

Jefferson County Sheriff's Office in 1973 and was 71 years old when he passed.

He was known as someone who enjoyed going to work to protect his community and who was tough but always showed compassion. He leaves behind a wife and a son, who will follow in his father's footsteps at the sheriff's office.

Though he may be gone, I know that Deputy Lee is still watching over his beloved community and family.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the extraordinary life and service of one Deputy James Lee.

He will be missed.

#### DEMOCRATS REIN IN INFLATION

(Ms. SCANLON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, for far too long, families in my district and across the country have struggled with rising healthcare and prescription drug costs. So, I am pleased to report that relief is on the way, thanks to Democrats' passage of the Inflation Reduction Act this summer.

This act reins in out-of-control healthcare costs and will make a real difference in family budgets by extending tax credits for health insurance, capping prescription drug costs for seniors at \$2,000 a year, capping insulin costs for seniors at \$35 a month, and allowing Medicare to negotiate lower prices with drug companies.

A family of four in Ridley Park could save more than \$2,800 in annual health insurance premiums. A senior couple in Media could save more than \$13,000 in yearly healthcare costs.

If the Inflation Reduction Act's \$35 insulin copay had been in effect in 2020, a Springfield resident who uses NovoLog could have saved \$1,300 a year.

Importantly, all these benefits are fully paid for by making the biggest corporations and billionaires pay their fair share.

#### REMEMBERING MARY FREEMAN KELLER ZERVIGON

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

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my friend, the dearly departed Mrs. Mary Freeman Keller Zervigon, an outstanding, cherished public servant from my home State.

A lifelong New Orleanian, Mrs. Zervigon was a policy advocate, philanthropist, and beloved civic leader who held posts in two mayoral administrations and spent countless hours working to improve the city of New Orleans as a member of many boards and commissions.

She lived her life doing what she believed in and in doing what was right. Raised with civic activism in her DNA—her mother played a key role in

desegregating New Orleans' public libraries—her ability to cut right to the chase made her an ideal lobbyist representing the city of New Orleans during rough legislative sessions.

She was an incredible lady and an incredible leader, one who will be sorely missed.

Rest in peace, my friend. God bless.

#### PREVENTING A PATRONAGE SYSTEM ACT OF 2021

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1339, I call up the bill (H.R. 302) to impose limits on excepting competitive service positions from the competitive service, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1339, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Reform, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

#### H.R. 302

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Preventing a Patronage System Act of 2021" or the "PPSA Act of 2021".

#### SEC. 2. LIMITATIONS ON EXCEPTION OF COMPETITIVE SERVICE POSITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No position in the competitive service (as defined under section 2102 of title 5, United States Code) may be excepted from the competitive service unless such position is placed—

(1) in any of the schedules A through E as described in section 6.2 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on September 30, 2020; and

(2) under the terms and conditions under part 6 of such title as in effect on such date.

(b) SUBSEQUENT TRANSFERS.—No position in the excepted service (as defined under section 2103 of title 5, United States Code) may be placed in any schedule other than a schedule described in subsection (a)(1).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, is debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform or their respective designees.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials on the bill before us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 302, the Preventing a Patronage System Act, introduced by Government Operations Subcommittee Chair Gerry Connolly along with Representative BRIAN FITZPATRICK.

This straightforward bill affirms Congress' role in making major changes to the civil service system and ensures that no President can do so unilaterally.

Now, that may sound simple, but this is critical to upholding the merit system principles that have been in place for almost 140 years and fortify the civil service of America.

Career Federal workers serve both Democratic and Republican administrations. They do their jobs guided by their expertise and best judgment, not by allegiance to any political agenda.

In 2020, former President Trump issued an executive order creating a new Federal employee classification in the excepted service called schedule F. Employees transferred to schedule F would have been stripped of workplace protections and converted to at-will employees. If the order had been fully implemented, it could have harmed tens of thousands of Federal employees.

Agencies were directed to identify civil service positions with a policymaking function to convert to schedule F who would be more easily removed from their jobs for not rubberstamping the President's political agenda. Presumably, those positions could then be filled with people who would be more loyal to the President.

Fortunately, one of the first things that President Biden did upon taking office was to revoke the schedule F executive order. But the order still shocked the Federal workforce.

Such an attack against the integrity of the civil service should shock us all, particularly as Members of Congress. We depend on the Federal workforce to serve impartially and in accordance with the law. Schedule F would have instead put immense pressure on Federal workers to bend to the political whims of the President, even if it meant violating the law or Federal regulations.

But this bill is not just about the past. It applies the lessons we learned from schedule F to prevent similar efforts to undermine the Federal workforce in the future, whether from a Republican or Democratic President.

There are some who are ready and waiting to reinstitute a system like schedule F if given the opportunity. We must prevent that, and we can take a big step toward that today by passing the Preventing a Patronage System Act.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Chairman CONNOLLY for his leadership on this bill and for making it a bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1230

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

Mr. Speaker, it is apparently Groundhog Day in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Today, just like the last day we debated a bill in the Oversight and Reform Committee's jurisdiction, Americans continue to face sky-high inflation, painfully high gas prices, and supply chain shortages.

Americans continue to face the consequences of a broken border that allow fentanyl shipments to flood in and kill our teens, along with a host of other urgent problems. They continue to look to this Congress for help with these real and pressing crises.

Yet, what are Democrats prioritizing instead of addressing these issues during one of the last legislative weeks of this session? Another bill that insulates Federal bureaucracy from accountability. This time the bill is Representative CONNOLLY's Preventing a Patronage System Act.

This is just another Democrat bill that has nothing to do with the American people's priorities. What is the problem the bill tries to address? The Democrats' bill seeks to prevent future Presidents making Federal employees more accountable to the American people whom they serve.

Our Founding Fathers never envisioned a massive, unelected, unaccountable Federal Government with the power to create policies that impact Americans' everyday lives. But that is currently the state of today's Federal bureaucracy.

President Trump sought to take on this bureaucracy and restore power to the people by draining the swamp. He issued an executive order in October 2020 to help make Federal bureaucrats who have the ability to create and implement policy more accountable for their actions.

We should all be in favor of policies making it easier to remove civil servants who refuse to follow the will of the voters. That is what President Trump's executive order did.

Democrats are beholden to the Federal bureaucracy—a workforce who thinks they know better than the American people. They are wrong. Democrats have made every effort to preserve bureaucrats' ability to thwart the policies of any President who tries to implement policies to reign in the expansive influence of the Federal Government over the daily lives of Americans.

This bill is contrary to the American way of government—of the people, by the people, and for the people.

The bill's sponsors allege it is a bill that prevents a return to the patronage system instituted in the 19th century. That is simply not true. President Trump never attempted to return to a patronage system. Just the opposite.

Instead of instituting a new patronage system, President Trump simply made it easier to discipline or remove

civil service officials in our government's policymaking roles.

These influential Federal employees should not be allowed to chronically underperform or actively undermine the work of their politically accountable superiors.

If you support an efficient and effective executive branch that is accountable to the American voters, then you must oppose H.R. 302.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to my colleagues who mentioned a problem with poor performers in the Federal workforce. Federal managers have tools now to remove poor performers when appropriate. In fact, over 10,000 Federal employees were removed last year from their jobs for poor performance.

This bill does not change the removal process for employees who are not performing their jobs well, and schedule F was never about removing employees who are performing poorly. That policy was designed to intimidate and remove career employees who dared to provide impartial advice that may be perceived as contrary to an administration's political agenda. Civil servants are supposed to help administrations follow the law.

So let's set the record straight about schedule F. It was intended to punish Federal employees doing their jobs ethically and legally.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the chairman of the Government Operations Subcommittee, and the author and sponsor of this bill.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the chairwoman of the full committee, for yielding.

I have to say, when he cites that our Founders never envisioned a large government, that is true—there were 13 colonies that became 13 States.

I will remind my friend from Kentucky, neither did they ever envision the State of Kentucky. As a matter of fact, what is now Kentucky was claimed and owned by my home State, Virginia. So there are a lot of things that weren't envisioned back in the 1780s that we have to deal with in the 21st century. That is what we are doing here today.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to discuss and advocate for the Preventing Patronage System Act, H.R. 302.

Our Federal workforce—the crown jewel of our Federal Government, especially during a pandemic—is comprised of roughly 2 million Federal employees hired on the basis of their acumen, their skill, and their dedication. They work each day for the American people—serving in myriad capacities to improve the Nation and America's posture abroad.

These impartial civil servants deliver mail; provide medical care to veterans;

help families in the wake of hurricanes and deadly fires; design websites that facilitate access to lifesaving payments like Social Security, unemployment insurance, and tax returns; and they build telescopes that make us rethink what is possible and what kind of universe there is to be explored.

This bill, H.R. 302, would ensure that Congress controls when and how to change the very nature of our invaluable civil service. It simply returns power to the legislative branch.

The Preventing Patronage System Act would protect merit-system principles in our civil service by limiting Federal employee reclassifications to the five excepted service schedules in use prior to fiscal year 2021. It doesn't preclude a President from requesting authorization from Congress to create a new one, but it requires it. It restores the balance.

Since the creation of the civil service in 1883, administrations have established an excepted service schedule only five times. These excepted service categories are created for positions that require unique hiring or operating rules, such as positions of a short-term political nature or positions in remote areas, or in instances in which there is a critical hiring need.

On October 21, 2020, then-President Trump signed Executive Order No. 13957 unilaterally attempting to create a new one, schedule F, in the excepted service. This executive order, according to a coalition of good government groups—I have got 34 of them endorsing this bill—could expose Federal employees to politically partisan motivated hiring and firing.

As drafted by that former President, schedule F would require agency heads to reclassify policy-determining, policymaking, or policy-advocating positions to a newly created schedule F. This action removes the due process rights and civil service protections of employees moved into that schedule.

Despite President Biden's rescinding of the schedule F, Axios recently reported that former President Trump continues to develop a unilateral plan to seize the reins of Federal Government and reclassify up to 50,000 Federal civil servants, who are now part of the civil service, and they would lose their protection and their merit-based promotion.

Blind loyalty and ideological purity tests should never determine who we trust with securing our Nation's borders, fortifying Federal IT systems, caring for seniors and veterans, fighting public health threats, or responding to natural disasters.

As one former Federal human resource expert said: Do we really think a government of political hacks and sycophants is in the best interests of the American people? Do we think making government more partisan will make it more trusted by the people?

The non-partisan Partnership for Public Service stated: "Endangering the skilled employees at the core of our

government . . . would harm the delivery of crucial services to the American people.”

Schedule F is a national security issue—and an issue that affects delivery of essential services and resources to every family and every business in this country.

H.R. 302 reinforces the legislative prerogative. It requires any attempt to create a new excepted service to have explicit congressional authorization.

It is bipartisan and it has 16 cosponsors, including three of my friends on the other side of the aisle.

Changing the nature and operations of the civil service is rare, important, and should require express congressional participation through legislation.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, President Trump's schedule F would send our Nation back to 1881 when President Garfield was shot by a man who believed the support of the President should have earned him a political partisan position in the Federal Government. Congress passed the Pendleton Act in 1883, 2 years later, to a move away from that patronage system, and it has been in place ever since.

As President Theodore Roosevelt said, “The worst enemies of the Republic are the demagogue and corruptionist. The spoils-monger and spoils-seeker invariably breed the bribe-taker and the bribes-giver, the embezzler of public funds and the corrupter of voters.” A good Republican President.

Acumen, not political fealty, must define our civil service.

Mr. Speaker, I have so many groups that have endorsed this bill and many, many Members that have, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a list of organizations that endorse H.R. 302.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM,  
*Washington, DC, September 14, 2022.*

Ms. CHERYL L. JOHNSON,  
*Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR Ms. JOHNSON: Below is a list of organizations that have endorsed H.R. 302:

1. American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE).
2. National Treasury Employees Union (NTEU).
3. The Partnership for Public Service.
4. National Federation of Federal Employees (NFFE).
5. International Federal of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE).
6. National Weather Service Employees Organization (NWSEO).
7. Patent Office Professional Association (POPA).
8. United Power Trades Organization (UPTO).
9. Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington (CREW).
10. International Marine Mammal Project of Earth Island Institute.

11. Civil Leadership Education and Research Initiative.
12. Project Blueprint.
13. American Society for Public Administration (ASPA).
14. National Association of Retired and Federal Employees (NARFE).
15. Professional Managers Association.
16. Public Citizen.
17. Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association (FLEOA).
18. International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF).
19. International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers (IAMAW).
20. National Association of Government Employees (NAGE).
21. Service Employees International Union (SEIU).
22. Professional Aviation Safety Specialists.
23. American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees.
24. American Foreign Service Association.
25. FAA Managers Association.
26. Laborers' International Union of North America.
27. National Air Traffic Controllers Association.
28. National Association of U.S. Attorneys.
29. National Association of Federal Veterinarians.
30. National Council of Social Security Management Associations.
31. National Postal Mail Handlers Union (NPMHU).
32. National Weather Service Employees Organization.
33. Patent Office Professional Association.
34. Federal Managers Association (FMA).

Sincerely,

GERALD E. CONNOLLY,  
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Government Operations,*  
*House Committee on Oversight and Reform.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM,  
*Washington, DC, September 12, 2022.*

Ms. CHERYL L. JOHNSON,  
*Clerk of the House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR Ms. JOHNSON: Below is a list of Members of Congress who would have cosponsored H.R. 302 had they been able to be added prior to the House Committee on Oversight and Reform discharging the bill:

- Madeleine Dean (PA)  
Brad Sherman (CA)  
Rashida Tlaib (MI)  
Mike Quigley (IL)  
David Trone (MD)  
Jamie Raskin (MD)  
Henry C. “Hank” Johnson, Jr. (GA)  
Rick Larsen (WA)  
Norma J. Torres (CA)  
Paul D. Tonko

Sincerely,

GERALD E. CONNOLLY,  
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Government Operations,*  
*House Committee on Oversight and Reform.*

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD two articles: an editorial in the Washington Post endorsing this bill and delineating the issue, and an article in Newsweek doing the same.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 29, 2022]

OPINION: CONGRESS MUST PREVENT ANOTHER TRUMP-ATTEMPT TO PURGE THE GOVERNMENT

(By the Editorial Board)

It might sound like an innocuous change to the structure of the federal workforce: creating a category of employee, known as “Schedule F,” for positions related to “policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating.” Yet, this change threatens to politicize the underappreciated ranks of those who keep the country's government running—the nation's professional civil service.

President Donald Trump created the Schedule F designation by executive order near the end of his term, just ahead of the 2020 election. The order would have removed long-held protections from tens of thousands of career bureaucrats, making them easier to dismiss. That would give the president vast powers to reshape the federal government at will—and could politicize positions long treated as nonpartisan and merit-based.

The Trump administration attempted unsuccessfully to rush through the change before the end of its term, and, upon taking office, President Biden immediately rescinded the order. But, according to a troubling recent report from Axios's Jonathan Swan, Mr. Trump and his associates plan to quickly reinstate Schedule F if he is elected in 2024, using it to fire career employees and replace them with loyalists. Other potential GOP presidential hopefuls have also indicated they would consider targeting the federal workforce.

The federal bureaucracy is a behemoth that includes approximately 2 million employees in myriad roles, working to keep the government operating. In 2020, the Trump administration justified its Schedule F executive order by suggesting that it would make it easier for supervisors to remove poor performers. No doubt there are ways to reform evaluation and dismissal processes so they are more nimble and responsive.

But much of our government's expertise rests with civil servants. A system that sees more people enter and leave federal agencies with the political churn would be less knowledgeable and efficient. It would also eliminate one of the major appeals of federal jobs: the understanding that there will be some measure of stability even when there are changes in administrations. If potential employees feel like they could be fired with little cause or recourse, fewer capable people will seek out these positions. That would only harm the wide range of government services on which Americans rely.

Democrats have introduced legislation that would forestall such a possibility. The Preventing a Patronage System Act, sponsored by Rep. Gerald E. Connolly (D-Va.), would block positions from being classified outside the existing system unless Congress consents to it. Mr. Connolly subsequently sponsored this as an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act, and it passed the House last month. Six Democratic senators, led by Sen. Tim Kaine (Va.), have introduced companion legislation that would do the same thing. These measures would uphold protections for federal workers and reduce opportunities for patronage-based hiring in the future.

Populist politicians point to the “deep state” as the root of America's ills. In fact, what they cast as a threat—a professional, merit-based, experienced civil service—is one of the country's greatest assets.

[From Newsweek, Sept. 13, 2022]

**HOUSE BILL WOULD BLOCK TRUMP PLAN TO MAKE IT EASIER TO FIRE FEDERAL WORKERS**  
(By Alex J. Rouhandeh)

The House will vote on a measure this week that would ensure the job security of thousands of federal employees who previously faced uncertainty around their employment security following an executive order issued by former President Donald Trump.

Trump issued an order in October 2020, the month before the presidential election, which established a new employment category for federal workers called "Schedule F." Under this category, individuals working in jobs tied to "policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating" would lose protections, including due process rights, which prevent them from being easily fired when a new administration takes office.

That order effectively eliminated civil service employment protection for federal employees that had been in place for more than 135 years.

While President Joe Biden revoked the order not long after entering the White House, there is no law in place preventing a future president from executing such an order again.

And Trump has made it clear that if he is reelected in 2024, he plans to do just that.

During a March rally, Trump told supporters that if he were again to serve as president he would introduce "reforms making every executive branch employee fireable," subsequently justifying this action by saying, "the deep state must and will be brought to heel."

"(This would) allow a Trump to put political people in those jobs," Democratic Congressman Gerry Connolly of Virginia, who has introduced a bill to prevent this executive order from being reintroduced, told Newsweek.

Axios' Jonathan Swan reported in July that if Trump were to retake office, he plans to reintroduce the effort, putting an estimated 50,000 jobs at risk.

Connolly explained the effect on decision-making in the federal government that Schedule F would have.

"All of a sudden now, because the people making decisions are avowedly political, owing their allegiance not to the Constitution but to the president who appointed them, and they serve at his pleasure or her pleasure," he said. "They can also now look at everything through a partisan political lens, and that can affect services provided by the federal government."

Connolly represents Virginia's 11th Congressional District, an area near the Washington metro area, which houses a large number of federal employees. He said he interacts with these people regularly, and sees them largely as civil servants rather than members of a "deep state" that must be dismantled.

"This right-wing mythology that they've created that there's this deep state that is attempting to thwart the political will of our elected political leadership is completely false—there is zero evidence of that," Connolly said. "It's all a myth created in order to expand their partisan political power over the civil service."

Under the Pendleton Civil Service Reform Act of 1883, it became unlawful to fire or demote employees for political reasons, ushering in today's standard, in which positions in the federal government are awarded based on merit rather than their political affiliation. Today, the National Archives writes that the act "applies to most of the 2.9 million" federal jobs.

Connolly's proposed Preventing a Patronage System Act, which he first introduced in

January of 2021, would prevent a president from placing employees under a new schedule without the approval of Congress.

In addition to Connolly, the bill has 16 cosponsors. Three are Republicans, including Representative Brian Fitzpatrick of Pennsylvania, who served as Connolly's original partner on the effort.

The passage of this bill could represent a significant victory for Connolly, as he looks to make a case for why he should fill the Democratic party's top spot on the Oversight and Reform Committee once current chair Carolyn Maloney leaves Congress at the end of this year.

If Republicans take control of the House, the Oversight Committee could become an avenue through which the party launches investigations into President Biden and his administration's top officials, as Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy has expressed interest in doing. Connolly would stand at the frontlines in opposing this agenda.

The Virginia Democrat has been a staunch critic of the Trump agenda and the former president's role in altering the functioning of federal institutions. Connolly served as a prominent voice during the 2020 election when Democrats raised concerns regarding Trump's choice for Postmaster General Louis DeJoy's running of the United States Postal Service.

In wake of a federal judge calling DeJoy's actions a potential "politically motivated attack on the efficiency of the Postal Service," Connolly worked as an original cosponsor to help pass the bipartisan Postal Service Reform Act of 2022. In the time since, Connolly has continued to go after DeJoy, introducing legislation to stop him from replacing the postal fleet with gas-powered trucks instead of electric ones.

He likens his work on the DeJoy appointment to his current work on Schedule F. He said both were issues that had not drawn public attention. And, as with Schedule F, the DeJoy appointment sparked questions regarding the politicization of federal government positions long viewed as apolitical.

"A career civil servant, (former Postmaster General) Meghan Brennan retires, and she is replaced by a Republican political donor," Connolly said.

"What we learned during the Trump years was that so much of our democracy is based on respecting the norms and precedent," Connolly added. "When you get an individual like Trump, who couldn't care less about any of that and is not going to respect it, you now have to look at codifying into law behavior that previously was assumed, and Schedule F, this patronage bill, is a good example of that."

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to what my friend, Mr. CONNOLLY, just said. This schedule F has been grossly mischaracterized by my friends on the other side of the aisle.

I want to relay a scenario. Let's say, Mr. Speaker, that this year were a Presidential election year. Let's say that gas prices were an issue in the election. One Presidential candidate campaigns on: We are going to lower the price of gasoline at the pump significantly. We are going to lower it to the price it was when President Trump was in office. The other Presidential candidate campaigns, and says: No, we are going to convert everything to electric vehicles, and everything is going to be fine.

I would say in that scenario the candidate who says they are going to

lower gas prices is going to win overwhelmingly because this is one of the biggest issues in America right now.

Fast-forward to the administration. The President comes in, and he says: We are going to lower gas prices because we are going to issue more permits and we are going to reduce the barriers and roadblocks that the previous administration put in to block the American energy companies. He orders that. He has got a mandate from the people on that issue.

The bureaucrats then say: No. No. We are not going to issue more permits. No. We are going to make it even harder. You can't frack and you can't drill. I don't care what the American people said at the voting box. I am Mr. Bureaucrat, and no, we are not going to do it.

That is why we need schedule F employees because the unelected bureaucrats are not accountable to the American people. We have got a scenario here in Washington, D.C. where the unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats are calling the shots, regardless of the will of the American people. That is why we support President Trump's proposal for the schedule F employees.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader of the House of Representatives.

□ 1245

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of this and the other two bills that we will vote on, the Oversight and Reform Committee bills that we are considering this week. Not only will they make government more accountable to the people it serves, they are also a testament to the extraordinary work and dedication to service of the committee's chairwoman, my friend, CAROLYN MALONEY.

She leaves Congress at the end of this year after an accomplishment of three decades in office. During that time, she has been a champion, not only for New York, but for all those across the country who cherish good government and the causes of justice, opportunity, and equality for which she has worked so very, very hard.

Few in the history of the Congress have worked on behalf of the consumers in a more dedicated and effective fashion than Chairwoman CAROLYN MALONEY.

Today, she continues that service by offering, on behalf of her committee, these three bills. I make particular mention of the bill authored by Chairman GERRY CONNOLLY of the Government Operations Subcommittee, which has been strongly supported by Chairwoman MALONEY and their colleagues and the committee's majority.

I, too, strongly support this effort, which would protect the nonpartisan

nature of our civil service by ensuring that Presidents cannot simply fire Federal workers by reclassifying them as “schedule F” employees. That is what the previous President suggested. That is what his supporters are suggesting now.

And they are suggesting, not only that, but they are going to put people in place who want to follow their political edicts, legal or not. They made it quite clear they want to eliminate what they call the deep state.

The deep state is a cadre of professionals dedicated to honoring the Constitution, the laws of this country, and carrying out the policies of the Congress and the President.

By the way, it is the Congress that makes policy, under the Constitution, under Article I. It is the executive that carries out policies. Now, Presidents of both parties want to be policymakers also. I get that. It is a nonpartisan desire of Presidents.

But our Founders but, more importantly, those who adopted the Civil Service Reform Act and have made amendments subsequent to that, and a majority of the Congress of the United States, both parties, thought that it was in the interest of citizens to have a professional cadre of employees, not subject to political pressure, or whim, or edict, but subject to following the law and carrying out the policies of this country.

We must guard against a future President taking that dangerous step of making them employees at will. Frankly, we have had a very stark example of a President whose will was inconsistent with American principles.

We must not return to the kind of patronage system that fueled corruption and partisanship before the civil service reforms of the late 19th century.

The other two bills authored by Chairwoman MALONEY are equally necessary and beneficial to the American people. The first would further protect whistleblowers against retaliation; and the second would protect the nonpartisan nature of the U.S. Census, prescribed by our Constitution, and so vital to equal representation.

When we passed whistleblower legislation and protections, we did so because we wanted people to be able to come forward and say the emperor has no clothes. The policies being pursued are being done inefficiently. The policies being pursued are wasting money. The policies being pursued are illegal.

That is why we protect whistleblowers, because it is in the interest of our citizens, of our country, and our laws and, by the way, in the interest of Congress, so that people can come forward to those of us who make policy, who appropriate money, to be told the policies that you passed are not being followed, or the money you dedicated is not being spent in the way you purposed it. So these bills are critically important.

And by the way, the Constitution says, count everybody. That is what

the Constitution says. The Supreme Court said that is what it said. Not just my friends; not just the people who like me; count everybody.

And by the way, if you are going to change the rules, tell the Congress, and tell us before it is too late for us to do anything about it. That is all this bill says. This bill ought to be overwhelmingly supported by both sides of the aisle.

Very frankly, if you have a deep state, you would think you would want to make sure that the Congress is the one that sets the policies of who is counted and not counted and how it is counted.

President Lincoln famously described ours as a “government of the people, by the people, and for the people.”

These bills, like the work of Chairwoman MALONEY, throughout her career in public service, will help us keep it that way.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support these bills.

And in closing, once again, I congratulate CAROLYN MALONEY of New York for her dedicated, extraordinarily effective service to the people of New York, people of her city, the people of this country. She has been an extraordinary Member of this institution and has made us better.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished majority leader quoting the Constitution’s constitutional role of Congress in making policy.

I will remind my friend, the majority leader, that it is Congress’ role to appropriate money, not the President. And that is why we should have oversight hearings on the \$300 billion student loan bailout proposal that the President unconstitutionally proposed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE).

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 302, Preventing a Patronage System Act. And the reason why I do so is that the executive branch needs to function in a way that helps the administration, the current President of the United States.

President Trump had an executive order to make a section called schedule F, where employees could be terminated. This is very important, and the reason why I say so is I am also a businessowner. And it is very important for any businessowner, any CEO, anyone running a company, to be able to terminate people working under them.

This is an important function of the executive branch. Preventing a Patronage System Act takes that away. It makes it to where they can put people into positions where you cannot fire them. That is wrong. This is not how the government should be working. It shouldn’t be putting people in places, unelected bureaucrats, into positions and jobs where they cannot be terminated. Anyone should be fired.

You see, there is a reason why the American people call Washington D.C.

the swamp, and it is not just because it is built on a swamp. It is called the swamp for a reason; because the American people see the government as a place where they call swamp creatures; they think they never leave.

In doing so, the Preventing a Patronage System Act, this bill will formally make it a Federal law in order to just make that happen.

You see, we really need a system in place. We need to make sure that we don’t pass Federal laws where people cannot be fired. It should never be the case.

People should be fired if they are not doing a good job. People should be fired if they are not doing things effectively for the administration they work for. The President of the United States should be able to fire whoever he or she wants.

The Democrats want to pass this bill to empower Democrat operatives; people that they have hired; people that they have put in their administration; they want to make sure those Democrat operatives are there to be able to undermine the next Republican President of the United States. That should not be a Federal law.

And as a businessowner, I am telling you, it is so important to be able to fire people in your company that aren’t doing a good job. And it should be no different for any President. The executive branch must be able to have people working there that can be terminated.

Everyone knows the movie “Pirates of the Caribbean.” And on the “Black Pearl”—that is the second one—it has pirates on the ship that become part of the ship walls. Effectively, that is what H.R. 302 is doing.

The Preventing a Patronage System Act will make employees in the executive branch just that, part of the building walls, making it impossible to get rid of them.

So, for this reason, I oppose this bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to respond to the gentlewoman who may not have been here when I made my previous remarks, because I point out that this is not about making it hard to remove poor performers. The Federal Government can and does remove poor performers where appropriate. And there is a process for that.

According to data from the Office of Personnel Management, the Federal Government removed 10,687 employees in Fiscal Year 2021.

It is in the public’s best interest to ensure that the President cannot take action that would politicize the civil service and threaten the integrity of the work that we depend on civil servants to perform every day.

One expert on Federal human resources, Jeff Neal, has explained that the tension that can exist between career employees and political appointees

usually reflects the “need to ensure that proposals are legal” and that “statutory and regulatory requirements, such as the Administrative Procedure Act, are met.”

In other words, this tension is actually a sign that the system is working, and procedures are being properly followed. That is certainly not poor performance or cause for removal.

Schedule F would have improperly targeted those who ensure legality, equity, and appropriate stewardship of taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), a distinguished member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform and a champion for workers.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding to me. And I appreciate her correction of the prior speaker on the other side who repeatedly said that Federal employees could not be fired, ignoring the figures that the Chair had given of 10,000 employees fired last year.

This is a civil service system. It is not a private system. It rules under the Constitution and under the rule of law. That is the difference between working for the Federal Government and working for a private employer.

I speak in strong support of the Preventing a Patronage System Act—note that word—Patronage System Act, of which I am a cosponsor.

This bill would prevent a future President from reimposing the schedule F scheme that would move tens of thousands of career employees into positions that would essentially be a new form of political appointment. The nonpartisan, apolitical civil service system is critically important to how our government functions.

President Trump attempted to—former President Trump attempted to illegally create this new class of Federal employees, in contravention of the Constitution and, more specifically, these employees’ rights.

□ 1300

We need to encourage the best to join the Federal Government, and this type of ploy by the prior administration would hinder that effort; instead, allowing an administration to engage in a patronage system. The government needs experts, not political cronies.

I appreciate Congressman CONNOLLY for introducing this important bill, and I am pleased to be able to speak in support of it.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Government Operations.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. COMER for yielding time.

The numbers that were just shared are out of 2.1 million Federal employees, and the figure is accurate. Some 10,000 were terminated in 2021, but this is a fraction. People in the private sec-

tor are three times more likely to be terminated for poor performance than are people in the Federal Government. That is because it is so restrictive and so difficult to go through the process.

In fact, when the discussion deals with Federal employees that have been on the job past the probationary period, the number of terminations drops to half of what was just spoken of. These are skewed numbers that are being shared, but also a fraction of the over 2 million Federal employees and a fraction in comparison to those who were terminated in the private sector.

We must be able to deal with poor performers in the Federal Government, and our Democrat friends want to protect them and make Federal bureaucrats a protected class. That is absolute insanity. It is bad for America. It is bad for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the gentleman’s statement.

Schedule F was never about removing employees who were performing poorly. That was not the purpose. There is already a procedure in place for that.

It aimed to strip workplace protections away from Federal employees so that anyone who didn’t adhere to an ideology aligned with the President, the former President, could be easily replaced with someone who did.

That is a violation of the impartiality with which the civil service is meant to operate. It is supposed to be an independent, merit-based system not tied to ideology.

If changes that consequential are to be made to the civil service, they shouldn’t happen without the approval of Congress. That is what this bill does. This bill preserves Congress’ authority in civil service policy. People can’t come in willy-nilly and change the system and make it a partisan system overnight.

If implemented, schedule F would have placed Federal employees’ careers in the hands of political appointees who could fire them for presenting data, evidence, or views that contradict the political whims of an administration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Virginia (Mr. BEYER), the distinguished chairman of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 302, sponsored by my friend and colleague from Virginia.

Three out of four of my grandparents were career Federal servants. I represent more Federal employees than any Member of Congress. I have a deep appreciation for the vital work our civil service does to keep our Federal Government functioning.

Our Federal employees have endured attack after attack from our former

President and his allies. The most significant threat to our Federal workers came when the former President tried to use executive action to strip Federal workers of their most basic protections and replace our career civil servants with political loyalists.

This rule would have made a huge number of Federal employees fireable by any future President, overturning a century-old system put in place by Congress to prevent this politicization.

Congress passed the Pendleton Act 139 years ago, through Democrats and Republican Presidents all those years, to require civil servants to be politically independent. We insist our public servants be loyal to our country, not to our political leaders. We demand integrity, competence, and experience, not partisanship and ideology.

Should schedule F ever be enacted, any future President could unilaterally transform a whole government overnight in wildly destructive ways.

The bill we are about to vote on will prevent something like schedule F from ever becoming law. It would block any reclassifications of Federal employees to schedule F and prevent any position in the competitive service from being reclassified to an excepted service position.

This bill is essential to keep Federal employees from being used as political bargaining chips and protects the careers of thousands of civil servants and their families, along with the legitimacy of the institutions under which they serve.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleagues talking about the politicization of how we deal with Federal employees. The fact is, the bureaucracy has never been more politicized than it is today.

This bill is the Federal bureaucrat protection act. That is what this is. Let’s be a hundred percent clear. This is about leftists in this body wanting to protect the entrenched leftists in the bureaucracy, undermining the will of the American people every single day. That is what it is about.

We don’t want to allow the people who are running the agencies to go in and fire people who are either not doing their job, completely violating their ethics at the desk, or, frankly, are going right against the law or the will of the American people.

Look no further than the Department of Homeland Security, which is turning a blind eye to our border. Look no further than an FBI that is targeting parents for daring to challenge school boards. That is what your Federal bureaucracy is doing.

All of these charges being levied, saying, oh, this is about hate, going after Federal employees—I am a former Federal prosecutor and worked with the Department of Justice. My father worked in the Federal Government for 20 years right here. But I know why the



gentleman, my friend, Mr. BEYER, was here: Because the richest counties in America are right here in Fairfax, Loudoun County, Montgomery County, feeding right off of the back of the beast that is the Federal Government, the bureaucrats that are stepping over the will of the American people.

If we dare put forward legislation, like I have, to say that those bureaucrats should be able to be fired at will—for example, how about the HUD employee caught using his work email for private business deals, the postal employee arrested for bringing cocaine into the workplace, and the EPA employee who spent years viewing pornography for 2 to 6 hours a workday?

The fact is, only 25 percent of Federal supervisors felt they could successfully remove an employee, while 78 percent reported that previous efforts to remove an employee had no effect. Only 3 percent of whistleblower complaints are substantiated. Mr. Speaker, 175 of 16,000 discrimination complaints were substantiated in 2019.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to preserve an entrenched bureaucracy to step over the will of the people so that this town can decide the well-being of the American people. That is what it is about.

It is about power. It is about the entrenchment of power among bureaucrats. My colleagues know it, and that is why they are trying to advance this legislation.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I refer to my prior statements and reiterate that schedule F was never about removing employees who are performing poorly. There is a whole process to do that.

This is about protecting the integrity of a merit-based system, so people are not retaliated against and fired because they are not doing what somebody is dictating them to do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), the distinguished Representative and chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time, and I say to the gentlewoman that it has been a preeminent privilege to serve with her for 10 these many years; indeed, superlative pleasure. I miss you already. Thank you for what you are doing.

I am grateful to my colleague, Chairman CONNOLLY. I see this as another example of his legislative brilliance: to make a decision that will allow people to succeed on their merits or fail on their demerits, to take the political patronage out of the civil service system.

The civil service system functions efficaciously across the length and breadth of this country. Police departments and fire departments across the country that have civil servants provide the institutional knowledge. They have the expertise. Mr. Speaker, you don't want to just throw out all the

best of the best that have been working there and understand what the system is all about.

Every new person who comes in would like to bring in people to support his or her political philosophy. I support your having people to work with you, but I don't support destroying a system that allows us to have the institutional knowledge to keep the government functioning efficaciously.

This patronage system that has developed under F has been a failure, and it is little more than fatuous folly that will prove to be harmful to this country.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 302, and I beg that my colleagues would do so, as well.

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

The U.S. House of Representatives needs to concentrate its energy on helping Americans survive economic turmoil and defending our borders and national security.

I once again urge House Democrats to get back to what the American people elected us to do: conduct oversight over the Federal Government and the Biden administration, which is on a path to destroy America.

We need to hold hearings, conduct oversight, and pass legislation affecting the crises that every American is facing today. That is our constitutional responsibility. But instead, today, we are once again spending valuable resources and time on divisive political messaging legislation.

I think if any American was watching this committee hearing today, they would share the frustration of those of us on this side of the aisle who are trying to drain the swamp, who are trying to hold unelectable, unaccountable Federal bureaucrats who refuse to do their jobs accountable. That is part of the job of Congress.

This bureaucracy gets bigger every Congress. I have noticed, with the exception of one speaker, all the speakers on the other side of the aisle who spoke in favor of this bill represent the Washington, D.C. Federal bureaucracy workforce.

The majority of Congress, we represent America, and America wants to hold poor-performing government employees, bureaucrats, who are paid with their hard-earned tax dollars, accountable. That is why the Republicans oppose this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to do the same.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I will respond to my very good friend, who I have tremendous respect for.

I do not represent the Washington workforce. I represent New York City. I represent the private sector, the private-sector capital of the world, New York City, Manhattan. That is who I represent.

I also represent taxpayers, a lot of them, and they want their money to be spent for good government. They want the people working in the government to be impartial and dedicated to doing the best job possible without political influence. That is exactly what this bill we are talking about today is about.

Schedule F, as I repeat, was never about removing employees who were performing poorly. We have a whole system to do that. We removed over 10,000 last year. This is about protecting employees who are doing a good job from political influence.

I reiterate the crucial role of the people who make up the professional and nonpolitical civil service in delivering government services to our constituents, protecting our democracy, and carrying out agency missions across the Federal Government.

Injecting undue political influence into that system, as schedule F would have done, would be disastrous for the merit system we have in place.

□ 1315

When we pass this bill today, we are making sure that no President of either party, Democrat or Republican, can ever unilaterally take such destructive action in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support a merit system, to support the civil service system that has served us so well, to vote to keep politics out of the civil service system, and to support the important underlying bill.

I congratulate my colleague and very good friend, Mr. CONNOLLY, on his excellent work on this bill. It is bipartisan. We have three Republicans. But I hope that we will pick up more, because this is about voting for freedom, democracy, independence, good government, you name it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). All time for debate has expired.

The further amendment printed in part A of House Report 117-464 may be offered only by the Member designated in the report, shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, 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, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HICE OF GEORGIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 117-464.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 14, strike “; and” and insert the following: “, subject to the terms and conditions under part 6 of such title as in effect on such date; or”.

Page 3, strike lines 15 and 16 and insert the following:

(2) in schedule F of the excepted service as in effect on December 31, 2020, pursuant to Executive Order 13957 (85 Fed. Reg. 67631; relating to creating schedule F in the excepted service).

Page 3, line 20, before the period, insert “or (a)(2)”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1339, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me begin by stating clearly that I oppose the underlying bill here. Some of my Democratic colleagues claim that there is no such thing as a deep state, that there are no problems that we have within our Federal employee system. But there are genuine, valid concerns.

Take, for example, a Washington Post story titled: “Resistance from within: Federal workers push back against Trump.” In that article: “Federal workers are in regular consultation with recently departed Obama-era political appointees about what they can do to push back against the new President’s initiatives.”

We have a problem, and it is a problem that bureaucrats do not do their jobs in fulfilling the will of a duly-elected President and the will of the American people. Instead, over and over, as time has shown it, they resist the will of the President.

This whole title here of H.R. 302, “Preventing a Patronage System Act,” a patronage system is designed to get people in the front door. That is not even what we are talking about. We are talking about people who are already in the door who are not doing their job. For crying out loud, it is the back door that needs to be dealt with, when you have poor performers, people who are not doing their job.

President Trump dealt with this by instituting schedule F, giving him the authority to do away with policy-makers who refused to do their job. That is something that is desperately needed, and that is what is at stake. It is that issue that my amendment addresses.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my good friend, Representative HICE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 302 preserves congressional authority to make sure that no President can establish a de-

structive policy like schedule F in the future without the approval of Congress.

The amendment would do the exact opposite. It opens the door for an administration to implement the revoked schedule F executive order and dangerously politicize the Federal workforce.

For all the reasons this was bad policy in 2020, it remains bad policy today.

Schedule F evaded congressional oversight in an attempt to make the civil service an instrument of partisan politics rather than the nonpartisan professional, independent workforce that Congress intended it to be.

Schedule F would replace a professional system with a patronage system, discouraging civil service employees from providing impartial advice based on the facts or reporting waste, fraud, and abuse.

Reviving this attack on Federal employees also makes it harder to retain and hire qualified employees, which further erodes the ability of the agencies to carry out their mission.

I strongly oppose this amendment, and I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to vote “no.”

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER), the ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this commonsense amendment offered by my friend, Representative HICE.

President Trump took needed steps to ensure civil servants serve the American people, not their own interests. One of President Biden’s first actions was to undo these needed reforms.

Representative CONNOLLY introduced this bill, even before President Biden was sworn in, to overturn President Trump’s action and to prevent any future President from reinstating them.

Obviously, the Biden administration has a radically different view of the Federal workforce than President Trump did, one that House Republicans strongly disagree with.

This amendment would simply ensure that a future President could reinstate a policy similar to schedule F to allow for more accountability within the career civil service. We should not tie the hands of a future duly-elected President to implement the clear mandates of the American people.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Operations, and the sponsor and author of this bill, H.R. 302.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the chairwoman of the committee, for yielding.

I must say, the innuendos, the negative characterization, the smears, if

not slanders, launched against Federal employees in general on the floor today would come as news, unwelcome news, to the almost quarter of a million Federal employees in Kentucky, Georgia, and Texas. Almost 10 percent of the entire Federal workforce live in those three States.

The amendment just offered is a direct assault on our Federal workforce and would completely gut the bill in front of us. It grew from the Trump administration’s efforts to turn our expert civil service into a collection of cronies. This amendment invites the crony clown car into the Federal Government.

My concern is not hypothetical. In September of 2019, then-President Trump circled areas of Alabama with a Sharpie that he claimed were dangerously in the path of a hurricane, Hurricane Dorian. That prognostication was contrary to what expert civil servants, not swamp creatures, at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration found. Luckily, the civil servants in NOAA’s Birmingham, Alabama, office tweeted out Mr. Trump’s error.

While “#Sharpiegate” made a funny hashtag on Twitter, the aftermath could have been catastrophic and cost lives.

What if FEMA deployed in the wrong region? What if millions of taxpayer dollars had been wasted, sending Federal help where it was not needed? What if families in the storm’s path were left stranded because our Federal workforce kowtowed to the permanent marker whims of the then-President.

I am not the only one sounding this alarm. Thirty-four professional associations, good government organizations, think tanks, and nonprofits, have endorsed this bill.

From the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers, hardly a politicized group:

The impact of schedule F and any similar effort to inject political patronage, cronyism, and corruption into the Federal Government would not only be felt by Federal employees; it would harm working people, our economy, the public interest, and the legitimacy of our democracy.

From the National Association of United States Attorneys:

If a President can unilaterally reclassify employees and strip them of their protections, there is no longer a safeguard against political interference. This is not the system of justice our Nation should support.

From the National Federation of Federal Employees:

Political operatives or ordinary criminals will be able to threaten the careers of Federal workers with impunity, jeopardizing the collective mission of the United States. This includes employees in Federal law enforcement, national security, and national defense, among others.

Hardly swamp creatures.

From the Nonpartisan Partnership for Public Service:

Endangering the skilled employees at the core of our government would not only further erode the critically low levels of trust



in government but would harm the delivery of crucial services to the American people, especially in a pandemic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I respect greatly the gentleman from Virginia and enjoy working with him, but his characterization that we are attacking Federal employees is just not true.

There are millions of great Federal employees, and those who are doing their job have absolutely nothing to worry about. That is not what we are addressing here. We are addressing those who refuse to do their job.

There needs to be a means of dealing with those—especially in this schedule F that President Trump put in place—those who are responsible for policy-making, to do the will of the elected President of the United States. My Democrat colleagues are trying to protect those individuals and enable them, give them the right to continue to force their will upon the American people rather than the will of the American people as expressed through the duly-elected President, whomever that may be. This is absolutely wrong and beyond my comprehension.

Even Federal employees themselves, year after year after year, talk about how difficult it is to get rid of poor performers in the Federal workforce. Here we are trying to protect them rather than have the ability to deal with and terminate poor performers and, specifically with schedule F, those who are responsible, regardless of the administration, to perform the will of that administration.

My amendment addresses these issues. I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1339, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE).

The question is on the amendment.

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

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Motion to recommit, if offered; and Passage of H.R. 302, if ordered.

Members will record their vote by electronic device.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 204, nays 226, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 431]

YEAS—204

Aderholt	Gibbs	Moolenaar
Allen	Gimenez	Mooney
Amodei	Gohmert	Moore (AL)
Armstrong	Gonzales, Tony	Moore (UT)
Arrington	Good (VA)	Mullin
Babin	Gooden (TX)	Murphy (NC)
Baird	Gosar	Nehls
Balderson	Granger	Newhouse
Banks	Graves (LA)	Norman
Barr	Graves (MO)	Obenrolte
Bentz	Green (TN)	Owens
Bergman	Greene (GA)	Palazzo
Bice (OK)	Griffith	Palmer
Biggs	Grothman	Pence
Billrakis	Guest	Perry
Bishop (NC)	Guthrie	Pfluger
Boebert	Harris	Posey
Bost	Harshbarger	Reschenthaler
Brady	Hartzler	Rice (SC)
Brooks	Hern	Rodgers (WA)
Buchanan	Herrell	Rogers (AL)
Buck	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (KY)
Bucshon	Hice (GA)	Rose
Burchett	Higgins (LA)	Rosendale
Burgess	Hill	Rouzer
Calvert	Hinson	Roy
Cammack	Hollingsworth	Rutherford
Carey	Hudson	Salazar
Carl	Huizenga	Scalise
Carter (GA)	Issa	Schweikert
Carter (TX)	Jackson	Scott, Austin
Cawthorn	Jacobs (NY)	Sempolinski
Chabot	Johnson (LA)	Sessions
Cline	Johnson (OH)	Simpson
Cloud	Johnson (SD)	Smith (MO)
Clyde	Jordan	Smith (NE)
Cole	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NJ)
Comer	Joyce (PA)	Smucker
Conway	Keller	Spartz
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Staubert
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Steel
Curtis	Kim (CA)	Stefanik
Davidson	Kustoff	Steil
Davis, Rodney	LaHood	Steube
DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Lamborn
Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Latta
Donalds	Latta	LaTurner
Duncan	LaTurner	Lesko
Dunn	Lesko	Letlow
Elizy	Long	Loudermilk
Emmer	Long	Lucas
Estes	Loudermilk	Luetkemeyer
Fallon	Lucas	Mace
Feenstra	Luetkemeyer	Malliotakis
Ferguson	Mace	Mann
Finstad	Malliotakis	Massie
Fischbach	Mann	Mast
Fitzgerald	Massie	McCarthy
Fleischmann	Mast	McCaul
Flood	McCarthy	McClain
Flores	McCaul	McClintock
Fox	McClain	McHenry
Franklin, C.	McClintock	Meijer
Scott	McHenry	Meuser
Fulcher	Meijer	Miller (IL)
Gaetz	Meuser	Miller (WV)
Gallagher	Miller (IL)	Miller-Meeks
Garbarino	Miller (WV)	
Garcia (CA)	Miller-Meeks	

NAYS—226

Adams	Carbajal	Crow
Agullar	Cárdenas	Cuellar
Allred	Carson	David (KS)
Auchincloss	Carter (LA)	Davis, Danny K.
Axne	Cartwright	Dean
Bacon	Case	DeFazio
Barragán	Casten	DeGette
Bass	Castor (FL)	DeLauro
Beatty	Castro (TX)	DelBene
Bera	Cheney	Demings
Beyer	Cherfilus-	DeSaulnier
Bishop (GA)	McCormick	Deutch
Blumenauer	Chu	Dingell
Blunt Rochester	Ciilline	Doggett
Bonamici	Clark (MA)	Doyle, Michael
Bourdeaux	Clarke (NY)	F.
Bowman	Cleaver	Escobar
Boyle, Brendan	Clyburn	Eshoo
F.	Cohen	Espallat
Brown (MD)	Connolly	Evans
Brown (OH)	Cooper	Fitzpatrick
Brownley	Correa	Fletcher
Bush	Costa	Foster
Bustos	Courtney	Frankel, Lois
Butterfield	Craig	Gallego

Garamendi	Lowenthal	Ryan (NY)
Garcia (IL)	Luria	Ryan (OH)
Garcia (TX)	Lynch	Sánchez
Golden	Malinowski	Sarbanes
Gomez	Maloney,	Scanlon
Gonzalez (OH)	Carolyn B.	Schakowsky
Gonzalez,	Maloney, Sean	Schiff
Vicente	Manning	Schneider
Gottheimer	Matsui	Schrader
Green, Al (TX)	McBath	Schrier
Grijalva	McCollum	Scott (VA)
Harder (CA)	McEachin	Scott, David
Hayes	McGovern	Sewell
Higgins (NY)	McKinley	Sherman
Himes	McNerney	Sherrill
Horsford	Meeks	Sires
Houlahan	Meng	Slotkin
Hoyer	Mfume	Smith (WA)
Huffman	Moore (WI)	Soto
Jackson Lee	Morelle	Spanberger
Jacobs (CA)	Moulton	Speier
Jayapal	Mrvan	Stansbury
Jeffries	Murphy (FL)	Stanton
Johnson (GA)	Nadler	Stevens
Johnson (TX)	Napolitano	Strickland
Jones	Neal	Suzozi
Kahele	Neguse	Swalwell
Kaptur	Newman	Takano
Katko	Norcross	Thompson (CA)
Keating	Ocasio-Cortez	Thompson (MS)
Kelly (IL)	Omar	Titus
Khanna	Pallone	Tlaib
Kildee	Panetta	Tonko
Kilmer	Pappas	Torres (CA)
Kim (NJ)	Pascarell	Torres (NY)
Kind	Payne	Trahan
Kinzing	Peltola	Trone
Kirkpatrick	Perlmutter	Underwood
Krishnamoorthi	Peters	Vargas
Kuster	Phillips	Veasey
Lamb	Pingree	Velazquez
Langevin	Pocan	Wasserman
Larsen (WA)	Porter	Schultz
Larson (CT)	Pressley	Waters
Lawrence	Price (NC)	Watson Coleman
Lawson (FL)	Quigley	Welch
Lee (CA)	Raskin	Wexton
Lee (NV)	Rice (NY)	Wild
Leger Fernandez	Ross	Williams (GA)
Levin (CA)	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (FL)
Levin (MI)	Ruiz	Yarmuth
Lieu	Ruppersberger	
Lofgren	Rush	

NOT VOTING—2

Budd O'Halleran

□ 1416

Mses. SPEIER, MCCOLLUM, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SHERILL, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mses. TLAIB, STEVENS, Messrs. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, YARMUTH, NADLER, ESPAILLAT, LARSON of Connecticut, LAWSON of Florida, EVANS, SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, AGUILAR, BROWN of Maryland, KAHLE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. WILD, and Mr. HIMES changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Bucshon)	Conway	Lawson (FL)
Barragán (Beyer)	(Valadao)	(Evans)
Bass (Correa)	DeSaulnier	McCaul (Van
Brooks	(Beyer)	Duyne)
(Fleischmann)	Dingell (Kuster)	McEachin
Bush (Bowman)	Fallon (Nehls)	(Beyer)
Carter (GA)	Johnson (TX)	Moore (WI)
(Mace)	(Jeffries)	(Beyer)
Cawthorn	Jones (Beyer)	Newman (Beyer)
(Boebert)	Khanna (Jeffries)	Norman
Cleaver (Davids	Kilmer (Jeffries)	(Duncan)
(KS))	Kirkpatrick	Palazzo
	(Pallone)	(Fleischmann)

Pingree (Kuster) Sánchez (Ruiz) Stansbury  
Rice (NY) Schiff (Deutch) (Pallone)  
(Deutch) Scott (VA) Swalwell  
Rush (Bowman) (Beyer) (Correa)  
Ryan (OH) Scott, Austin  
(Correa) (Cammack) Wexton (Beyer)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 204, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 432]

YEAS—225

Adams	Doyle, Michael	Lowenthal
Aguilar	F.	Luria
Allred	Escobar	Lynch
Auchincloss	Eshoo	Malinowski
Axne	Españillat	Maloney,
Bacon	Evans	Carolyn B.
Barragán	Fitzpatrick	Maloney, Sean
Bass	Fletcher	Manning
Beatty	Foster	Matsui
Bera	Frankel, Lois	McBath
Beyer	Gallego	McCollum
Bishop (GA)	Garamendi	McEachin
Blumenauer	Garcia (IL)	McGovern
Blunt Rochester	Garcia (TX)	McKinley
Bonamici	Golden	McNerney
Bourdeaux	Gomez	Meeks
Bowman	Gonzalez (OH)	Meng
Boyle, Brendan	Gonzalez,	Mfume
F.	Vicente	Moore (WI)
Brown (MD)	Gottheimer	Morelle
Brown (OH)	Green, Al (TX)	Moulton
Brownley	Grijalva	Mrvan
Bush	Harder (CA)	Murphy (FL)
Bustos	Hayes	Nadler
Butterfield	Higgins (NY)	Napolitano
Carbajal	Himes	Neal
Cárdenas	Horsford	Neguse
Carson	Houlahan	Newman
Carter (LA)	Hoyer	Norcross
Cartwright	Huffman	Ocasio-Cortez
Case	Jackson Lee	Omar
Casten	Jacobs (CA)	Pallone
Castor (FL)	Jayapal	Panetta
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Pappas
Cherfilus-	Johnson (GA)	Pascarell
McCormick	Johnson (TX)	Payne
Chu	Jones	Peltola
Cicilline	Kahele	Perlmutter
Clark (MA)	Kaptur	Peters
Clarke (NY)	Katko	Phillips
Cleaver	Keating	Pingree
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Pocan
Cohen	Khanna	Porter
Connolly	Kildee	Pressley
Cooper	Kilmer	Price (NC)
Correa	Kim (NJ)	Quigley
Costa	Kind	Raskin
Courtney	Kinzinger	Rice (NY)
Craig	Kirkpatrick	Ross
Crow	Krishnamoorthi	Roybal-Allard
Cuellar	Kuster	Ruiz
Davids (KS)	Lamb	Ruppersberger
Davis, Danny K.	Langevin	Rush
Dean	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (NY)
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
DeGette	Lawrence	Sánchez
DeLauro	Lawson (FL)	Sarbanes
DeBene	Lee (CA)	Scanlon
Demings	Lee (NV)	Schakowsky
DeSaulnier	Leger Fernandez	Schiff
Deutch	Levin (CA)	Schneider
Dingell	Levin (MI)	Schrader
Doggett	Lieu	Schrier
	Lofgren	Scott (VA)

Scott, David  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Speier  
Stansbury  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Strickland

Aderholt  
Allen  
Amodei  
Armstrong  
Arrington  
Babin  
Baird  
Balderson  
Banks  
Barr  
Bentz  
Bergman  
Bice (OK)  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (NC)  
Boebert  
Bost  
Brady  
Brooks  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Calvert  
Cammack  
Carey  
Carl  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Cawthorn  
Chabot  
Cline  
Cloud  
Clyde  
Cole  
Comer  
Conway  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Crenshaw  
Curtis  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donalds  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ellzey  
Emmer  
Estes  
Fallon  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Finstad  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Fleischmann  
Flood  
Flores  
Foxy  
Franklin, C.  
Scott  
Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garbarino  
Garcia (CA)

Budd

Suozi  
Swalwell  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres (NY)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Vargas

NAYS—204

Gibbs  
Gimenez  
Gohmert  
Gonzales, Tony  
Good (VA)  
Gooden (TX)  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Greene (GA)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Harris  
Harshbarger  
Hartzler  
Hern  
Herrell  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice (GA)  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Hinson  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Issa  
Jackson  
Jacobs (NY)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)  
Keller  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kim (CA)  
Kustoff  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
LaTurner  
Lesko  
Letlow  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Mace  
Malliotakis  
Mann  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClain  
McClintock  
McHenry  
Meijer  
Meuser  
Miller (IL)  
Miller (WV)  
Miller-Meeks

NOT VOTING—3

□ 1428

Ms. BUSH and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Bucshon)	Fallon (Nehls)	Palazzo
Barragán (Beyer)	Johnson (TX)	(Fleischmann)
Bass (Correa)	(Jeffries)	Pingree (Kuster)
Brooks	Jones (Beyer)	Rice (NY)
(Fleischmann)	Khanna (Jeffries)	(Deutch)
Bush (Bowman)	Kilmer (Jeffries)	Rush (Bowman)
Carter (GA)	Kirkpatrick	Ryan (OH)
(Mace)	(Pallone)	(Correa)
Cawthorn	Lawson (FL)	Sánchez (Ruiz)
(Boebert)	(Evans)	Schiff (Deutch)
Cleaver (Davids	McCaul (Van	Scott (VA)
(KS))	Duynne	(Beyer)
Conway	McEachin	Scott, Austin
(Valadao)	(Beyer)	(Cammack)
Cuellar (Garcia	Moore (WI)	Stansbury
(TX))	(Beyer)	(Pallone)
DeSaulnier	Newman (Beyer)	Swalwell
(Beyer)	Norman	(Correa)
Dingell (Kuster)	(Duncan)	Wexton (Beyer)

## CELEBRATING THE CONGRES- SIONAL WOMEN'S SOFTBALL TEAM VICTORY

(Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to announce to our colleagues in the United States House of Representatives that the Congressional Women's Softball Team last night snapped a 7-year dry spell and beat the press team, the Bad News Babes, 6–5. I am surprised that they are not here to participate in this exuberance.

It has been 7 long years in the wilderness, and we are so proud to stand before you and tell you a couple of important things. One is that our greatest source of pride is that this team is bipartisan.

Madam Speaker, the greatest source of pride for us as a team is that this team is bipartisan. Ever since our inception in 2009, the Congressional Women's Softball Team has played across the aisle, in both Houses, and really tried to set an example every day of how we can come together, leave our differences off the field, and make sure that we can come together for a common purpose, and that is fighting breast cancer and making sure that we can raise awareness about breast cancer in young women; and, also, to make sure that we can demonstrate that coming together can help build relationships and foster collaboration once we leave the field and the game is over.

Most importantly, I am so proud to tell you that our charity, the Young Survival Coalition, which is a young women's breast cancer organization that helps young women deal with the unique challenges that we face when diagnosed with breast cancer, we have raised, in the last 14 years, \$2.6 million for the Young Survival Coalition and, last night, raised a record, more than \$530,000 for YSC.

Very briefly, because I know we are all in a hurry, without the leadership and dedication of our board of directors, led by Atalie Ebersole, who is our intrepid committee chair, year in year and out, she just does an amazing job with the whole organizing committee, and also—I am annoying. I am going to