities will fight this.

But I encourage my colleagues to pass the Responsible Borrowing Act and go back to the days in which the colleges cared about their students.

There are some colleges who aren't going to take advantage of this, they don't care about their students' financial health at all once they leave. It is sad to see, but I have come across it.

At least we want to give the responsible colleges the right to tell their students, hey, wait a minute, you don't have to take out any more debt.

I would like to thank you for listening to this. I hope you all learned a little bit about Ahmadiyya Muslims and a little more about the huge volume of people crossing the southern border.

I think you learned a little bit more about the huge number of people in our country, and particularly Democrats—I can't believe I was once a Democrat—who want to restrict free speech, and we have to be on the lookout for that and educate our young ones.

We learned a little bit about the Responsible Borrowing Act and how it is high time we let universities tell their students, you don't have to take out any more. We also learned a little bit how our government is not working for peace in the Ukraine.

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

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE FOR THE 118TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,

Washington, DC, February 2, 2023.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to clause 2(a) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and clause (b) of Rule I of the Rules of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I respectfully submit the Rules of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for the 118th Congress for publication in the Congressional Record. On February 1, 2023, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure met in open session for the Committee's organizational

meeting and adopted the Committee Rules by voice vote with a quorum present.

Sincerely,

SAM GRAVES,
Chairman, Committee on
Transportation and Infrastructure.

RULE I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) Applicability of House Rules.—

(1) In general.—The Rules of the House are the rules of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure (hereinafter referred to in these as rules the “Committee”) and its subcommittees so far as applicable, 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 non-debatable privileged motions in the Committee and its subcommittees.

(2) Subcommittees.—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.

(3) Incorporation of House Rule on Committee Procedure.—Rule XI of the Rules of the House, which pertains entirely to Committee procedure, is incorporated and made a part of the rules of the Committee to the extent applicable. Pursuant to clause 2(a)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Chairman of the Committee is authorized to offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

(b) Publication of Rules.—Pursuant to clause 2(a) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Committee's rules shall be publicly available in electronic form and published in the Congressional Record not later than 60 days after the Chairman is elected in each odd-numbered year.

(c) Vice Chair.—The Chairman shall appoint a Vice Chair of the Committee and of each subcommittee. If the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee is not present at any meeting of the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, the Vice Chair shall preside. If the Vice Chair is not present, the ranking majority member who is present shall preside at that meeting.

RULE II. REGULAR, ADDITIONAL, AND SPECIAL MEETINGS

(a) Regular Meetings.—Regular meetings of the Committee shall be held on the last Wednesday of every month to transact its business unless such day is a holiday, or the House is in recess or is adjourned, in which case the Chairman shall determine the regular meeting day of the Committee for that month. A regular meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with if, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no need for the meeting. This paragraph shall not apply to meetings of any subcommittee.

(b) Additional Meetings.—The Chairman may call and convene, if the Chairman considers necessary, 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 purpose pursuant to the call of the Chairman.

(c) Special Meetings.—If at least three members of the Committee desire that a special meeting of the Committee be called by the Chairman, those members may file with the Clerk of the Committee their written request to the Chairman for that special meeting. Such request shall specify the measure or matter to be considered. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the Clerk of the Committee shall notify the Chairman of the filing of the request. If, within three calendar days after the filing of the request, the Chairman does not call the requested special

meeting, to be held within seven calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the members of the Committee may file with the Clerk their written notice that a special meeting of the Committee will be held, specifying the date and hour thereof, and the measure or matter to be considered at that special meeting. The Committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the Clerk of the Committee shall notify all members of the Committee that such meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered; and only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at that special meeting. Such notice shall also be made publicly available in electronic form and shall be deemed to satisfy paragraph (d)(1).

(d) Notice.—

(1) Minimum Notice Period.—Pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Chairman shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of a Committee or subcommittee meeting, 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.

(2) Changes in Meeting Times.—A meeting may commence sooner than announced if the Chairman, with concurrence of the ranking minority member, determines there is good cause to begin the meeting sooner or the Committee or subcommittee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business. The Chairman shall make a public announcement of the meeting time change at the earliest possible opportunity.

(3) Notification of Daily Digest Clerk.—The Clerk of the Committee shall notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record promptly and make publicly available in electronic form a time change for a Committee or subcommittee meeting made under this paragraph.

(e) Prohibition on Sitting During Joint Session.—The Committee may not sit during a joint session of the House and Senate or during a recess when a joint meeting of the House and Senate is in progress.

RULE III. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS GENERALLY

(a) Minimum Period For Availability of Committee Markup Text.—Pursuant to clause 2(g)(4) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Chairman shall make publicly available, in electronic form, the text of any legislation to be marked up at least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of legislation, or at the time of a meeting announcement under paragraph (d)(2) of Committee Rule II if made within 24 hours before such meeting.

(b) Open Meetings.—Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, and each hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee shall be open to the public, except as provided by clause 2(g) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House or clause 2(k) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House.

(c) Meetings To Begin Promptly.—Each meeting or hearing of the Committee shall begin promptly at the time so stipulated in the public announcement of the meeting or hearing.

(d) Addressing the Committee.—Except as provided under paragraph (e) of Committee Rule IV, a Committee member may address the Committee or a subcommittee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration—

(1) only when recognized by the Chairman for that purpose; and