



CONTENTS:

1. [H.J.Res. 27 - Further Additional Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019](#)
2. [H.R. 135 — Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Act, as amended](#)
3. [H.R. 136 – Federal Intern Protection Act](#)
4. [H.R. 202 – Inspector General Access Act](#)
5. [H.R. 113 – All-American Flag Act](#)
6. [H.R. 247 – Federal CIO Authorization Act](#)
7. [H.R. 150 – Grant Reporting Efficiency and Agreements Transparency \(GREAT\) Act](#)
8. [H.Res. 41 - Resolution Rejecting White Nationalism and White Supremacy](#)

H.J.Res. 27– Making Further Additional Continuing appropriations for Fiscal Year 2019 (Rep. Lowey, D-NY)

FLOOR SCHEDULE:

The House is expected to consider H.J.Res. 27, a Continuing Resolution (“CR”), on January 15, 2019 under suspension of the rules, which requires a 2/3 vote for passage.

TOPLINE SUMMARY:

The [bill](#) would further extend to February 8, 2019 the discretionary funding and certain programmatic extensions of the [Continuing Resolution Division of H.R. 6157](#), which lapsed on December 21, 2018 under the terms of the most-recently enacted continuing resolution, [H.J.Res 143](#).

Thus, it would extend through February 1, 2019, funding under the following seven appropriations bills:

1. Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies
2. Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies
3. Financial Services and General Government
4. Homeland Security
5. Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies
6. State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs
7. Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies

Additionally, it would extend the authorization of several programs through February 1, 2019 including:

- Violence Against Women Act (VAWA),
- “Immigration Extensions” provided in Title II of Division M of the FY 2018 Omnibus,
- Certain registration and fees provisions of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and Federal Food Drug and Cosmetic Act, and
- Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and the Child Care Entitlement to States.

COST:

A Congressional Budget Office estimate for the bill is not available.

However, according to a CBO [estimate](#) for the [Senate Amendment to H.R. 695](#), which also provided continuing appropriations for the same seven appropriations measures, the bill would provide on an annualized basis a net total of \$305.7 billion in base discretionary spending for FY 2019. Of this total, approximately \$7.8 billion is for defense purposes and \$297.9 billion is for non-defense purposes. Further, the bill would provide for cap exempt funding totaling \$19.6 billion, of which \$12.2 billion is for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terror (OCO) funding and \$7.4 billion is for disaster relief purposes.

Combined with appropriations already enacted for FY 2019, the bill would provide on an annualized basis a net total of \$1.237 trillion in base discretionary spending for FY 2019. Of this total, approximately \$646.9 billion is for defense purposes and \$589.9 billion is for non-defense

purposes. Further, the bill would provide for cap exempt funding totaling \$19.6 billion, of which \$81.0 billion is for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terror (OCO) funding, \$9.3 billion is for disaster relief purposes, and \$1.68 billion for emergency requirements.

The Budget Control Act (BCA) base discretionary spending caps for FY 2019 are \$647 billion for defense spending and \$597 billion for non-defense spending.

CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS:

Wall Funding & Shutdown

For the second week in a row, Speaker Pelosi will be forcing the House to vote on appropriations measures that have no realistic chance of becoming law. Many conservatives will view this bill as a waste of time by House Democratic Leadership because it was understood by House and Senate leadership that the Senate would not consider a government funding measure until it was agreed to by the President. No such agreement exists to date.

Conservative members may be concerned that House Democrats have been forcing separate consideration of this continuing resolution and the other individual appropriations measures being brought up in the House in an attempt to peel off Republican members from voting 'no' by focusing on the keeping the unfunded portions of the government open with short extensions and the programs funded in individual appropriation bills. Conservatives should be resolute in understanding that votes on these funding bills represent part of a cohesive position on the FY 2019 funding debate. Further, the vote may be seen by conservatives as a ploy to blame Republicans for continuing the partial shutdown.

Many conservatives will be concerned that appropriations are being concerned without an agreement in place to provide full-year funding for the Department of Homeland Security with additional funding for a southern border wall/barrier as requested by President Trump. Currently enacted funding ([section 230 of the FY 2018 Omnibus](#)) for the Department of Homeland Security includes \$1.571 billion for fencing and border security technology along the southern border, of which about \$1.34 billion can be used for fencing. None of that funding can be used for construction of a President Trump wall according to restrictions of that section. House Republicans passed an amended continuing resolution on December 20, 2018 prior to the lapse in discretionary funding that would have fully funded the President's wall funding request.

Other Concerns:

Conservatives may be concerned that this bill providing for hundreds of billions of dollars in spending is being considered on suspension.

Some conservatives may be concerned that the bill would extend the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) through December 7, 2018, which would extend protections to individuals based on sexual orientation and gender identity.

Some conservatives may be concerned that the bill would extend the authorization for the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program rather than adopt reforms advocated in legislation advanced by the House Ways & Means Committee (the JOBS for Success Act).

- **Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?** No.
- **Encroach into State or Local Authority?** Some conservatives may believe that some of the programs funded under the continuing resolution should be funded by state and local governments or the private sector.
- **Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch?** No.

- **Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?** No.

DETAILED SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:

Further Additional Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019

The bill would extend through February 1, 2019, funding as provided in the [FY 2018 Omnibus](#) for the following seven appropriations bills:

1. Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies
2. Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies
3. Financial Services and General Government
4. Homeland Security
5. Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies
6. State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs
7. Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies

Funding provided under those bills expired when the extension provided by the most recently enacted continuing resolution, H.J.Res. 143, expired on December 22, 2018.

The bill would also extend the authorization expiration date for several federal programs through February 1, 2019 that were also extended under H.J.Res. 143, but expired on December 22, 2018. Those extended programs are as follows:

Violence Against Women Act (VAWA).

On March 7, 2013, President Obama [signed](#) the [Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act](#) to continue the provision of assistance to victims of domestic and sexual violence through grant funding through the end of FY 2018. The legislation divided conservatives, including several changes to the original legislation, such as extending protections to individuals based on sexual orientation and gender identity. The reauthorization also included a provision allowing American Indian women who endure assault on reservations perpetrated by non-American Indian individuals to pursue justice in Tribal Courts.

The FY 2018 Omnibus appropriated \$492 million for the Office on Violence Against Women. The President's FY 2019 budget requests \$485.5 million for the Office. In its [Blueprint for Balance](#), the Heritage Foundation called for a complete elimination of VAWA grants, arguing that these services are better funded at the local level and [that](#) "using federal agencies to fund the routine operations of domestic violence programs that state and local governments could provide is a misuse of federal resources and a distraction from concerns that are truly the province of the federal government."

"Immigration Extensions" provided in Title II of Division M of the FY 2018 Omnibus.

Specifically, these extensions pertain to the federal E-Verify program, the Special Immigrant Religious Workers program, [Conrad 30 waiver program](#) for international medical school graduates, and EB-5 regional investor visas.

Another immigration extension would allow the Secretary of Homeland Security to increase the number of H-2B visas above the cap "by not more than the highest number of H-2B nonimmigrants who participated in the H-2B returning worker program in any fiscal year in which returning workers were exempt from such numerical limitation" upon the determination that "the needs of American businesses cannot be satisfied in fiscal year 2018 with United States workers who are willing, qualified, and able to perform temporary nonagricultural labor".

Certain registration and fees provisions of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and Federal Food Drug and Cosmetic Act

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and the Child Care Entitlement to States

TANF is a welfare program that provides federal grants to the states for a wide range of benefits, services, and activities, most notably cash welfare for certain low income families with children, but it funds a wide array of additional activities. TANF was created in the 1996 welfare reform law.

Some conservatives may be concerned that the bill does not include reforms to strengthen oversight of state use of federal TANF funding and bolster the program's work requirements. Such reforms are contained in legislation being developed by the House Ways & Means Committee called the [JOBS for Success Act](#).

COMMITTEE ACTION:

This bill was introduced on January 14, 2019.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION:

President Trump has consistently voiced his opposition to signing a government funding bill that did not include extra money for the southern border wall/barrier.

The [Statement of Administration](#) Policy for two appropriations measures voted on in the House last week recommended a veto with the following reasoning that would apply to the present measure as well: "The Administration is committed to working with the Congress to reopen agencies affected by lapsed appropriations, but any effort to do so must address the security and humanitarian crisis on our Southwest border and should restore funding for all agencies affected by the lapse."

H.R. 135 – Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Act of 2019, (Cummings, D-MD)

FLOOR SCHEDULE:

Expected to be considered on January 10, 2019, under a suspension of the rules, which requires a 2/3 majority for passage.

TOPLINE SUMMARY:

[H.R. 135](#) would strengthen Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) protections for federal employees.

COST:

A Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimate is not available.

A similar bill, H.R. 702, was passed in the 115th Congress. CBO [estimated](#) that implementing H.R. 702 would increase annual federal administrative costs by less than \$500,000, subject to the availability of appropriated funds. Direct spending by some agencies could be affected, so pay-as-you-go procedures would apply. However, net changes in direct spending would be negligible. Revenues would not be affected and net direct spending or on-budget deficits would not increase in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2028.

CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS:

- **Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?** No.
- **Encroach into State or Local Authority?** No.
- **Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch?** No.
- **Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?** No.

DETAILED SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:

Currently, federal EEO programs must identify and remove barriers to equal opportunity. Employees who believe they are victims of discrimination can bring a complaint to their agency's EEO program. Some have been concerned that a few federal agencies have not met the EEO program standards set forth by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC).

H.R. 135 amends the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation act ([5 U.S.C. 2301 note](#)). The bill would require that within 30 days of an agency taking final action or the EEOC issues a decision regarding discrimination or retaliation under this section, the agency must provide notice on the agency's website for one year. The notice must include the dates that the act occurred and the finding was made, the laws that were violated, and the rights of employees under this section. In addition, within 60 days the agency must submit to the EEOC a report detailing whether disciplinary action has been taken.

The bill would also require the annual congressional report be made available in an electronic format beginning one year after enactment, but may also be submitted electronically sooner.

Agencies are currently required to post on their websites summaries of equal employment opportunity complaints by current or former employees or applicants. Regarding discrimination, H.R. 135 would require that this information include the date of the finding, the agency that was affected, the law that was violated, and whether or not a disciplinary action was necessary. In addition, the agencies must include, for every class action complaint alleging discrimination or retaliation: (1) the date the complaint was filed; (2) a summary of the allegations; (3) the number of plaintiffs; (4) the status of the complaint; and, (5) the case number.

The bill would add a new section requiring each federal agency establish a tracking system that would allow the tracking of complains from inception to resolution. Should adverse action be taken against an employee for discrimination or relation, this bill would require a notation be made on the employee’s record, provided that all appeals processes have been exhausted.

The bill would add a new title requiring agencies establish an Equal Employment Opportunity Program that is not under the control of a human capital or general counsel office, is absent of conflicts of interest, and ensures efficient and fair resolution of discrimination or retaliation complaints. The head of the program must report directly to the head of the agency. The title also clarifies that an agency’s human capital or general counsel office may provide advice or counsel to the agency regarding a complaint’s resolution, including legal representation.

The new title also requires that should the EEOC find discrimination or retaliation, the matter must be referred to the Office of Special Counsel (OSC) within 30 days. OSC must, in turn, notify the EEOC should disciplinary action be initiated.

Finally, the bill amends the statement required on nondisclosure agreements under [5 U.S.C. 2302\(b\)](#) to prohibit non-disclosure agreements that bar an employee from notifying Congress, OSC or the Office of the Inspector General about violations of fraud, abuse, or waste.

H.R. 135 contains identical language to H.R. 702, which passed the House in the 115th Congress under suspension on July 11, 2017. The RSC’s legislative bulletin for H.R. 702 can be found [here](#).

COMMITTEE ACTION:

This bill was introduced on January 3, 2019, and referred to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION:

No Statement of Administration Policy is available at this time.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY:

According to the sponsor: Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: “Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power to.... provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States”. No specific enumerating clause was cited.

H.R. 136 – Federal Intern Protection Act (Cummings, D-MD)

FLOOR SCHEDULE:

Scheduled for consideration on January 10, 2019, under suspension of the rules, which requires 2/3 vote for passage.

TOPLINE SUMMARY:

[H.R. 136](#) would offer the same protections against harassment and discrimination to unpaid interns at federal agencies as currently afforded to employees.

COST:

A Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimate is not available.

A similar bill, H.R. 653, was passed in the 115th Congress. CBO [estimated](#) that implementing H.R. 653 would result in negligible increases in costs related to agency training or discrimination and harassment settlement claims. Pay-as-you-go procedures would apply, as the bill could affect direct spending from some agencies. However, net changes in direct spending would be negligible. Revenues would not be affected.

CBO estimated net direct spending on on-budget deficits would not increase by more than \$5 billion in the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2028.

CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS:

- **Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?** The bill would expand the scope of federal workplace protections to a previously unprotected group.
- **Encroach into State or Local Authority?** No.
- **Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch?** No.
- **Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?** No.

DETAILED SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:

H.R. 136 would include unpaid interns and applicants for internships under the same protections federal employees have against workplace discrimination and harassment. Currently, paid interns are considered employees and are treated as such with regard to discrimination laws.

H.R. 136 contains identical language to H.R. 653 which was passed the House in the 115th Congress under suspension on May 17, 2017. The RSC's legislative bulletin for H.R. 653 can be found [here](#).

COMMITTEE ACTION:

H.R. 136 was introduced on January 3, 2019, It was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION:

A Statement of Administration Policy is not available.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY:

According to the bill's sponsor: Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: "Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18".

H.R. 202 – Inspector General Access Act (Rep. Richmond, D-LA)

FLOOR SCHEDULE:

Scheduled for consideration on January 10, 2019, under a suspension of the rules which requires a 2/3 majority for final passage.

TOPLINE SUMMARY:

[H.R. 202](#) would eliminate a [provision](#) of current law that requires misconduct allegations that involve Department of Justice (DOJ) attorneys, investigators or enforcement personnel to be referred to the DOJ Office of Professional Responsibility.

COST:

A Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimate is not available.

A similar bill, H.R. 3154, was passed in the 115th Congress. CBO [estimated](#) that implementing H.R. 3154 would not significantly affect spending.

CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS:

- **Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?** No.
- **Encroach into State or Local Authority?** No.
- **Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch?** No.
- **Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?** No.

DETAILED SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:

H.R. 202 would eliminate a [provision](#) of current law that requires misconduct allegations that involve Department of Justice (DOJ) attorneys, investigators or enforcement personnel to be referred to the DOJ Office of Professional Responsibility.

H.R. 202 contains identical language to H.R. 3154 which was passed the House in the 115th Congress under suspension on November 29, 2018. The RSC's legislative bulletin for H.R. 3154 can be found [here](#).

COMMITTEE ACTION:

H.R. 202 was introduced on January 3, 2019, and referred to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION:

A Statement of Administration Policy is not available.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY:

According to the sponsor: "Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill."

H.R. 113 – All-American Flag Act (Rep. Bustos, D-IL)

FLOOR SCHEDULE:

Scheduled for consideration on January 10, 2019, under a suspension of the rules which requires a 2/3 majority for final passage.

TOPLINE SUMMARY:

[H.R. 113](#) would require the flags purchased by the federal government to be 100 percent manufactured in the United State from materials that been grown or 100 percent manufactured in the United States.

COST:

A Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimate is not available.

A similar bill, H.R. 3121, was passed in the 115th Congress. CBO [estimated](#) that implementing H.R. 3121 would not significantly change the cost of purchasing flags. The bill could affect direct spending, so paygo would apply, but the net increase in spending would be negligible.

CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS:

Some conservatives may be concerned that this is a protectionist policy for flag manufacturers.

- **Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?** No.
- **Encroach into State or Local Authority?** No.
- **Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch?** No.
- **Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?** No.

DETAILED SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:

H.R. 113 would require the flags purchased by the federal government to be 100 percent manufactured in the United State from materials that been grown or 100 percent manufactured in the United States. The bill would allow for the following exceptions: (1) procurements by vessels in foreign waters; (2) procurements for resale in commissaries, military exchanges, or non-appropriated fund instrumentality operated by an agency; and (3) procurements under the [simplified acquisition threshold](#), which is currently \$250,000. Agencies are not required to comply with the requirement if the head of the agency determines that satisfactory quality and sufficient quality of American-made flags are not available at market prices within the necessary timeline. The President may also waive the requirement if necessary to comply with a trade agreement.

Some conservatives may be concerned that this is a protectionist policy for flag manufacturers.

H.R. 113 contains identical language to H.R. 3121 which was passed the House in the 115th Congress under suspension on November 29, 2018. The RSC's legislative bulletin for H.R. 3121 can be found [here](#).

COMMITTEE ACTION:

H.R. 113 was introduced on January 3, 2019, and referred to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION:

A Statement of Administration Policy is not available.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY:

According to the sponsor: "Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution."

H.R. 247 – Federal CIO Authorization Act (Rep. Hurd, R-TX)

FLOOR SCHEDULE:

Scheduled for consideration on January 10, 2019, under a suspension of the rules which requires a 2/3 majority for final passage.

TOPLINE SUMMARY:

[H.R. 247](#) would rename the [Office of E-Government](#) as the Office of Chief Information Officer, and establish a Federal Chief Information Security Officer to direct OMB's cybersecurity efforts. The bill would require agencies to submit a report to the Chief Information Officer on information technology expenditures.

COST:

A Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimate is not available.

A similar bill, H.R. 6901, was passed in the 115th Congress. CBO [estimates](#) that implementing H.R. 6901 would cost up to \$2 million. The bill could affect direct spending, so paygo would apply, though the net changes in direct spending would not be significant.

The bill does not authorize additional funds to carry out the provisions.

CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS:

- **Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?** The bill would establish a Federal Chief Information Security Officer (CISO) within OMB.
- **Encroach into State or Local Authority?** No.
- **Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch?** No.
- **Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?** No.

DETAILED SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:

H.R. 247 would rename the [Office of E-Government](#) as the Office of Chief Information Officer. The Federal Chief Information Officer (CIO) would be appointed by the president and report directly to the director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

The bill would also establish a Federal Chief Information Security Officer (CISO) within OMB. The CISO would be a presidential appointee that reports directly to CIO, directs OMB's cybersecurity efforts, and carries out the duties related to information security for agencies.

The bill would require agencies to submit a report to the CIO on information technology expenditures.

The bill would require the CIO to submit a proposal to congress for consolidating information technology across the federal government, and increasing the use of shared services.

The bill does not authorize additional funds to carry out the provisions.

H.R. 247 contains identical language to H.R. 6901 which was passed the House in the 115th Congress under suspension on November 29, 2018. The RSC's legislative bulletin for H.R. 6901 can be found [here](#).

COMMITTEE ACTION:

H.R. 247 was introduced on January 4, 2019, and referred to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION:

A Statement of Administration Policy is not available.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY:

According to the sponsor: "Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article 1, Section 8". No specific enumerating clause was cited.

H.R. 150 – Grant Reporting Efficiency and Agreements Transparency (GREAT) Act (Rep. Foxx, R-NC)

FLOOR SCHEDULE:

Expected to be considered January 10, 2019, under suspension of the rules, which requires a 2/3 majority for passage.

TOPLINE SUMMARY:

[H.R. 150](#) would require the secretary of the agency that issues the most federal awards, along with the director of the Office of Management and Budget, to establish government-wide standards for information reported by federal award recipients.

COST:

A Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimate is not available.

A similar bill, H.R. 4887, was passed in the 115th Congress. CBO [estimated](#) that implementing H.R. 4887 cost \$50 million over the 2019,-2023 period, subject to appropriation. The bill could affect direct spending, so paygo would apply.

CONSERVATIVE VIEWPOINTS:

- **Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?** No
- **Encroach into State or Local Authority?** No.
- **Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch?** No.
- **Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?** No.

DETAILED SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:

H.R. 150 would require the secretary of the agency that issues the most federal awards, along with the director of the Office of Management and Budget, to establish government-wide standards for information reported by federal award recipients.

Within two years, the secretary and director must issue the guidance to all agencies, which must apply the standards to all reporting by federal grant and cooperative agreement award recipients.

The head of each agency is require to ensure all grants and cooperative agreements use data standards for all future information collection within three years of enactment.

Audits required under [31 U.S.C. 7502](#), would also be subject to the data reporting requirements.

The bill would require the secretary and director to enable the collection, public display and maintenance of federal award information as a government wide data set within four years.

The bill does not authorize additional funds.

H.R. 202 contains identical language to H.R. 4887 which was passed the House in the 115th Congress under suspension on September 26, 2018. The RSC's legislative bulletin for H.R. 4887 can be found [here](#).

COMMITTEE ACTION:

H.R. 150 was introduced on January 3, 2019, and referred to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION:

A Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is not available.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY:

According to the sponsor: "Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: "Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution grants the Congress the authority to enact this law."

H. Res. ____ Rejecting White Nationalism and White Supremacy (Rep. Clyburn, D-SC)

FLOOR SCHEDULE:

Expected to be considered on January 15, 2019 under a suspension of the rules which requires 2/3 majority for final passage.

TOPLINE SUMMARY:

[H. Res. ____](#) would resolve that the House rejects white supremacy and white nationalism as intolerant practices that are contrary to American values.

CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS:

- **Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?** No.
- **Encroach into State or Local Authority?** No.
- **Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch?** No.
- **Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?** No.

DETAILED SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:

H. Res. ____ would resolve that the House rejects white supremacy and white nationalism as intolerant practices that are contrary to American values.

On January 10, 2019, Rep. Steve King was [quoted](#) as saying “White nationalist, white supremacist, Western civilization—how did that language become offensive?” He was subsequently stripped of his committee assignments on January 14, 2019. A [statement](#) from Republican Leader McCarthy explained the decision.

Rep. King released a [statement](#) in which he generally attested that his words were mischaracterized and taken out of context.

Some members may view the resolution as censorship of speech in contradiction to the First Amendment.

COMMITTEE ACTION:

H. Res. ____ was introduced on January 14, 2019.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION:

A statement of Administration Policy is not available.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY:

A Constitutional Authority Statement is not required.

NOTE: *RSC Legislative Bulletins are for informational purposes only and should not be taken as statements of support or opposition from the Republican Study Committee.*