

our children safe. We can't prevent every tragedy, but there are actions we can take right now, today, to save lives. We have the power.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to find the courage to act. Our kids are counting on us.

#### POSTPARTUM DEPRESSION

(Mrs. LOVE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to raise awareness about postpartum depression. I rise today to raise awareness about maternal deaths. I rise today to let the country know about one of my constituents, Emily Dykes.

Emily was a good person. She was active in her community and beloved by all who knew her. But most of all, she was an amazing mother. However, with her fifth child, she developed some difficulties, and Emily was overtaken by severe anxiety. It was so severe, in fact, that it led to her mistreatment, misdiagnosis, and misunderstanding of her condition. Eventually, it led to her suffering so badly that, in her search for safety, she ran onto a freeway and was killed by a semi truck.

The horrible fact is that Emily is not the only woman who suffers from this. Right now, there are thousands of women who suffer just like Emily suffered.

As a mother, I want those women to know that they are not alone. There are many who have gone through very similar experiences, and there are places that mothers can go and get help. I encourage them to reach out. I encourage families to help out.

This is not something that will go away unless we work to find a solution, that is, unless we as a society recognize it and take away the stigmas related to postpartum depression and help provide support to those who come forward for help.

As we raise this awareness, we can find solutions that will make sure that the tragedies that befell Emily and her family won't happen again. Mr. Speaker, I ask my community, State, colleagues, friends, and Members of Congress to come to the table to help save lives so that children like Emily's five children are not left without a mother.

#### GUN VIOLENCE

(Mr. HASTINGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, as my colleague, BRAD SCHNEIDER, just said, yesterday we held a moment of silence for those who were killed at Santa Fe High School. I have relatives and their children who live in Parkland, so these kinds of shootings affect us all.

Everybody in this country knows that we have a gun epidemic in this country. We also know that we have a severe mental health crisis in our Na-

tion. In my opinion, it is morally unjust for this Congress to do nothing.

I own a gun. I believe in the Second Amendment. I would stand toe-to-toe with anyone who would urge that we take guns away from people, but I will stand with anyone who says that assault weapons should only be in the hands of military and police.

I cannot understand how we continue to have these moments of silence and return to doing nothing. We don't have all of the answers, but we do have some of the answers, and to do nothing is morally bankrupt and legislative malpractice.

#### RECOGNIZING 74 HEROES ON VIETNAM VETERANS MEMORIAL WALL

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, during one of my recent weekly talk radio townhalls, I spoke to a family member of a veteran who served aboard the destroyer USS *Frank E. Evans* during the Vietnam war.

The Vietnam veteran, Richard Grant, from Fargo, advocates for servicemembers who died during the Vietnam war but are not presently recognized on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial here in Washington.

The USS *Frank E. Evans* provided naval gunfire off the coast of Vietnam, including during the Tet Offensive. While conducting friendly maneuvers outside of the official combat zone, it collided with a friendly Australian aircraft carrier, killing 74 crewmembers.

I introduced an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act to engrave the names of the 74 crewmembers who died on that day on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall. Their sacrifice and that of their families is worthy not only of our mention, but of the high honor of being memorialized forever on the wall.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to lead this amendment and urge my colleagues to support it. I look forward to the day when the wall is engraved with the 74 names of the heroes of the USS *Frank E. Evans*.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5515, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 204, TRICKETT WENDLER, FRANK MONGIELLO, JORDAN MCINN, AND MATTHEW BELLINA RIGHT TO TRY ACT OF 2017; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 2155, ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 905 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 905

*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. 5515) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, 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 shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. 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 Armed Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-70 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived.

SEC. 2. (a) No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution. (b) Each further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered 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. (c) All points of order against the further amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their designees, 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.

SEC. 4. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment pursuant to this resolution, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 204) to authorize the use of unapproved medical products by patients diagnosed with a terminal illness in accordance with State law, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on

the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 2155) to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on the recorded vote ordered on the question of reconsideration of the vote on the question of passage of H.R. 2 may continue to be postponed through the legislative day of Friday, June 22, 2018.

□ 1115

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), 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. BURGESS. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 905 provides for the consideration of three important bills aimed at protecting our country, reducing regulatory burdens in the financial sector, and allowing patients who have nowhere else to turn with another option to potentially save their lives.

These three bills, taken together, show House Republicans' commitment to putting Americans' interests first.

Today's rule provides for a structured rule to begin consideration of H.R. 5515, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019. The resolution grants 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chair and ranking member of the House Committee on Armed Services.

In addition, as the first of two likely rules on the fiscal year 2019 NDAA, the rule provides for the consideration of 103 amendments to the defense bill.

Along with the Defense Authorization Act, the resolution today provides for a rule for House consideration of S. 2155, the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, the Senate-passed bipartisan bill to re-

duce the regulatory burdens imposed on community and local banks by the Dodd-Frank financial regulatory legislation.

The legislation went through rigorous debate in the House and the Senate, and it mirrors in many ways the House-passed CHOICE Act, passed by the House in the summer of 2017 under the stewardship of Financial Services Chair JEB HENSARLING.

Moreover, the resolution before us provides for a rule to allow the House to consider the unanimously passed Senate bill, S. 204, the Trickett Wendler, Frank Mongiello, Jordan McLinn, and Matthew Bellina Right to Try Act of 2017.

This legislation, highlighted by the President during his last State of the Union address, has been a top priority of the President for the Congress, allowing terminally ill patients a last chance at survival using a carefully crafted FDA process.

H.R. 5515, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, would authorize appropriations for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, as well as prescribe military personnel strengths for the next fiscal year.

This critical piece of legislation, one of the most important bills that any Congress will consider in any year, provides the resources and the direction necessary for our men and women in uniform to do what they do best: protect and serve our country throughout the world.

As will be discussed by many Members of this body over this week, this bill touches on all aspects of military policy, from the Middle East to the Korean Peninsula to the Arctic waters.

Among the hundreds of amendments the Rules Committee is likely to make in order on this legislation, I am pleased that, once again, my amendment, offered with Ms. LEE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. JONES, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LEWIS, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, will again be made in order. This continues to push the Department of Defense to finally complete a full audit of its finances, as required by law.

S. 2155, the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, corrects some of the more egregious provisions in the Dodd-Frank financial regulatory legislation.

The bill focuses on regulatory relief on smaller financial institutions—namely, community banks and credit unions—so they can more readily meet the needs of their local communities without burdensome Federal regulations stifling their economic growth. This places the focus of the financial institutions back on their customers instead of completing paperwork and answering to agencies in Washington, D.C.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, our final bill in today's rule, S. 204, will look familiar to many people here today, as we are again considering legislation that

would bring hope to terminally ill patients across our country.

A similar bill, H.R. 5247, passed this House in March. Minority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER and Senate Democrats have refused to act on H.R. 5247, the revised version of the Right to Try legislation, which passed the House 2 months ago on a strong bipartisan vote.

As this body had heard earlier this year, Right to Try was the one piece of legislation that President Trump came and stood in the well of this House and specifically promised to the American people in his State of the Union address.

Today, I will say again what I said in March when we first took up Right to Try: I stand with the President and I stand with the thousands of Americans with terminal diseases and their families and their friends in getting this important policy to the President's desk.

Mr. Speaker, when we pass this bill today, it doesn't go back to the Senate. It has already been passed by the Senate. It goes immediately down to the White House for a signature and becomes law.

Here is an interesting fact. In the last couple of months since the House passed its Right to Try bill, even more States have joined this strong grassroots movement. Now, 40 States, including my home State of Texas, have passed and signed a version of Right to Try into law.

In nine other States, a version of Right to Try has already been introduced, including the State of New York, which is the home State of the minority leader of the United States Senate.

Last year, the Energy and Commerce Health Subcommittee held a hearing on access to investigational drugs where S. 204 was discussed. At that time, the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, Dr. Scott Gottlieb, and other advocacy groups expressed concerns on the various Right to Try bills introduced in the Senate and the House.

So, when the President asked the Congress to act, the House responded by holding multistakeholder discussions with patient groups, medical research advocates, and the administration in order to improve the original Right to Try bill. I want to commend Chairman WALDEN for leading these negotiations.

I am also proud of the revised Right to Try legislation that the Energy and Commerce Committee produced because the policies were sound, and I believe it was a positive step forward in granting access to new treatments while allowing additional input from the Food and Drug Administration.

Unfortunately, the minority party on the other side of the Capitol, Senate Democrats, said "no, thank you" to the revised House bill. While I am not surprised by their decision, I think the American people, particularly patients

with terminal diseases and their loved ones, would not be satisfied with a “no, thank you” nonaction by Congress on such an important issue.

Today, the House is ready to act for the American people and will be considering S. 204, the Trickett Wendler, Frank Mongiello, Jordan McLinn, and Matthew Bellina Right to Try Act of 2017.

This passed the Senate unanimously last August. This bill will offer terminally ill patients a chance at life. After it passes this House, it will be signed into law.

Our Nation has achieved unprecedented innovation and scientific breakthroughs recently and over the course of the last decade. American patients have widespread access to innovative treatments, thanks to researchers and our academic institutions and those working in the pharmaceutical and medical device industries.

Despite these achievements, we continue to hear from patients with serious, life-threatening conditions, including my constituents from north Texas, who remain frustrated with what they see as regulatory barriers from trying new therapies when everything else has failed them.

As a physician, I understand that access to investigational drugs and therapies is a deeply personal priority for those seeking treatment for loved ones diagnosed with very difficult diseases.

This crossroads where our Nation seems to be—when a potentially life-saving treatment, while not approved, both exists but remains unavailable—is an important debate that we are having for these Americans. To them, it is not only a matter of life or death but another chance to spend more time with their children, grandchildren, parents, and other family members.

Some of the opponents of Right to Try point to the Food and Drug Administration's current expanded access program, which is aimed at helping patients who do not qualify for clinical trials gain access to therapies that the agency has yet to approve.

While this program makes a good faith effort to help patients, we can do more by passing Right to Try and creating an alternative pathway for these patients to access eligible investigational drugs.

Additionally, we know that many individuals may not qualify for a clinical trial if they do not meet strict patient inclusion criteria, which may include factors such as age, gender, type and stage of their disease, previous treatment history, and other medical conditions.

There are also many patients for whom participation in a clinical trial is not feasible, especially those who live in rural areas far from the clinical trial sites.

Most, if not all, of the patients with a terminal medical condition fall into one of these categories. This legislation that we are doing today allows these patients to participate in an al-

ternative pathway, opening another door to investigational drugs that does not exist today.

While there are a few differences between S. 204 and the House-passed Right to Try legislation, the underlying policies between the two bills are very similar.

For example, only certain investigational drugs are considered eligible under both bills. In order to qualify, the drug must have completed a phase one clinical trial; have an active application at the Food and Drug Administration; be under active development or production by a manufacturer; and not have been approved, licensed, or cleared for sale under current law.

Also, both bills require reporting of serious adverse events, having written informed consent to the treating physician, and notifying the agency when a sponsor provides an investigational drug.

Lastly, Commissioner Gottlieb at the Food and Drug Administration recently expressed support for the Senate-passed Right to Try bill being considered today and said that his agency could ensure an appropriate level of patient safety through guidance and rule-making.

In other words, while the Food and Drug Administration may have some additional work, the key point is the agency can achieve the proper balance of ensuring patient safety and granting access to new investigational drugs.

I think the Commissioner would agree that we would have preferred the revised House Right to Try legislation, but doing nothing is currently not an option. Hundreds of thousands of Americans with terminal illnesses and their families are looking for us to act. I support restoring hope for these patients and giving them a fighting chance at life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members of this esteemed body to support today's rule and all three underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying measures that are in this combined rule are matters of substance that do need to be addressed, and I will get back to it in a moment.

Several of my colleagues will join me today in recognizing a historic moment in this particular body in this great country of ours.

Madam Speaker, let me recognize that tucked inside this rule is the majority's 83rd and 84th closed rules of this Congress—and we are just in May—with more to go.

□ 1130

That is a historic number because it makes the 115th Congress the most closed Congress ever. My Republican friends have made history for all the wrong reasons.

But we should not let this milestone go unrecognized right from the very beginning, because it is a sad point in this Chamber's history. It is why we have ignored virtually every major issue the public cares about. It is why this Congress can't get anything done. It is why we are so dysfunctional.

It is clear to me that the majority has turned a deaf ear, which is absolutely shameful. Please know this: 1,793 amendments offered by Members of this body have been denied.

When I came to Congress in 1992, there was an echo chamber from the right talking about the Democrats' closed rules. Quite frankly, at that time, I did not understand that dynamic. I arrived here, and during that particular session of Congress, we did have open rules, but there were closed rules as well.

When NANCY PELOSI was last Speaker, we had 12 open rules. This Speaker, our now lame-duck Speaker, up to this point, has been and is the only Speaker of the House of Representatives never to have an open rule. What that means is not just Democrats have been shut out but Republicans have been shut out.

Day in and day out, night in and night out, in the Rules Committee, Members offer up meaningful suggestions to this Congress, and they are denied. That is not denying the Member of Congress; it is denying the people those persons are here to represent and who expect them to advance measures that are pertinent to their respective communities.

There will be Members who will talk about the shamefulness of the kinds of amendments that have been denied.

This particular measure authorizes \$647 billion in base budget authority for defense programs in the coming fiscal year, as well as an additional \$69 billion in overseas contingency operations.

The legislation comes on the heels of the bipartisan budget agreement signed into law in February, which increased the budget caps for defense and non-defense spending for 2 years.

The legislation provides, rightly, a 2.6 percent pay raise for Active-Duty troops, the highest such raise in 9 years. It strengthens the Military Health System, provides assistance to local educational agencies servicing military dependent students, and improves the Transition Assistance Program to provide servicemembers better tailored resources and information as they prepare to enter civilian life.

I was glad to see that this NDAA establishes a prescription drug monitoring program in order to prevent opioid abuse within the military, a proactive step that will help our country combat drug addiction.

What is important about this particular measure is the chairman, Chairman THORNBERRY, and the ranking member, ADAM SMITH, have worked together, along with the members of the Committee on Armed Services, to

produce a bipartisan product. It proves it can be done.

This is a bipartisan measure, and most Members in this body will have amendments that will be made in order and will have an opportunity to present their ideas how to better sustain military readiness. That is as it should be.

But there are members of the Committee on Armed Services who belong to other committees of jurisdiction. In those committees of jurisdiction where few hearings are held, no bipartisan effort is undertaken, they are shut out just as well as the rest of the members of the other jurisdictions.

Every jurisdiction in this Congress should be bipartisan and should have input from both parties.

And I find it passing strange that I hear voices saying that Democrats are obstructionists. Obstructionists of what? We can't even get amendments made in order.

The only thing we have left that we can do is voice our objection to the kind of closed process that we have witnessed during this particular session of Congress. I hope the American public understands how much their Members are being denied an opportunity to represent them.

In terms of military readiness, the fiscal year 2019 NDAA dedicates substantial funding toward cutting-edge military capabilities and countering emerging threats through investments in cyber and space. The bill includes funding for thousands of additional Active-Duty troops and authorizes important funding for military construction and infrastructure.

You know what it doesn't include and what it won't? There will be Members who will offer that we have an Authorization for Use of Military Force. Seventeen years have passed since we have had a new Authorization for Use of Military Force. Congress should be declaring war, not Presidents.

And it doesn't mean this President. The three or four before him operating in this Congress were allowed to go forward under the aegis of a 17-years-ago Authorization for Use of Military Force.

I was also pleased to see an improved commitment to Historically Black Colleges and Universities in this year's package—schools that are critical to ensuring a pipeline of highly skilled, diverse college graduates into the United States Armed Forces.

This bill also takes significant steps to support our allies. It provides \$6.3 billion for the European Deterrence Initiative and declares that it is the policy of the United States to counter Russian influence campaigns.

The bill also imposes additional sanctions on Russia for violating the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, and it renews authority in the war against the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria and fully funds Israeli missile defense partnerships.

Madam Speaker, there is a lot that we can be proud of in this NDAA. Un-

fortunately, despite all of these important investments, there are a few provisions in this bill that raise serious concerns.

I have already spoken to the failure to pass a new military-use-of-force measure. The one that we have is overly broad, and Members have never had an opportunity to vote on a new one, even as we commit to military engagements overseas.

Members on both sides of the aisle agree that an up-or-down vote on a new AUMF is long overdue. So this is the time and the place to do it. My colleague BARBARA LEE, I am sure, and my colleague on the Rules Committee JIM MCGOVERN, I am sure, are going to offer measures that will accomplish that.

I am also particularly alarmed that this legislation repeals the Federal ban on military production of low-yield nuclear weapons. Repealing this 15-year ban and pursuing low-yield nuclear warheads for submarine-launched ballistic missiles will have significant ramifications for global security.

Additionally, the NDAA includes a number of provisions targeting DOD's fourth estate, which refers to non-military portions of the Department of Defense. These provisions affect human resources, information systems, and other important services that affect the day-to-day lives of our servicemen and -women as well as national readiness.

Under this bill, these offices are targeted with an unrealistic and unnecessary spending cut, setting up a sequester-like automatic 25 percent reduction to critical support functions.

Madam Speaker, this brings me to the second measure, the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act.

Under the pretext of providing relief to community banks, this bill rolls back important financial and consumer protections and provides a giveaway to large Wall Street banks, allowing them to skirt enhanced regulations aimed at protecting our economy from another financial crisis.

The third measure, the Trickett Wendler, Frank Mongiello, Jordan McInn, and Matthew Bellina Right to Try Act, exposes more patients to harm and further sidelines the Federal Drug Administration's ability to oversee investigational treatments than the bill passed by the House in March.

In fact, during the Rules Committee hearing in March, Energy and Commerce Committee Chair WALDEN and Health Subcommittee Chair and fellow Rules Committee member BURGESS had reservations about this measure, which is why the House took up the more narrowly focused bill in the first place.

Madam Speaker, last Friday, there was another school shooting. Again, America watched in horror as students and teachers fled their classrooms from a murderous gun rampage. Again, community leaders and government officials offered thoughts and prayers. Yes-

terday, we offered a moment of silence. Again, calls for stricter gun control laws and heightened school security returned.

We all know that this will happen again to our young people. And for that reason, I can state emphatically and without fear of having to correct the RECORD that the Republican leadership of this House has not only abdicated their responsibility to the American people and our children but their common sense as well.

No other country in the world has as many guns, as many homicides, or as many mass shootings as we do. There is simply no more time to waste. We need to be considering a ban on bump stocks. We need to be considering a ban on assault weapons.

And don't anybody tell me we can't ban assault weapons. We did that when I first came to Congress. We banned assault weapons, and the kind of mass killings we have seen went down after we did that.

We need to be considering protective orders allowing people to petition the court to temporarily remove firearms from an individual in crisis. We have seen evidence of that working when Florida passed its law. One week after that law went into effect, a person had his guns removed who would have been a harm to himself and to others.

We need to be considering comprehensive background checks, and we can't stop there. We need to increase access to mental health services. We need to eliminate the feeling in this country that seeking help carries with it some sort of stigma.

We need to learn to recognize the danger signs and offer a clear course of action. We need to teach students about conflict resolution.

And we need to do more about civility in this Nation, in this House. And we should be its leaders, not standing and offering a moment of silence and returning to do nothing, as we have done, shooting after shooting, mass shooting after mass shooting, in this country.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the fiscal year 2019 National Defense Authorization Act.

I want to thank Chairman THORBERRY for all his leadership on this bill.

Providing for our Nation's common defense is our constitutional duty. As a retired lieutenant general in the Marine Corps, I know that certainty from Washington, especially on this side of the river, is critical for the military to carry out its missions. Our men and women in uniform need consistency and reliability over the long term to meet complex threats, changing threats, in all corners of the world.

This bill increases resources for readiness training and upgrades essential

equipment to provide our warfighters with increased capabilities on land, at sea, and in the air.

I also want to thank the committee for including report language highlighting the critical role that the Soo Locks play in our national security. The Soo Locks, located in my home district, are a single point of failure in a multibillion-dollar supply chain and a potential target for disruptive activities. Any unscheduled outing of the locks would threaten our national economy and, in turn, our national security.

Again, I thank the chairman for all his hard work on this defense authorization. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

□ 1145

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU), a member of the Foreign Affairs and Judiciary Committees, to discuss the commonsense issues that we all care about but have been blocked during this closed Congress.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Madam Speaker, PAUL RYAN promised regular order when he took over the speakership. He has broken that promise repeatedly. We have voted on bills here on the floor that violated the standard committee process.

The majority has employed a technique called marshal law that allows them to bring up bills with little to no notice, and now we know we have the most closed Congress in U.S. history. The majority has blocked all amendments on most bills. That is a disgraceful way to run the people's House.

Twenty-three amendments of mine have been blocked—simple amendments. One of them basically says, hey, the Federal Government should invest more in cybersecurity. We can't even get a debate on that.

Really?

Another amendment I have deals with anticorruption, and whether you have a Republican or a Democrat or an Independent, you don't want corruption. You don't want members of the executive branch making money off the taxpayer's dime.

So one of these amendments basically says we are not going to reimburse the President or other members when they go and spend money on Mar-a-Lago or other Trump properties and have the Federal Government pay money there because that flows to the President or his immediate family. Can't even get a vote on that. Why? Because the Republican leadership knows it would pass.

We need to open up this Congress and have a debate. We came here to debate ideas, not to block them.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this historic bipartisan compromise that rolls back some

of the most harmful policies from the Dodd-Frank Act and will help grow our economy.

The Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act includes bipartisan legislation that I authored to help communities in Indiana and across the United States save money on roads, bridges, and schools. It reverses a backward banking rule that gave foreign countries an advantage over American cities and towns. This will drive down the cost of borrowing and make it cheaper for cities and towns to finance local infrastructure projects.

Ultimately, this bill saves taxpayer dollars. That is why it has passed the House twice. It is supported by numerous advocacy groups, and my good friend, the State treasurer of Indiana, Kelly Mitchell. I applaud this bill's inclusion in this banking reform package, and I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a member of the Foreign Affairs and Judiciary Committees, to discuss the commonsense issues that we all care about but that have been blocked during this closed Congress.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We pride ourselves on being the most deliberative body on the planet, and all of us come here to contribute our best ideas to improve the lives of the American people.

You wonder why this place doesn't work? It is the whole set of exclusion of ideas from nearly half this body.

I am one of those people who has offered just about 25 amendments that were blocked by the Republicans. What are they afraid of? Debate your ideas. Make your arguments. Vote. Be held accountable.

Some of the things they blocked, the amendments I offered: an amendment to increase student loan interest tax deductions in our tax bill; a provision to end tax breaks for companies that ship American jobs overseas; an amendment to increase funding to combat violent extremism; and an amendment to increase funding for fire departments in the SAFER grants. Those are just four examples.

Their practice, they marked an important moment in history, not a good moment: the most closed Congress in the history of the United States, excluding from consideration debate, argument, and accountability.

Vote on these things so the American people know where you stand. That is what we have here, over 1,000 ideas proffered by Democrats that our Republican colleagues won't even bring to the floor for consideration so the American people know where they stand on a range of important issues.

This is a dark day for Congress, the most closed Congress in our history. It means the voices of the American people as reflected in nearly half of this

body are not being considered, debated, and voted upon by the Congress.

It is wrong. It is negatively impacting the lives of the American people. There are real consequences. It is not just that we want our own amendments considered. It is because we understand it will benefit the American people.

I urge my colleagues to have some self-reflection on what they are doing here.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds for purposes of rebuttal before I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD).

As a point of situational awareness, as of last week, in this Congress, over 1,000 amendments have been heard on the House floor: 47 percent Democratic, 41 percent Republican, 15 percent bipartisan.

For a point of reference, the last term that NANCY PELOSI was Speaker of the House, the 111th Congress, less than 1,000 amendments for the entire Congress. We passed that milestone prior to last week. We will continue to hear amendments on the floor.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD).

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Today is a great day for North Carolina's community financial institutions, small business innovators, and, most importantly, our economy. I rise today in strong support of this rule that will bring a much-needed regulatory relief bill, S. 2155, to the House floor.

The most damaging aspect of the Dodd-Frank bill was the additional and unnecessary regulatory burden placed on community financial institutions, and because of this, we have seen American consumers and small businesses struggle to get the credit and the support that they need. Economic growth is held back because of Dodd-Frank, but I am happy to report that relief is on the way with the passage of S. 2155.

Madam Speaker, while I urge adoption of this rule and urge passage of this bill, I also look forward to working with our chairman and our leader, JEB HENSARLING, Senator MIKE CRAPO, and Senate Democrats to craft a package of bills that focuses on capital formation. I offer any support I can to help bring that collection of bills across the finish line as well. I urge adoption of the rule, Madam Speaker.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, just to respond briefly to Mr. BURGESS, it is a good thing that they made a handful of amendments in order that added up to 1,000. If we went through it, they would look like studies and things that were not significant; but when it came to the healthcare measures or when it came to tax reform, not one amendment by a Democrat was made in order.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut

(Ms. DELAURO), who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, to discuss the significance of this record-breaking closed Congress and real people affected by these closed rules.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, this week, the Republican majority won the honor of having run the most closed Congress in American history: 84 closed rules, zero open rules.

What does that mean? It means that they blocked us from fully debating or amending legislation, prohibiting us from fully giving our constituents a voice in this Congress.

Why are we here? Our constituents sent us here to be able to debate issues and to vote on those issues.

Two weeks ago, the majority blocked my amendment to ensure equal pay for equal work. Congress passed the Equal Pay Act in 1963 to end unequal wages. Yet, in 2018, women still earn about 80 cents, on average, to a man's dollar. The gap is worse for women of color.

A woman working full-time will lose \$400,000 over the course of her career. African American women lose \$840,000. Latinas will lose over \$1 million.

Since women are the sole or co-breadwinner in half of the families with children, our Nation's families and our economy suffers, which is why I offered the Paycheck Fairness Act as an amendment. It toughens remedies in the Equal Pay Act to help America's working women fight wage discrimination and receive a full paycheck. They blocked it.

The strength of this institution is its potential to make a difference in the lives of the American people. That is vital when the biggest economic challenge is jobs that do not pay them enough to live on.

We cannot help raise wages, improve education, or fix crumbling infrastructure when this majority, more than any in American history, has closed the House to debate and to amendments. They closed it to action. It is unacceptable. The American people deserve better.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) for yielding this time to debate these important measures.

This is a historic moment here in the House. Today, we will be sending the most significant financial regulatory relief legislation to the President's desk in more than a decade. I am proud to have been part of this effort, and I thank all of my colleagues who helped get us to this moment.

Madam Speaker, for the past 3½ years I served in this House, I have been telling the same story over and over again:

My home State of Georgia lost 70 banks during the financial crisis, the most of any State in the Nation. Today, 52 of Georgia's counties do not have a community bank headquartered there, and three of Georgia's counties

have no bank branch whatsoever. Why? Because of excessive regulatory burden placed on small community banks and credit unions by previous legislative action and through overreach by regulators.

Today, we are taking a major step toward reversing that trend by taking bold action and by sending progrowth regulatory relief to small community banks and credit unions to the President's desk. This bill will help ensure that community banks and credit unions will no longer be crushed under the weight of regulations that do not distinguish between them and the largest financial institutions.

Much of this bill originally came from House bills—bipartisan, I may add. This moment is an example of the legislative process working well in a strong bipartisan fashion.

I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, may I ask how much time both parties have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LOVE). The gentleman from Florida has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), a member of the Financial Services Committee, to discuss the significance of this record-breaking closed rule and the real people affected by the GOP shutting down our democratic process.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I am here to protest what has been the most closed Congress in American history. I know the other side will recite the number of amendments that have been allowed, but the fact remains, this is the most closed Congress we have ever had: 84 closed rules and not one open rule.

We are sent here by our constituents to advocate for their interests, and in the minority, one of the few tools we have is the ability to offer amendments and have those arguments heard on the floor of this House. Knowing that we may not win every fight, knowing that we may not win a majority on each idea, we ought to at least allow the power of a good idea to have a fair hearing.

Twenty-eight times I have offered amendments, thoughtful amendments that were crafted with the idea that we could actually improve policy, and 28 times those amendments have been blocked.

These are not messaging amendments, just to give two examples:

One would have increased the amount of funding available to local governments that are struggling to improve their drinking water systems. Think about my hometown of Flint and the hundreds of other communities that would have benefited from that.

Another would have directed the Federal Government to do more to deal with this issue of PFAS, perfluorinated

chemicals, that is poisoning groundwater. In fact, while the EPA is having a conversation today about this very dangerous chemical that is affecting human life in this country, I offered an opportunity for Congress to do something.

Why didn't we do it? Because up in the Rules Committee, it was blocked.

The ideas ought to have a chance on the floor of the House. That is what we are sent here to do. We ought to open this Congress up.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this historic bipartisan legislation. This progrowth bill is thanks to all the hardworking members of the House Financial Services Committee, and I am proud to have contributed to this meaningful reform.

S. 2155 will reduce regulatory burdens hindering Main Street by providing job creators with resources they need to grow their businesses and, frankly, their banks. Under Dodd-Frank, big banks have gotten bigger and small banks have become fewer. Our economy is not well served when small banks are handicapped.

As a former manufacturer, I understand the toll excessive regulatory burdens can have on small businesses. That is why I am a proud supporter of this legislation, and I look forward to seeing this bill signed on the President's desk.

□ 1200

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative SARBANES' bill, H.R. 20, the Government by the People Act.

This legislation would overhaul our broken campaign finance system and return to a government of, by, and for the American people.

Madam 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), who is a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to discuss our proposal.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, no matter what you think of S. 2155, one of the underlying bills being considered today, it is not what a clear majority of Americans want Congress to be doing.

Madam Speaker, nobody is coming up to us in townhalls and asking Congress to deregulate large financial institutions. We are not going to a fish fry



and hearing from people that they want us to dismantle important consumer protections. And nobody at VFW halls, Rotary Clubs, and PTA meetings thinks this bill should be Congress' priority.

The reason this bill is on the floor is that the power brokers on Wall Street want it on the floor. It is their bill; it is not the people's bill.

Our broken campaign finance system lies at the heart of this warped political system, where big money calls the shots in Washington.

For starters, in this broken system, too many good candidates without access to big money are effectively barred from running altogether. Those who can make it through have to spend hours dialing for dollars, courting a narrow slice of the Nation's elite, while high-powered lobbyists and special interests are dictating legislation here in Congress, just like today.

Most recently, these backroom power brokers used their influence to demand billion-dollar handouts for the wealthiest 1 percent from the GOP tax scam. Now they are once again tearing down critical rules to protect our financial system from another economic collapse.

Today's previous question would force a vote on H.R. 20, the Government by the People Act, a comprehensive reform of our campaign finance system to combat the influence of big money in our politics, raise civic engagement, and amplify the voice of everyday Americans.

This legislation would increase and multiply the power of small donors in America, breaking candidates' reliance on the big money crowd, giving candidates the resources they need to compete and win.

That way, when it comes time to make policy, the elected representatives of the people will work on behalf of our constituents, not the big money donors.

Madam Speaker, the American people are sick of getting a raw deal from Washington. That is why Democrats are offering a better deal for our democracy: a comprehensive reform agenda to get rid of the corruption that has led to such a dysfunctional political system here in Washington. We will deliver real reforms that will restore a government of, by, and for the people.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF).

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, today, I rise in support of S. 2155, the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act.

This pro-growth package provides the desperately needed regulatory relief to our community financial institutions while providing consumers with greater options for accessing credit.

For too long, we have seen many of the onerous regulatory burdens restrict

banks and credit unions from serving the needs of their communities. After 8 years of failed economic policies, which led to the slowest, weakest recovery in the modern era, the economy is finally starting to take off, and consumer optimism is increasing each and every day each.

As a member of the House Financial Services Committee, we remain committed to passing legislation designed to roll back some of the most burdensome provisions found in the Dodd-Frank Act.

This legislation was intended to rein in large financial institutions, while harming our local community banks and credit unions. These increased regulations created a higher cost of business and diminished credit availability.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALMER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Frankly, the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act tailors the rules to the size and risk profile rather than imposing sweeping changes to our consumer financial institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their work on this important legislation, and I urge passage on the rule and on the final vote.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), a member of the Financial Services Committee, to continue the discussion of commonsense issues that we all care about but have been blocked during this closed Congress.

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and distinguished Member of Congress, Mr. HASTINGS, for providing me the opportunity to speak today on behalf of deported veterans.

Mr. Speaker, setting the record for the most closed Congress is not a proud accomplishment. Our job is in our title: Representatives. We represent the American people.

According to the most recent Gallup poll, 78 percent of Americans disapprove of the way Congress is handling itself. Can you blame them?

When I came to Congress, I heard from constituents and Americans across the country about the injustice of deported veterans.

I heard from Arnold Giammarco from Connecticut, who was deported to Italy after coming to the United States at the age of 4 and honorably serving our country.

I heard from Gerardo Armijo, a Purple Heart recipient in my district, who was brought to the United States as an infant. He served two tours in Iraq, came home honorably discharged with PTSD after he suffered major injuries from an IED, and failed to get the care that he needed from the Veterans Administration. Due to drugs and alcohol, he found himself in some trouble and is now deported.

These stories are flooding in from all corners of the globe. We are deporting honorably discharged veterans after promising them citizenship. This is a disgrace.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), my good friend, a former member of the Committee on Rules who is now a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, to discuss the commonsense issues that we all care about that have been blocked during this closed Congress.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is the most closed Congress in my lifetime. Eighty-four closed rules. That means we don't debate on the floor.

That is also on top of the fact that we don't debate in committee. The tax bill that was passed out of the Ways and Means Committee had no discussion, no debate, and no publication until it was brought up for a vote. The same thing is true for the healthcare bill.

We need to be debating things.

One of them was allowing citizens to import safe prescription drugs from Canada at a lower cost when those prescriptions were manufactured in FDA-approved facilities. I offered that amendment, and we were denied the opportunity to vote on that.

Mr. Speaker, had we been allowed to vote on it, it would have passed, and Americans would have saved billions of dollars—and I said the word “billions”—on safe prescription medication if we could crack the lock that Pharma has on price gouging for pharmaceuticals.

We could do that if the majority would allow us to vote on amendments that pursue the opportunities that Americans need to be safe and secure.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, my good friend, who also serves on the Committee on Agriculture, to discuss the significance of this record-breaking closed Congress and real people affected by these closed rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day, a very sad day, for this institution. Today, it becomes official that this will become the most closed Congress ever in the history of the United States.

You heard why this matters. You heard from some of my colleagues here today that important issues, issues that the American people care about, like ensuring clean water for children, like high ethics in the executive branch, like cybersecurity, like banning bump stocks, like protecting our

veterans, or like protecting Medicare or Social Security—these amendments are routinely denied. We are shut out.

Millions of young people all over the country protested for us to do something to combat gun violence, and we have done nothing. We have done nothing in this Chamber other than a moment of silence.

The frustration of these young people is compounded by the fact that we can't even bring an amendment to the floor to ban bump stocks or to expand background checks or to ban assault weapons. They don't want to let anything come to the floor. It is outrageous.

And for anybody to stand up here and defend this process, to somehow normalize this process, give me a break. This closed process is something you would see in Russia or Turkey or in some other authoritarian government, not in the people's House.

This is supposed to be the greatest deliberative body in the world. What is so radical about deliberating every once in a while?

We have a report that we are releasing today. It is 230 pages. Go to the Rules Committee Democrats' web page, and you can read all about how there has been a deliberate attempt to shut out the voices of the American people.

Enough. This is not the way this place is supposed to be run.

If Democrats are given the privilege to control this House again, I will tell you, we need to be more accommodating, we need to be more open, and we need to allow this place to be a deliberative body where important issues get debated.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we need to fix problems in this country.

We could pass a bill to protect the Dreamers in a nanosecond if the Republican majority would allow us to bring an amendment to the floor, but they won't. Why? Because they are afraid that we are going to win.

They don't want a fair fight. They want a system that is always rigged in their favor. Well, that is not democracy. That is not the way this place is supposed to be run.

If we have a more accommodating approach to legislating, then I guarantee you that the polarization will be less. You will have more bills that will pass in a bipartisan way.

And, by the way, it is not just Democrats that get shut out; 180 Republicans have been shut out of the amendment process as well.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. MCGOVERN. The sad thing is that they just go along to get along,

and they are complicit in this most closed process in U.S. history.

Enough. Enough. We deserve better, the American people deserve better, my constituents deserve better, and your constituents deserve better. This place needs to be run differently.

Mr. Speaker, vote against this rule.

And I say to my Republican friends: Have the guts to stand with us and vote "no" on this closed process.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes for the purposes of a response.

I would, of course, lead with the observation that those who do not remember their history are doomed to repeat it. I don't remember precisely who said it, but I think it bears repeating today.

In the 111th Congress, Speaker Pelosi and the Democrats allowed less than a thousand amendments to be considered on the floor.

Of the bills that were considered at that time, the Dodd-Frank bill was one of those bills. The amendments that were blocked by the Democrats in the 111th Congress were precisely the type of amendments that we are now considering today in the bill to alleviate some of the obstructions, some of the gridlock that has occurred with our credit unions and smaller banks—things that people have been asking us for repeatedly for the last 5 to 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, the number of amendments that were blocked in the 111th Congress was significant. We have a chance today to undo some of that process, and I believe we ought to take that opportunity. As of 1½ weeks ago, over a thousand amendments had been made in order in this Congress.

The Committee on Rules is run differently today than it was in the 111th Congress. It used to be that you had to submit 45 copies of an amendment and you had a time limit by which you had to submit those amendments. You can submit amendments late now.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to myself.

Chairman SESSIONS has been very accommodating in allowing us to bring amendments to the Committee on Rules late.

There is no clock in the Committee on Rules, as the gentleman well knows. You can talk as long as you want in the Committee on Rules about your amendments, and you can offer whatever amendments you prefer.

The process is not ideal, but it is important that we move forward with these important reforms that people have been asking us for years. And, today, that day is at hand, and those reforms will be delivered.

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

□ 1215

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my friend from Texas, we don't want to talk. That is what you guys want to do. We want to legislate.

The fact is that the majority of bills that you have brought to this House floor have been closed. You have more closed rules than any other Congress in the history of the United States of America. How anybody can defend that with a straight face is beyond me.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the gentleman from Texas that I am prepared to close if he is.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, seeing no more speakers on my side, I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. Speaker, I ask the American people to look at this chart. Rules under Speaker RYAN: structured rules, 44 percent; closed rules, 56 percent; open rules, zero. That is what we are talking about.

As with all bipartisan measures, this NDAA has many things to like and some provisions that are causes for concern, but it did demonstrate that there can be bipartisan cooperation in order to safeguard our national security, and that should be the case in every one of the jurisdictional undertakings here in Congress.

I commend the committee for once again tackling such a major legislative package, but sadly, this approach is far and away the exception to the rule around here.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we have a moral responsibility to address gun violence in this country. Gun violence has overtaken our country. We have a moral responsibility to every child who now attends school thinking about, not if a school shooting will happen, but when it will happen to them. This responsibility is not owed to them at our leisure, it is not owed to them next month or next week or tomorrow, but today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I again want to reiterate, the Rules Committee has spent hours listening and considering Member testimony. We have welcomed over 225 Members to testify during this Congress, and roughly 493 times have made over 1,000 amendments in order, including 474 from Democrats, 383 from Republicans, and over 150 which were bipartisan amendments.

The rule today is important, three important pieces of legislation.

The National Defense Authorization Act. Our number one priority when we are elected to this body is the defense



of our Nation, and we are authorizing that expenditure today.

The bill to reform the financial services institutions is one that has been requested by small banks and credit unions for years, and this body is today prepared to deliver.

Then finally, the Right to Try Act. The President stood in the State of the Union message and said that it was not correct that people had to go to other countries in order to get the medicines that they needed to prolong their lives. He wanted that to end, and today we are taking the step to end that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support today's rule and the three underlying pieces of legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 905 OFFERED BY  
MR. HASTINGS

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

SEC. 8. 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. 20) to reform the financing of congressional elections by broadening participation by small dollar donors, 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 shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on House Administration, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means. 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. 9. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 20.

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 de-

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of House Resolution 905, if ordered, and

Approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 184, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

YEAS—222

Abraham	Graves (GA)	Olson
Aderholt	Graves (LA)	Palazzo
Amash	Graves (MO)	Palmer
Amodei	Griffith	Paulsen
Arrington	Grothman	Perry
Babin	Guthrie	Pittenger
Bacon	Handel	Poe (TX)
Banks (IN)	Harper	Poliquin
Barletta	Harris	Posey
Barr	Hartzler	Ratcliffe
Barton	Hensarling	Reed
Bergman	Herrera Beutler	Reichert
Biggs	Hice, Jody B.	Renacci
Bilirakis	Hill	Rice (SC)
Bishop (MI)	Holding	Roby
Bishop (UT)	Hollingsworth	Roe (TN)
Blackburn	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Blum	Huizenga	Rohrabacher
Bost	Hultgren	Rokita
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Rooney, Francis
Brat	Hurd	Rooney, Thomas J.
Brooks (AL)	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (KS)	Ross
Buchanan	Jenkins (WV)	Rothfus
Buck	Johnson (LA)	Rouzer
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Royce (CA)
Budd	Johnson, Sam	Russell
Byrne	Jordan	Rutherford
Calvert	Joyce (OH)	Sanford
Carter (GA)	Katko	Scalise
Carter (TX)	Kelly (MS)	Schweikert
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Scott, Austin
Cheney	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Coffman	King (NY)	Sessions
Cole	Kinziger	Shimkus
Collins (GA)	Knight	Shuster
Collins (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Simpson
Comer	Labrador	Smith (MO)
Comstock	LaHood	Smith (NE)
Conaway	LaMalfa	Smith (NJ)
Cook	Lamborn	Smith (TX)
Costello (PA)	Lance	Smucker
Cramer	Latta	Stefanik
Crawford	Lesko	Stewart
Culberson	Lewis (MN)	Taylor
Curbelo (FL)	LoBiondo	Tenney
Curtis	Long	Thompson (PA)
Davidson	Loudermilk	Thornberry
Davis, Rodney	Love	Tipton
Denham	Lucas	Trott
DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Turner
Diaz-Balart	MacArthur	Upton
Donovan	Marchant	Valadao
Duffy	Marino	Wagner
Duncan (SC)	Marshall	Walberg
Duncan (TN)	Massie	Walden
Dunn	Mast	Walker
Emmer	McCarthy	Walorski
Estes (KS)	McCaul	Walters, Jimmy
Faso	McClintock	Weber (TX)
Ferguson	McHenry	Webster (FL)
Fitzpatrick	McKinley	Wenstrup
Fleischmann	McMorris	Westerman
Flores	Rodgers	Williams
Fortenberry	McSally	Wilson (SC)
Fox	Meadows	Wittman
Gallagher	Messer	Womack
Garrett	Mitchell	Woodall
Gianforte	Moolenaar	Yoder
Gibbs	Mooney (WV)	Young (AK)
Gohmert	Mullin	Young (IA)
Goodlatte	Newhouse	Zeldin
Gosar	Noem	
Gowdy	Norman	
Granger	Nunes	

NAYS—184

Adams	Cárdenas	Crowley
Aguilar	Carson (IN)	Cuellar
Barragán	Cartwright	Cummings
Bass	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Beatty	Castro (TX)	Davis, Danny
Bera	Chu, Judy	DeFazio
Beyer	Ciicilline	DeGette
Bishop (GA)	Clark (MA)	Delaney
Blumenauer	Clarke (NY)	DeLauro
Blunt Rochester	Clay	DeBene
Bonamici	Cleaver	Demings
Boyle, Brendan F.	Clyburn	DeSaulnier
Brady (PA)	Cohen	Dingell
Brownley (CA)	Connolly	Doggett
Bustos	Cooper	Doyle, Michael F.
Butterfield	Correa	Ellison
Capuano	Costa	Engel
Carbajal	Courtney	Eshoo
	Crist	

Espallat  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gallego  
Gomez  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Lamb  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee

## NOT VOTING—21

Allen  
Black  
Brown (MD)  
Burgess  
DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Frelinghuysen

Gabbard  
Gaetz  
Garamendi  
Higgins (LA)  
Hoyer  
Norcross  
O'Rourke

## □ 1244

Mses. MENG, KELLY of Illinois, and VELAZQUEZ changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. MARCHANT changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 210.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 180, not voting 20, as follows:

## [Roll No. 211]

## AYES—227

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Bergman  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Brooks (AL)

Rice (NY)  
Rosen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schradler  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Suozi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Culbertson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Curtis  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
DeSantis  
Diaz-Balart  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes (KS)  
Faso  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Gallagher  
Garrett  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gottheimer  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Handel  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Hollingsworth

Adams  
Aguilar  
Amash  
Barragán  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Espallat  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gallego  
Gomez  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.

Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schneider  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

## NOES—180

Abraham  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Bergman  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)

McCormack  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascarelli  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rosen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez

## NOT VOTING—20

Allen  
Bass  
Black  
Brown (MD)  
DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Frelinghuysen

Gabbard  
Gaetz  
Garamendi  
Gohmert  
Higgins (LA)  
Hoyer  
Norcross  
O'Rourke  
Pearce  
Rogers (KY)  
Speier  
Stivers  
Walz

## □ 1252

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 179, answered “present” 1, not voting 28, as follows:

## [Roll No. 212]

## YEAS—219

Abraham  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Bergman  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carson (IN)  
Carter (TX)  
Cartwright  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clay  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Comstock