

can to prevent such events from happening in the future. Congress must act now.

The intersection between domestic violence and gun safety is paramount. While I am a supporter of the Second Amendment, the rights protected in the Second Amendment are not immune from government regulation. In fact, Congress has repeatedly failed to pass commonsense gun safety reform.

Make no mistake, strengthening the background checks, eliminating gun show loopholes, and preventing potential terrorists will not limit the rights of lawful gun owners to protect and defend themselves.

The rising tide of gun violence in our communities must stop. In memory of Cora Wilson and the thousands of other domestic violence senseless deaths, let's act now.

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against congressional inaction on gun violence.

I represent the 11th District of Illinois, which includes the great cities of Aurora and Joliet. And I am also the only Ph.D. scientist in Congress. As a scientist, I always look at the facts, and the facts are crystal clear that gun violence is a public health crisis and Congress needs to do more to keep guns out of the hands of people who should not have them.

It is not just the mass shootings that we read about on national news. In the cities in my district, gun violence of all kinds is an issue that we struggle with every day. Leading medical groups have taken note of the effects of gun violence on our communities and have called for change.

Just this month, the American Medical Association called gun violence a public health crisis. When the foremost medical group in our country calls for action, it is time for Congress to listen. But Congress will not even allow the Centers for Disease Control to study the causes of gun violence and its effects on our communities.

We need a rational and effective approach to gun violence for the sake of our communities and the safety of the American people.

GUN OWNERSHIP IS NOT AN ABSOLUTE RIGHT

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, our laws allow law-abiding citizens the right to possess guns. But why should that right allow those who are reasonably suspected of terrorist activity to purchase weapons of mass destruction?

Gun ownership is not an absolute right. Some weapons should be banned,

and some people should not be allowed to buy guns.

Specifically, let's start today with the proposition that if you are on the terrorist watch list, you should be placed on the gun no buy list. Yes, if you are on the terrorist watch list, you should not be able to buy a gun.

Why defend people who are reasonably, reasonably, reasonably suspected by the FBI to be terrorists or terrorist sympathizers?

H.R. 5611 fails to value the safety, security, and the lives of the American people. It is simple. We must vote on legislation that truly says, no fly, no buy.

Speaker RYAN, bring up the King-Thompson bill, H.R. 1076, to assure that those individuals on the terrorist no-fly list should not be able to buy guns.

Speaker RYAN, protect the American people.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Armed Services:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: I will be taking a leave of absence from the House Committee on Armed Services (HASC) since I have been selected to serve on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. As a representative of San Antonio, TX, Military City USA, it has been a privilege and an honor to serve on this committee.

During my time with HASC, I have worked with my colleagues to meet the needs of our men and women in uniform and provide the Department of Defense with the capability required to meet the security challenges of the 21st century.

The federal government's most important responsibility is ensuring the safety of the American people. I look forward to continuing my efforts in Congress to protect our nation and its people.

Sincerely,

JOAQUIN CASTRO,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces, without objection, the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to clause 11 of rule X, clause 11 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, and notwithstanding the requirement of clause 11(a)(1)(D) of rule X, of the following Member of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. CASTRO, Texas.

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4361, FEDERAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS SAFEGUARDS ACT OF 2016, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 803 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 803

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4361) to amend section 3554 of title 44, United States Code, to provide for enhanced security of Federal information systems, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-59. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of July 7, 2016, or July 8, 2016, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to a measure addressing the Federal Aviation Administration.

□ 1245

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin at the end of the Reading Clerk's recitation of the rule. It makes in order that at any time on July 7 or 8 the Speaker can entertain motions to suspend the rules and bring up the FAA bill.

In addition to serving on the Rules Committee, I serve on the Transportation Committee. We have been working very hard with the Senate to try to bring an FAA extension to a conclusion. We are very close to getting that done. But without the passage of this rule, we would not be able to consider that expeditiously later in the week. So among the many reasons to support the rule today, I would like to encourage my friends who care about transportation and who care about the Federal Aviation Administration during this holiday season to support the rule on those merits alone.

But the primary purpose of the rule today, Mr. Speaker, is to bring up H.R. 4361. It is a bill designed to make some relatively minor, but important, changes to the way we interact with Federal Government employees.

For example, Mr. Speaker, it ought to go without saying that focusing on pornography in the workplace during your daily activities should be prohibited. I would have guessed that it was. It certainly is in my office, but that commonsense provision is contained in this bill.

It extends the probationary period, Mr. Speaker. As you know, when you get involved as a Federal Government employee, the stereotypical answer is that you can never be fired. You can be completely derelict and never be relieved from civil service. That is not true, and most of our Federal Government workers are incredibly conscientious. But it is true that we often do not have a long enough probationary period to find out whether or not someone is going to be a good civil servant. This extends the length of that probationary period from 1 year to 2 years so that we will have time to look at those employees.

It adds accountability to what they call the Senior Executive Service, Mr. Speaker. That is that area just above civil service folks oftentimes at the highest points in their career providing incredibly valuable work to the government. But it has been a challenge for

folks to provide managerial accountability to those individuals, and we have added those improvements to the underlying text as well.

This is a compilation of many different ideas that have all been vetted individually. We have combined them together. Again, they are independent ideas, but they are all focused around the idea of how do we give the taxpayers the best bang for their buck when it comes to America's civil service system.

Now, this came out of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, Mr. Speaker, but that is not to say that folks will not have some other ideas on how to make this bill better. I would like to tell you, Mr. Speaker—and I don't do so with a small amount of pride; I do so with a great amount of pride—that every single Member who brought amendments to the Rules Committee yesterday and said they had ideas about how to improve this bill, every single Member that brought amendments got amendments.

We talk about how to run this institution, Mr. Speaker, in a way that gives folks a voice. We have seen in recent times that how folks express their voice varies in this institution. I think it is important that we find a respectful way to have a dialogue about the ideas. The Rules Committee is not always able to make everything in order. In fact, we weren't able to make everything in order last night either, but every single Member who came to make their case, every single Member who submitted ideas to the committee was heard and will have an opportunity to bring their ideas here on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, this is the way we ought to be doing business. This is the way that the Rules Committee was designed to operate. It is a rule that all of my colleagues can be proud of. I hope that we will quickly dispense with this rule so that we can get on to the underlying legislation. I encourage all my Members to vote in the affirmative.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 4361.

Once again, this rule is not open. It does not make in order all amendments that were offered at our meeting yesterday. It makes in order some of them, but not all of them. In fact, much less would be offered here on the floor if we allowed this under an open rule where Members would have the opportunity to offer germane amendments while we were having the debate.

This is a silly bill. It would simply attempt to prevent the President from being President for the rest of his term of office. We elect Presidents of the United States to 4 years in office. I understand the gentleman from Georgia may not have voted for this particular President. There have been Presidents

in the past that I haven't voted for, but according to our Constitution, their term is 4 years.

It is a particularly silly effort because it is a bill that requires the President's signature. Of course, the President, rightly so, has said that he will veto it. Why would a President support a bill that says: I am agreeing to not do anything for the final 6 months of my Presidency?

This bill is really more of a talking point just trying to further delegitimize the current President of the United States. It is part of a systematic effort throughout this great President's time in office to delegitimize him and prevent him from doing the duty to which he was elected, to serve as our Commander in Chief and chief of the executive branch in government which, of course, involves rulemaking authority, which has always been the prerogative of the executive branch.

Now, we can write tighter legislation, and we probably should. That is a matter of legislative prerogative to prevent future Presidents of both parties from interpreting the authority we give them in ways that are contrary to this body's goals. But you certainly can't fault a President when you leave them the discretionary authority in bills that pass this body to become law simply trying to make them work.

Now, this is a messaging bill, again, to delegitimize the President. Well, it turns out that we Democrats have our own messaging that we want to do as well, and we are going to be spending a lot of our time here today, as we have been, talking about meaningful legislation to address gun violence.

Americans have demanded meaningful action on gun violence in the wake of the worst mass shooting in America's history at the gay club in Orlando just recently, and continual violence and the threat of terrorism continue to be a scourge in our communities.

Now, before heading on the holiday break, my Democratic colleagues took strong, necessary action with regards to their actions on the floor. The demands are simple, and a number of my colleagues will talk about them. One, a vote on a bipartisan bill that the President would sign if it reached his desk that would simply expand background checks, which my home State of Colorado has already done.

But, again, until we close this gun show loophole, even residents of my State that are convicted felons, who, through due process of law, lost their right to bear arms, can simply drive an hour to Wyoming and go to an open-air gun show without any background check. Even though they are a convicted felon, they can purchase a weapon.

So we do need a better system of background checks, and, of course, a bill to address people that are on the terrorist watch list from acquiring arsenals to commit terrorist acts.

Enough is enough. Every single one of my colleagues has a personal experience with these kinds of incidents in their district. Communities have suffered long enough, and, frankly, it is time for action. We can't only do moments of silence; we need to take action.

Of course, this bill we are considering is just a continuation of the Republican effort to delegitimize President Obama at the end of his term, just as many of my colleagues from the other side have attempted to do throughout his presidency.

Do you know what? President Obama was elected. Do you know what? President Obama was reelected. He is the President. He will be President until January when we inaugurate a new President. Taking actions like denying him even hearings or votes on Supreme Court nominations or passing a bill saying that Federal agencies have to stop their work just because you don't like who the President is is really disrespectful to our constitutional system of governance.

This bill would virtually prevent the President of the United States from doing his job by stopping all rules regardless of when the rules were proposed or how long they have been working on various regulatory improvements.

It also has several provisions that are needless or antagonistic toward Federal employees. For instance, if Federal employees are underperforming or defrauding, we need to make sure that we have the tools to make personnel decisions, and this bill prevents that.

Many of the majority claim that some of these ideas come from the business community. But, of course, it is not a practice in the business community to demean employees and then turn around and ask them to do more for less.

Instead of wasting time on this bill that is never going to become law—it is not going to pass the Senate; if somehow it did, the President would veto it; it is not going to become law—let's start work on bills that, for instance, make it harder for terrorists to acquire arsenals to commit acts of terror, and to make sure that convicted felons can't simply cross State lines to acquire a weapon that would be illegal because there is no background check and so there is no way of finding that out.

Those are the kinds of things we need to do. Let's get back to work.

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

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

I look forward to working with my friend from Colorado to fight terrorism in this country. We have bill after bill after bill after bill that we are working on collaboratively here. We need go no further than the Defense Appropriations bill, which we all know needs to move across this floor. We know NDAA is a perennial challenge that we work

on together and collaboratively in order to give folks the tools that they need.

And certainly not to diminish the role this body has in fighting terrorism, this body also has a role in governing the civil service system. This happens to be a civil service bill today. Instead of bringing seven different rules on seven different bills and taking up all of that floor time talking about the civil service, we have combined them all into one bill so that we can move expeditiously and we can take care of the business that is important to do.

Far from taking tools away from the civil service, this bill adds tools to the civil service. Instead of a 1-year probationary period, it is 2. Instead of having to demote someone, you have a possibility of removing someone. If the behavior is egregious, this is an addition of tools to the civil service arsenal.

We heard testimony in the Rules Committee last night, Mr. Speaker, of a survey of Federal Government employees who themselves said it is too difficult in the current system to get rid of underperformers in their midst.

Who among us does not want to work in a team of excellence?

I am very inspired by the commitment of so many of the men and women in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. Folks that are depicted in the media as scoundrels, I am proud to work with so many folks here because they are hard-working public servants who want to do the right thing for their constituents back home even when we disagree.

□ 1300

But I will tell you that, far from being a bill targeting this President, this bill has nothing to do with the President. Far from this being an opportunity to try to rein in the President's powers, I would remind my friend from Colorado, Mr. Speaker, that the Constitution gives absolutely no rulemaking authority to the President whatsoever.

I will say that again. The President of the United States under the United States Constitution has absolutely no rulemaking authority whatsoever. Every bit of rulemaking authority granted to the President of the United States is, in fact, a grant, and it is a grant that comes from the United States Congress.

To characterize having this institution do oversight on its delegation of its responsibilities to the chief executive officer, to characterize that as some sort of anti-Obama agenda is ludicrous. In fact, I would tell you, Mr. Speaker, it has been Presidents of both parties as lame ducks, while they are on their way out the door, when they are no longer accountable to anyone in America any longer, who have pursued their most aggressive rulemaking role in those lame duck days, in those final 2 months after the last election their Presidency has taken place. I don't understand how we are served by that on

either side of the aisle, on either end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

And I would remind the entire Chamber that the rulemaking that goes on in executive branch agencies is rulemaking in pursuit of the goals that we have legislated. To suggest that failing to implement rules and regulations is somehow harming the President is ludicrous. It is this Congress that has passed the laws that need to be implemented. We are equally harmed in this way.

My challenge to the White House, Mr. Speaker, is don't put it off. For Pete's sake, whatever you have got going on out there that is so mission critical that it could be described as an attack on the integrity of the administration for us to try to rein it in today, let's go ahead and get it done today, let's go ahead and roll that rule out tomorrow, let's go ahead and see it done in August, there is time in September and October.

Every American citizen is instinctively suspicious of what goes on in this town in lame duck sessions. They are suspicious because time and time again they see things happen in lame duck sessions that could never have happened otherwise.

Far from being an attack on the administration, Mr. Speaker, this bill is in service to the American people, and that is why I am proud to represent it today. I do hope we can get expeditiously again to the passage of this rule and to the underlying bill.

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

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

I think it is obvious that this bill is targeted at the current President, Barack Obama, because it affects him during the period between the next election and when the next President, whoever she is, takes office next January. Clearly, that is the President that it is targeted after. I have never heard these Republicans have the same concerns about either President Bush or any prior Presidents, as has been done systematically against this particular President, that prevented him from doing his authority that this body has sent him bills to do. He is doing his job, and we should let him do his job until the next President takes office.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, we will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the non-partisan no fly, no buy legislation that will allow the Attorney General to bar the sale of firearms and explosives to those on the FBI's terrorist watch list.

The Republican majority refused even debate closing this glaring loophole for the first half of the year. Only after Democrats took action did the Republicans decide to propose a toothless version of this bill that will do nothing to keep our communities safer.

This country can't wait any longer for Congress to take meaningful action on this issue. We are happy to have a discussion if we want to talk about

how we can have better transparency and oversight of these lists and ensure that due process is followed. Democrats care a lot about those issues, and we are happy to join those discussions and work out any issues that might exist in a bill that really is common sense.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY), to discuss our proposal, one of our leaders on this effort.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I find it particularly ironic that we are here talking about suspicion of the public, talking about accountability. I will tell you, that is why my colleagues are here today, that is why several hundred Americans came to the Capitol today: to demand accountability of this body, to demand action by this body, because in 3½ years since the slaughter of schoolchildren in my community of Newtown, this body has done nothing, nothing at all.

Today, we are bringing up another useless messaging bill to provide fodder for TV ads in the fall, rather than responding to the needs of the American people. They are here. Ninety of them die every day when we do nothing about guns. So, in fact, we do need to be talking about accountability. But it is the accountability of the elected Members of Congress to bring forth reasonable, commonsense legislation, bipartisan legislation, that will help save lives.

This is about immediate needs of the American people that have been going unanswered now for 3½ years. That is the sort of accountability we should be talking about today.

The two bills we are asking for action on are simple. No fly, no buy. If you are too dangerous to get on an airplane, you pose a threat to the American people and national security of this country and you should not be legally allowed to buy an arsenal. And second, and critical, the basis, and it is, frankly, about accountability, we need to have background checks on each and every commercial sale of guns. If we aren't asking a question, we are not going to know if we are keeping guns out of the hands of dangerous people.

The Internet has now become the go-to place, whether you are a terrorist, a domestic violence abuser, a felon, or dangerously mentally ill. It is our responsibility to take action to close these loopholes, to do our best to actually write the laws that our law enforcement are charged with enforcing.

So with all due respect to my colleagues about important issues about Federal employee accountability, we need to be accountable in this institu-

tion. It is our job to protect and defend the American people. That is why we are here today and that is why we are going to be here every day we are in session to raise these issues.

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

I will tell my friends, I have only had a voting card in this institution for 5½ years, but I have learned enough in those 5½ years to know that we can't consider every issue every day. The gentlewoman from Connecticut just had her State ObamaCare exchange taken over by Federal regulators this week because it is so financially unstable. It was the 14th of 23 of these exchanges that have failed in the intervening year. Not failed the American taxpayer, though they have, but failed the American citizens who were forced into them.

I will wait to hear if anybody is going to come to the floor today to wonder why it is we are not focused on abolishing those punitive actions, if we are going to have anybody come to the floor today and ask what we are going to do for those 400,000 people in Connecticut who we forced into an exchange that is now in receivership. We can't do every issue every day. I hope we will get to these issues as well, Mr. Speaker. But let's not minimize what this bill is today.

I am not going to characterize anyone's motives, Mr. Speaker, but the reason this bill was necessary to begin with is because the Federal labor unions that represent Federal Government employees were standing between us and some serious national security concerns. Now, that hasn't been raised yet. But I want to make sure that if we are going to go down some rabbit holes, that we try to come back to why this is so important.

At the Department of Homeland Security, Mr. Speaker, they saw an uptick in the infections of their computer system. Now, they are mandated by Federal law to protect the Federal IT infrastructure. And when they delved further, Mr. Speaker, what they found was that individuals accessing their personal email, their Web mail, from their office computer was providing the gateway for these infections at the Department of Homeland Security.

So, as you would expect, the Department of Homeland Security—and this was in the Immigration and Customs Enforcement subdivision—said no more Web mail until we get this figured out. The labor union filed suit. The labor union appealed that decision and said: No, no, no, no, I understand that you are trying to protect national security here, but we think we have collective bargaining rights and that our employees have the right to access their personal email on their work time and you cannot take this step to protect national IT infrastructure security without coming to the labor union collective bargaining table first. That is just nonsense. That is just nonsense.

Now, you don't have to take my word for it, Mr. Speaker. I don't claim to be

a labor union attorney. I have never done that kind of work. But I will read from the report. This is the dissenting member, because when the labor union appealed to the labor union board, the board came down in their favor. The dissenting member of the board wrote this. He said:

It is obvious to me (after having served for seven and a half years as the chief information officer at the U.S. Department of Labor) that neither the FLRA—

That is the board.

—nor the arbitrator possesses the specialized knowledge or expertise that would permit us to decide when a Federal agency ought to address specific security risks or permit us to second-guess how that agency should exercise those responsibilities.

This is a member of the labor board saying: Guess what? Having been the chief information officer, I can tell you this board has no skills that enable it to make decisions in this area.

He goes on:

I cannot conclude that Congress intended for our statute to be read so expansively as to impose additional—

In this case bargaining.

—requirements on Federal agencies before they can act to secure the integrity of their Federal IT systems, the breach of which could directly impact our Nation's security and economic prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, this is a member of the labor board saying: I cannot believe that what Congress intended was to give labor relations so much power in this country that agency heads would be prevented from acting in the name of national security. And he was right. He was right.

But you don't have to take my word for it that he is right. If this rule passes, if this bill comes to the floor, we are going to pass it again today. If you wonder what it was Congress intended, you need wait no further in the middle of the afternoon here on a Wednesday to find out what Congress intended because we are going to act on it again.

It is lunacy, it is lunacy to suggest that collective bargaining rights have to run in conflict with national security. But that is the way the labor board came down. And only with the passage of this statutory change will we be able to see that Congress' original intent is fulfilled.

Mr. DEUTCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's discussion and analysis of these issues, but it begs just a couple of questions.

There is some extensive discussion about what Congress intended and how a statute will be interpreted and whether interpreting that statute, acting in the name of national security, whether the statute should be clear so that it can be acted upon in the name of national security.

So I ask my friend, if that is the case, if we are so worried about IT infrastructure and the security risks of

IT infrastructure and what Congress intended in a statute, then clearly the gentleman would agree we ought to be more concerned. In fact, it should be our fundamental concern to worry not just about the security risk to IT, but the security risk to the lives of people who live in our communities.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman knows what bills we are discussing, the gentleman knows it well. I had constituents in the office today. They brought their young children in. They are in town for the Fourth of July. And the dad said: ROB, sometimes I think folks are just trying to pick a fight up there. They are not even trying to find a solution or a pathway forward.

My friend knows what FISMA requires, and it has nothing to do with the topic that the gentleman is pursuing. The gentleman knows what the labor act requires, and it has nothing to do with the topic that the gentleman is pursuing. And the gentleman knows that this bill is not trying to address a frivolous issue. It is an important issue that ought to be a uniting issue.

□ 1315

I understand that, as Members of this Chamber, we all have different axes that we have to grind, that we all have different topics that are hot in our districts back home, and that we all have different ideas about how to move this country forward.

What ought to be number one on that list for me is the FairTax, Mr. Speaker. This doesn't happen to be FairTax day, but it is civil servant improvement day; and there is not a Member in this Chamber who believes we got it right the first time. There is not a Member in this Chamber who doesn't believe that we can do better both for civil servants themselves and for the taxpayers who fund them.

Mr. Speaker, the rule that we are debating right now made amendments in order from every single Member of this body who had ideas about how to change it. I want to make that clear, Mr. Speaker. We may hear some conversation about voices in this Chamber and whether or not they will have an opportunity to be heard on this bill. On this bill, in this moment, on this day, for this issue, every single Member who said "pick me" had a chance to have his voice heard.

Mr. DEUTCH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DEUTCH. I understand what we are debating here; but I would just ask the gentleman that, as we have a discussion about national security and the security risk to infrastructure: Isn't it true that the threat of a suspected terrorist purchasing a gun and the failure—

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time from the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we are not going to be able to

come together on solving civil service issues today. Perhaps we are not. Perhaps we are just going to have to bring this bill to the floor without the kind of collegial debate that I would have hoped for. We will just have a vote on it, and we will see where the vote lies, but it doesn't have to be that way, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't have to be that way.

I tell my constituents at town hall meetings all the time that what has disappointed me the most in this Chamber has been the focus that folks put on those things that divide us instead of on those things that unite us.

If folks treat me shabbily on the little issues, Mr. Speaker, how do I gain the trust with them to work with them on the difficult issues? If folks go around the process on the little issues, how do we gain the trust with one another to work together on the big issues?

We have got to get the little things right. It provides a framework for success that we will use to conquer the big issues, too. I have unlimited faith and expectations for this body, Mr. Speaker, but let's get this little thing right today. Let's build that trust.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, our time is spoken for, so I appreciate our being able to ask some questions even if we weren't able to complete them on our time. I think the gentleman from Florida's point was that many of the arguments by the gentleman from Georgia can be applied to the need to actually prevent terrorists from acquiring arsenals to commit terrorist acts.

Are we concerned about cybersecurity?

Yes. Again, our time is spoken for.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. No. I will be happy to enter into a discourse with the gentleman on his time, but I have a number of speakers here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a leader on the issue of fighting against terrorism.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear to the American people the extraordinary irony of this argument by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle in that they are deeply focused on national security interests and the protection of infrastructure while they refuse to debate, for a moment, the fact that thousands of people on the terrorist watch list have purchased guns.

Ninety-five percent of the people who have been killed in this country by terrorists since September 11 have been killed by a firearm, and there is no legal prohibition against preventing those individuals from going into a gun

store and buying as many weapons as they want. So if we are really interested in protecting the American people and the infrastructure and the national security of this country, let's start with the simple proposition: prevent suspected terrorists from buying guns.

Mr. Speaker, since we adjourned the last time, 2 weeks ago, 543 Americans have been killed by gun violence. In my home State, since the beginning of this year, five people have been killed, and 36 people have been wounded in the State of Rhode Island by gun violence. Every day, 91 Americans lose their lives to an incident of gun violence. We kill each other with guns at a rate that is 297 times higher than in Japan, 49 times higher than in France, and 33 times higher than in Israel, just to give you some comparison. We have a gun violence epidemic in this country.

We have a lot of statistics, and we have heard a lot of numbers. Earlier today, many of us stood on the steps of the Capitol with the survivors of gun violence, with mothers and fathers, with sons and daughters, with people all across this country who have suffered and whose lives have been changed forever because of gun violence.

We heard from Catherine Bodine, from New Paris, Ohio. She was shot, and her 10-year-old daughter was killed because a convicted domestic abuser—someone who was legally prohibited from owning a gun—was able to purchase a firearm in a private sale without there being a background check.

We heard from Antwan Reeves, a father of four, who was sitting in a parked car with his cousin, Los Angeles Rams' wide receiver Stedman Bailey, in November of last year, when someone drove past and sprayed their car with bullets. Antwan was shot 11 times as he shielded his kids in the back seat. His cousin was shot twice in the head, but, miraculously, he survived.

We heard from Barbara Parker, whose daughter, Alison Parker, a reporter, was on live television when she was shot and killed, along with her cameraman, by a disgruntled former coworker in Roanoke, Virginia.

We heard from Jill Robinson, whose 43-year-old son died in Baltimore after he was shot in the head, chest, and leg during a robbery gone wrong.

We heard from DeAndrea Yates, whose 13-year-old son was hit by a stray bullet at a birthday party in Indianapolis. Once an aspiring athlete, DeAndrea is now a paraplegic who has lost the power of speech.

We heard from Kate Ranta, who was shot by her estranged husband after he broke into her apartment in Coral Springs, Florida. Kate's father was also shot. The incident took place in front of her 4-year-old son.

Finally, we heard from Andrew Goddard, whose son, Colin, was shot and killed in his French class at Virginia Tech during one of the worst mass shootings in American history.

This epidemic is affecting Americans all across our country—young and old, rich and poor, Black and White, gay and straight. There are 33,000 Americans who lose their lives every year in an incident of gun violence. For these families, a moment of silence is not enough; and for these families, the conversation they are hearing from the Republicans is not enough.

As much as you try to change the subject, we will not. We heard their stories today. It is time for the entire Congress to hear their calls and to take up commonsense bills that will reduce the ongoing bloodshed in this country.

Mr. Speaker, preventing suspects who are on the terrorist watch list from buying guns and having universal background checks are bills that will make a difference in the lives of all Americans. Bring those bills to the floor. Do it today. Let's have a debate. Let's hear the arguments. Do it for every American whose life has been changed by this epidemic. We owe it to them. We can have lots of debates, but these are urgent issues that are facing our country. We owe it to the American people.

I ask my friend from Georgia: Will you use your influence in the Republican caucus to bring these bills to the floor? To urge the Speaker?

You are an eloquent debater. Bring these bills to the floor. Defend your opposition so as to let the American people have a vote. Let's honor the memories of all who have been hurt by gun violence in this country, and let's do something today.

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

I would say to my friends that I believe in this institution, and I believe in the debates that we have here. I was very disappointed in what I saw before the Fourth of July when folks took away the voices of many of us on the floor, and did so in violation of the rules that I hold to be very important; but I am grateful to my friends for the way that they are doing their debate today. They have an important issue that they want to spend time on, and I would be happy to reserve so that they could continue to do that.

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

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

I want to be clear. We would rather have this debate time under the rule for a bill that allows for the consideration of the no fly, no buy bill; but given that that rule hasn't come up before the Rules Committee yet, this and the 1 minutes and the sit-ins are, really, the only alternatives that are left to what I believe to be a majority of this body that cares a lot about keeping weapons out of the hands of terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), a leader on the issue to reduce gun violence.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman from Colorado. I associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleague from Georgia that the disappointment that you had before the Fourth of July break pales in comparison to the disappointment of the families in the State of Connecticut and of the families all across this Nation who have witnessed firsthand devastation that defies comprehension and definition. It is that palpable feeling and their frustration for people who are sworn to serve the constituents they represent and to be denied even a vote.

As for the bill for which this rule is currently being discussed, I agree with what Mr. POLIS had to say, but I would say this: At least you are getting a vote.

PAUL RYAN has said—and I have great respect for our Speaker—“we will not duck the tough issues. We will take them head on . . . We should not hide our disagreements. We should embrace them. We have nothing to fear from honest disagreements honestly stated,” except we don't ever get to state them because there is never a bill that comes before the floor.

JOHN LEWIS and I had a candid discussion with the Speaker last night at the Speaker's invitation. The Speaker is an honorable man, and his respect for JOHN LEWIS and for JOHN LEWIS' explanation in talking about why we are here and why people are gathering outside of this building on a daily basis and throughout the social media, I think, is indicative to what is happening here in our call for a vote.

Later today, on a rule and on a bill that TIM MURPHY is putting forth, the Speaker said: Geez, I hope we can all come together on that.

We went back to our caucus and to our people, and they all said: We understand the importance and magnitude of that bill. We understand the work that has gone into it.

We will work and participate even in the midst of strong disagreement and differences because of the respect for the institution and also the work that went into that. We just ask that you respect our concerns, and, more importantly than our concerns, the concerns of hundreds of thousands of constituents all across the country who are asking for one simple thing: the responsibility, and then the dignity that comes from a vote. It doesn't matter where we sit in the final analysis. It matters where Congress stands, and we need to stand up and be counted.

As has been said, the gentleman from Georgia is an eloquent debater. I have great respect for people on the other side of the aisle. It is now long overdue that we have an honest debate, whether we disagree or not, and to honestly state them.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to tell my friend from Connecticut how much I appreciate his comments. You don't solve big issues by fussing at

each other on TV. You solve big issues by sitting down with each other and talking about them. I appreciate the gentleman's accepting the Speaker's invitation. It was an earnest effort to try to find a pathway forward. I am proud to serve in a House that is led by someone who is committed to finding pathways forward and to doing them in the collaborative way that the gentleman from Connecticut described.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank my friend from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I would, respectfully, tell my friend from Georgia that preventing guns from falling into the hands of suspected terrorists is a big issue, but it is a small issue for us to address. It is very straightforward. I oppose the rule today because I find it hard to believe, given the threat of suspected terrorists' buying guns, that, rather than debating that, we are debating a bill about eliminating pornography from our agencies. That is the priority.

America is watching. What is this House going to do in response to the continued threat of gun violence?

Last month, in my home State of Florida, we suffered the worst mass shooting in our Nation's history. We shut down the House to demand a vote on legislation that will make our communities safer. Now, this week, we have a proposal before us that looks like it was blessed by the gun lobby. The fact is that gun companies have had their way in Washington for too long, and it is about time that we put the safety of the American people first.

This morning, I met with my constituent Kate Ranta and joined her on the Capitol steps. She is a brave survivor of gun violence. Her words that she shared on the Capitol steps deserve to be heard in the people's House; so I will share them.

“I am far too familiar with the dangerous and deadly relationship between guns and violence against women in America.

“Three-and-a-half years ago, my estranged husband stalked me to my apartment, an address I had not given him.

□ 1330

“He shot through the door with a 9-millimeter handgun. My father and I were standing behind that door pushing against it. My son was standing directly behind us and the bullets flew through the door.

“My father and I were both shot in front of my son when he was only 4 years old. He screamed, ‘Don't do it, daddy. Don't shoot mommy.’

“He then watched me crawl in my own blood and begged for my life. He was only 4.”

Kate's domestic abuser shouldn't have been able to get a gun, but our

broken and disjointed laws just don't work.

Thirty-two States don't require background checks on all gun transfers. Those who we know are dangerous, those we know who want to hurt their own family, the presence of a gun, Mr. Speaker, in a domestic violence situation makes it five times more likely that the woman will be killed.

Our broken gun laws make it as easy as a mouse click to get a handgun or a rifle with a 30-round magazine. Or they can go to one of the estimated 2,000 gun shows held every year in America. They can get these guns with no questions asked. We must close these loopholes.

Kate won't stop speaking out for her family and for others like hers. I won't stop speaking out for them. We have to have a vote to close the background check loophole.

I also value the way this body works. I value debate. But it is not debatable. It is not debatable that if you buy a gun in a gun store and have to have a background check that you shouldn't have to have the same check if you buy it at a gun show or if you buy it online. It is not debatable. It is not debatable that suspected terrorists shouldn't be able to buy guns.

Let's move forward and do the right thing for the American people.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO).

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question so that the House can consider legislation to close an outrageous legal loophole that allows known terrorists to purchase deadly weapons.

Mr. Speaker, I am a United States Marine. I carried an M16A4 in Iraq, and I know something about firearms. I know that marines go into battle armed with these weapons because they are an effective tool for killing people.

I know that military-style weapons fire rounds at velocities exceeding 3,000 feet per second. And as a surgeon in Orlando said, "the bullets have more energy to them—more speed—so they cause more tissue injury." I know that causing more tissue injury is the very point of these weapons.

I know that high-capacity magazines enable shooters to kill more people before law enforcement can stop them. I also know that these magazines have no useful purpose for hunting or for sports shooting.

I know that, despite all of this, House Republicans oppose keeping assault rifles and high-capacity magazines off our streets. Incredibly, they even oppose legislation that would prevent terrorists who want to kill Americans from purchasing military-style weapons.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I know that it is shameful and horrifying that chil-

dren in America today conduct active-shooter drills in their classrooms. I know it is shameful and horrifying that, in the wake of Orlando, some of our LGBT brothers and sisters still live in fear in the 21st century. And I know that it's within our power to stop the carnage in our communities by passing commonsense gun violence legislation.

Let's defeat the previous question, and let's finally get serious about ending the epidemic of gun violence in America.

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

We are going to have an opportunity to vote on this rule here in about 15 minutes. And when we dispose of this rule and then we bring up the underlying bill and then we vote on that underlying bill, we are going to make a difference on the one issue that is before us today.

I do hope that we will be back in here to have more of a conversation. I regret that we didn't start that conversation sooner. I regret that when Republicans controlled the House, the Senate, and the Presidency, they did not solve the challenge of violence in this country. And I regret that when the Democrats controlled everything in this Nation—the House, the Senate, and the White House—they did not solve the challenge of violence in this country.

Mr. Speaker, if it were easy, we would have done it before. But I am absolutely certain of one thing, and that is that the solution is going to be found with earnest discussion, not shrill re-creations. Of that, I can be sure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I say to my friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) that I don't think anybody is saying that this will somehow solve the issue of violence in this country. We all know that is a complicated issue. There are economic factors. There are social factors. But it should be common sense that terrorists shouldn't be able to assemble arsenals to commit acts of mass violence against our fellow Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against the previous question today so we can bring up amendments that will address the issue of gun violence prevention in our country.

Eighty-five percent of Americans believe that we should pass the no fly, no buy bill. Ninety percent of Americans believe that we should expand and enhance background checks for those folks who are trying to buy guns. And we have a perfect opportunity to do it.

There are two bills in the House, both of them bipartisan, that address these two issues. Both of them are bipartisan. Both of them are pro Second Amendment. Both bills help keep guns away from criminals, terrorists, and the dangerously mentally ill.

Earlier today, some 300 victims and survivors of gun violence assembled outside. I listened to what they had to say.

Later, I met with one of the women, one of the victims, Catherine Bodine from Ohio. She was wounded, and her 10-year-old daughter, Samantha, was killed.

The murderer was a felon. He could not pass a background check, could not go to a licensed gun dealer and buy a gun. So instead he went online, and he bought a gun online. He wounded this woman, and he killed her 10-year-old daughter, Samantha.

We should do everything we can to prevent those sorts of tragedies from happening, and we have a chance to do it with the two bills that are in this House. The background check bill, the bill that would have prevented this murderer from buying a gun online, is not only bipartisan, it is not only pro Second Amendment, it has 186 bipartisan coauthors.

This is easy to do. This isn't a heavy lift. Bring the bill to the floor for a vote. Let America see us do our work. Let the Representatives of the American people have a vote on a background check bill that will, in fact, save lives.

We know that background checks save lives. Every day, 170 felons are prohibited from buying guns through licensed dealers because of background checks. Every day, 50 domestic abusers are prohibited from buying guns through licensed dealers because of background checks.

Why not expand it to include all commercial sales of firearms, not just 60 percent of the commercial sale of firearms? This makes sense. It is bipartisan. It is pro Second Amendment, and it will save lives. It works. We know it works. It will stop criminals. It will stop terrorists, and it will stop the dangerously mentally ill. It will make it much more difficult for them to get guns.

Will it stop all violence? No. Nothing can do that, but this is our first line of defense. This is something that this Congress can do that will save lives.

Please bring these bills for a vote.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my friend from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) if he has any further speakers remaining.

Mr. POLIS. We have a lot of speakers, hundreds of them. As much time as you want to give us, we will be happy to use.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time so those speakers can continue.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I am on the floor today to urge our Republican colleagues to allow the two bills that have been spoken of over and over and over and over again to be brought to the floor. You know the statistics.

Abraham Lincoln said that the sentiment of the American people is everything. The sentiment of the American

people has been expressed. There is over 90 percent support for one bill and 85 percent support for the other.

We all know that our top responsibility as Members of Congress is the security of our country and its people. This is a national security issue. This is a national security issue.

No one in my district can believe that we would allow someone that the FBI has placed on their terrorist list to be able to go out and purchase weapons. This simply doesn't make any sense. The American people are worthy of so much more.

The other bill, the background check, Mr. THOMPSON gave a magnificent description of that.

You know, above the Speaker's chair, it says, "In God we trust"—"In God we trust." Do you think for a moment that God is proud of where we are and what we are not doing?

Members gather here, and they have moments of silence, moments of silence, thoughts and prayers. You know what? Maybe we should gather and pray for ourselves that God will give every single Member of this House the courage to stand up and to do the right thing for our country and to lessen this devastating violence that is taking and claiming too many lives of the American people.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to share with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) that I don't know how things work on the other side of the aisle, but I will tell you, at every Republican Conference meeting we have, we open it in prayer. We pray for ourselves; we pray for you; we pray for this Chamber; and we pray for the President of the United States. I think that is time well spent, and I am glad that we still open this House in prayer every day of the week.

Again, there is more that we can accomplish beginning on that foundation of those things that unite us than we can on those foundations of things that divide us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU).

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to respectfully request that my constituents and your constituents receive the dignity of having their Member of Congress cast a vote on gun safety legislation, specifically, on background checks and making sure that terrorists don't buy guns.

I served on Active Duty in the U.S. Military. I am still in the Reserves. I fired guns. I have taken them apart, cleaned them, and put them back together. I have two marksmanship awards from the United States Air Force, and I know how lethal these weapons are, which is why we need gun safety legislation.

Every day, 297 people are shot. That means that in the next 5 minutes, someone else will be shot. Who will that be? Will it be a child? Will it be someone that you know?

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we have many more speakers, but we are out of time. I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Jonathan Blunk, A.J. Boik, Air Force Staff Sergeant Jesse Childress, Gordon Cowden, Jessica Ghawi, Navy Petty Officer Third Class John Thomas Larimer, Matt McQuinn, Micayla Medek, Veronica Moser-Sullivan, Alex Sullivan, Alex Teves, Rebecca Wingo, those are the victims of the Aurora shooting.

Jennifer Markovsky, Ke'Arre M. Stewart, Garrett A. Swasey, those are the victims of the recent shooting at the healthcare clinic in Colorado Springs.

It is time for action. As we stand here today, we are still reeling from the deadliest mass shooting in our country's history at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, targeted against the gay community.

It is time for action. It is our duty in Congress, our moral duty as parents, sisters, brothers, husbands, and wives to protect our fellow Americans. We can do that and protect the Second Amendment. We can and must do both.

Vote "no" on this rule and the underlying bill. Demand the leadership of this House bring up the bipartisan background check bill and the no fly, no buy bill to prevent terrorists from assembling arsenals to kill our fellow Americans.

Personal liberties and public safety are not mutually exclusive. We can protect both.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1345

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

I love serving on the Committee on Rules. We are the last committee to touch every piece of legislation before it comes to this House. It gives us a chance to perfect some of that legislation, but it also gives us a chance to work through the rules of the House.

There are some things that people think are glorious and glamorous about being a United States Congressman, Mr. Speaker, and I wish someone would send me a list of those things from time to time. I will tell you one thing that is not particularly glamorous, and that is sorting through Jefferson's Manual of procedure here. What is not particularly glamorous is reading the House rules. But if one were to do those things, Mr. Speaker, if one were to do those things, what one would find is that any Member of this Chamber can bring up any bill they wish to bring up if they can get a majority of the House to agree with them to do it. Not the majority of the House, Mr. Speaker, but a majority of the House.

I am going to say that again. Any Member of this Chamber can bring up any bill in this House if only they go out and do the work of finding 218 votes to agree with them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it sounds like a lot of heavy lifting to get 218 votes to agree with you, but it turns out, if you can't get 218 votes to agree with you to bring it up, you can't get 218 votes to agree with you to pass it, so you can't move the legislation anyway.

We heard testimony from the other side about the outreach that our Speaker, PAUL RYAN, is doing to try to bring together the sides of this House, and I love him for that. But we have also heard it suggested that the majority is using its majority to silence voices in this House—and it can't be done. It can't be done. If you have 218 votes, you can do anything you want in this institution, and if you don't have the 218 votes, you can't do anything at all.

Time and time again, Mr. Speaker, we have seen this Chamber moved from the filing of a discharge petition, the gathering of 218 votes, and this House coming together to move issues forward. There is no shortage of avenues for a Member of Congress to have their voice heard. What there is a shortage of sometimes is finding the folks who want to do the hard work to make it happen because, I promise you, Mr. Speaker, it is easier to come down here on the floor of the House and make a speech than it is to go door to door and gather 218 votes to move a priority of mine. It is hard. It is hard.

Now, we have done that on the underlying bill, brought together different pieces of legislation designed to make incremental changes to provide taxpayers more bang for their buck and civil servants more tools at their disposal. We did it because agency heads who were trying to implement procedures in the name of national security were stymied. We did it because Federal employees, when surveyed, said they feel like they are surrounded by underperformers, and folks can't get rid of those underperformers in a capable and efficient way. We are responding to those changes.

When folks came to the Committee on Rules and said: We know how to do it better—and by "folks," Mr. Speaker, I just want to be clear, I am not talking about Republican folks. I am talking about Republicans, Democrats, every Member of this Chamber who came to the Committee on Rules and said: I have a plan to do it better. We said: Bring your amendment to the floor of the House, and let's have a vote. Bring your amendment to the floor of the House, and let's have a vote.

Do not let someone tell you that when PAUL RYAN is trying to run an open facility that it is not happening right here in this Chamber. It is happening here today, and it happens over and over and over again. Every Member who does the hard work and the heavy lifting to craft an idea—not to craft a speech, Mr. Speaker, but to craft an amendment, not to come down here and make a point, but to come down

here and make a difference. Every single Member who said: I have a difference that I can make on this legislation, the Committee on Rules said: Bring your amendment to the floor, and we will have a vote.

Let's succeed together on the little things, Mr. Speaker. If the hard things were easy, we would have done them already. The hard things are hard, and that is the problem. Let's get together on these things that are common sense. Let's get together on these things that bring us together. Let's get together on these things where every single voice in the Chamber is being heard. Let's succeed, let's make a difference, and then let's come back tomorrow and do it again.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 803 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1076) to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1076.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that

"the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair

will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

HELPING FAMILIES IN MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS ACT OF 2016

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2646) to make available needed psychiatric, psychological, and supportive services for individuals with mental illness and families in mental health crisis, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2646

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2016".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE USE

Sec. 101. Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use.

Sec. 102. Improving oversight of mental health and substance use programs.

Sec. 103. National Mental Health and Substance Use Policy Laboratory.

Sec. 104. Peer-support specialist programs.

Sec. 105. Prohibition against lobbying using Federal funds by systems accepting Federal funds to protect and advocate the rights of individuals with mental illness.

Sec. 106. Reporting for protection and advocacy organizations.

Sec. 107. Grievance procedure.

Sec. 108. Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality.

Sec. 109. Strategic plan.

Sec. 110. Authorities of centers for mental health services and substance abuse treatment.

Sec. 111. Advisory councils.

Sec. 112. Peer review.

TITLE II—MEDICAID MENTAL HEALTH COVERAGE

Sec. 201. Rule of construction related to Medicaid coverage of mental health services and primary care services furnished on the same day.

Sec. 202. Optional limited coverage of inpatient services furnished in institutions for mental diseases.

Sec. 203. Study and report related to Medicaid managed care regulation.

Sec. 204. Guidance on opportunities for innovation.

Sec. 205. Study and report on Medicaid emergency psychiatric demonstration project.

Sec. 206. Providing EPSDT services to children in IMDs.

Sec. 207. Electronic visit verification system required for personal care services and home health care services under Medicaid.