

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 front-line 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 mem-

ber 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. McCLEIN-TOCK) each will control 20 minutes.