

Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walterski  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack

Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

## NAYS—78

Adams  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Capps  
Capuano  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Conyers  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeGette  
Deutch  
Ellison  
Engel  
Frankel (FL)  
Gallego  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez

Hastings  
Hinojosa  
Honda  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Larsen (WA)  
Lee  
Lewis  
Lynch  
McGovern  
Moore  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Norcross  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Pocan

Rangel  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Takai  
Takano  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Vargas  
Velázquez  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)

## NOT VOTING—10

Amodei  
Beyer  
Edwards  
Fattah

Fincher  
Grayson  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)

Pompeo  
Smith (TX)  
Van Hollen

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1119

Ms. JACKSON LEE changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, during roll-call Vote No. 163 on H.R. 3724, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “yes” when I should have voted “no.”

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) for the purposes of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

(Mr. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-

hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9:00 a.m. for legislative business.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, the House will also consider H.R. 4498, the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act, sponsored by Representative STEVE CHABOT. This bill extends the role of angel investing in assisting start-up businesses to acquire the financing needed to grow, innovate, and create jobs.

The House will also consider H.R. 4901, the Scholarship for Opportunity and Results Reauthorization Act, sponsored by Representative JASON CHAFFETZ. This bill is essential to improving education outcomes for low-income students in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider H.J. Res. 88, sponsored by Representative PHIL ROE, which disapproves of the rules submitted by the Department of Labor relating to the definition of the term “fiduciary.” This ill-advised rule will result in thousands of individuals being dropped by their financial advisers and unable to receive sound financial advice.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information as to the schedule. As I am sure he knows, I will want to ask him some questions about things that are not yet scheduled and, of course, the next week we will take a recess.

□ 1130

As the gentleman knows, the budget was passed out of the Budget Committee last month. We understand, of course, obviously, the Appropriations Committee is proceeding to mark up bills notwithstanding the fact that the budget has not been passed.

We are not sure exactly what the allocations for each subcommittee are going to be because, apparently, there has been no 302(b) allocation, which is the allocation to the 12 subcommittees.

It is going to be hard for us to tell exactly how much money is left if, in fact, appropriations bills are brought to the floor without knowing fully the distribution of funds for both defense and domestic priorities.

First, let me ask the gentleman: Does the gentleman expect the budget to be brought to the floor prior to the bringing of appropriations bills to the floor?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We will continue to work through the budget process, and I will update the Members once there is more information.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the depth of that information.

We do have a serious problem. And I want to tell my friend, the majority leader, as someone who had served on the Appropriations Committee for 23

years, obviously, one of the important facts to know is how much will be allocated for each one of the 12 subcommittees so you can make judgments, as bills come to the floor or as they come to full committee, about whether the funding levels for those are appropriate or whether there ought to be other priorities that ought to be brought to the floor.

I appreciate the gentleman's response. I know that the Speaker has indicated that doing a budget is absolutely the responsible thing to do, that that is the regular order to do, and I know the budget has passed out of the committee. So I am wondering: What is holding the budget up, Mr. Leader? Why aren't we considering it?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding and asking again.

As for the schedule, we are not scheduled for next week. We continue to work through. We think the budget is very important. When we have it scheduled, I will notify.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman, I suppose, for that additional information.

Of course, it goes without saying that it is not scheduled next week, and we still don't have the knowledge that I think is necessary for us to have before you bring the appropriations bills to the floor. In having said that, I understand the gentleman's answer.

There are three items that I have brought up before, Mr. Leader, that we think are critical items to be brought sooner rather than later that we need to deal with.

First, I want to reiterate what I said last week. I appreciate the majority leader's and I appreciate the Speaker's action and the chairman of the committee, Mr. BISHOP, in working with Treasury and with our side of the aisle to try to get a bill that we can agree on—that can enjoy bipartisan support—that will address the crisis that confronts the American citizens who live in Puerto Rico.

I also want to thank the gentleman—we had a meeting in his office—in that he and I shared the view that we ought to have a bill that is simple and straightforward so that we can forge a bipartisan agreement and get this bill done.

The Speaker has set May 1 as the deadline. It would appear that we are not going to meet that deadline. And we did not meet the March 31 deadline. But I know we had a meeting yesterday with our staffs. It was a positive meeting, and I hope it will lead to a productive meeting as well.

I would like to yield to my friend to see if the gentleman has any comments about where we stand on our moving forward on a bill to address the fiscal crisis in Puerto Rico.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes, the gentleman is correct in that we have been working together, especially with the Natural Resources Committee, on the proposal.

I appreciate the gentleman's commitment as well in making sure that we produce a bill that has solid financial footing and no financial bailout, which the work we are doing right now does not.

As the gentleman knows, the discussions are ongoing, and part of the challenge of finishing it is the Treasury Department. The Treasury Department still had some concerns.

I know there were some meetings this week, and I know there were Members on your side of the aisle who did not feel comfortable in moving forward until the Treasury Department had finished some of those negotiations.

But we look forward to getting the bill finished and moving it forward on a bipartisan basis, a bill that has no bailout, but that meets the needs with what is going on in Puerto Rico.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I would reiterate what he and I both stated last week, which is that, clearly, this is not a bailout. There is no money contemplated that is going to Puerto Rico, and there is no extension of U.S. credit backing from the United States to Puerto Rico.

What it is, as the gentleman knows, is just setting up a process for a restructuring of debt that everyone knows cannot be paid, and there needs to be some sort of rational way that Puerto Rico can work itself to both repay that which it can repay while, at the same time, maintain the absolutely essential services of education, health care, and public safety for the American citizens who live in Puerto Rico. So I would hope that we would continue to work on that.

Again, the majority leader's staff and my staff, Treasury, and Mr. BISHOP's staff, the leader's staff and Mr. RYAN's staff all have been working towards that end, and I appreciate that.

But I think we all feel a sense of urgency. Even if we could work it out over the weekend or before we end next week, if we could bring it to the floor next week, if we had an agreement, I think that would be a good thing for us to do. I don't know whether it is possible—I hope it is possible—but I look forward to working with the majority leader towards that end.

There are two other items, as you know, that I have mentioned in the past.

Zika. There was a very compelling editorial in The Washington Post today about Zika. The administration has asked for \$1.9 billion to address that crisis, which, clearly, almost every week, the CDC says is a growing one, with more exposure, with more of the United States' mainland being implicated as being at risk.

In addition to that, of course, Ebola continues to be a continuing health challenge both in Africa and in this country, but mainly in Africa. As you know, we appropriated money.

Mr. ROGERS and the Appropriations Committee and the gentleman said: Look, we can take some of that money and move it over to the Zika effort.

The problem with that, Mr. Leader, as I think you have heard me say before, is that Ebola continues to be a crisis.

Is there any expectation that we could bring a supplemental appropriations bill for this emergency that confronts the health of our people here, in Puerto Rico, in the Caribbean, and, frankly, in other parts of the world? Is there any chance of bringing a supplemental to the floor to address both of those?

In addition, Flint continues to be on bottled water because they have not yet been provided with a water system that works for their people.

So those three items, in addition to Puerto Rico, I think are compelling, timely issues for us to address.

Will the gentleman give me any additional information as to when that might occur?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to take the opportunity to thank the gentleman for working with us on Zika.

As he knows, I approached him early on to make sure we dealt with this in a bipartisan manner. As to any threat, we want to make sure it is not a partisan issue.

As the gentleman knows, there was somewhere around \$2 billion in unobligated Ebola money. One of the ideas, especially when the administration had requested money, was to have time to go through and ask the question, and many of those questions have not been answered yet.

We wanted to make sure no funding problems would happen. We are proud of the administration for its being able to take our idea and move almost \$600 million into Zika as we go forward. That will take us quite a ways into this fiscal year.

We are continuing to look at and to ask questions. I have a whole list here of questions that have been asked from a standpoint of an updated spending plan from HHS, which still hasn't been planned, of where they go, of what activities will the funds carry out, of how much funding do the agencies anticipate needing in 2016.

I mean, as the gentleman knows, never should we write a blank check, but never should we turn a blind eye to a problem. I am proud of the fact that we have not and that we have responsibly made sure that close to \$600 million is used right now.

We have asked the questions of what we need to go forward. I know the Appropriations Committee is continuing to work on that. We have the appropriations process going through, and that will probably be the ideal time to deal with it and anything going any further because we would have the questions answered and the ability to fund it.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Let me make a couple of observations.

I hear there is some discussion about the appropriations process. As the gentleman well knows, the appropriations process hasn't done too well lately.

Forgetting about who is to blame or who is not to blame, the appropriations process, essentially, has not worked, as the gentleman knows. Of course, last year, as we had done the year before, we passed an omnibus and didn't pass the appropriations bills.

My view is we have an emergency. It is doubtful that appropriations bills are going to get done in time. My own supposition is we are going to have a CR in September.

We have, really, 40 days left between now, I think, and the August break of legislative days. It is going to be problematic, at best, to get appropriations bills done by October 1, much less to respond to an emergency, which is why we believe that a supplemental, really, is called for.

We have two emergencies that are ongoing and a third in Flint, Michigan, and we believe that we ought to respond to those long before the possibility, much less the probability, of the appropriations bills passing this House, the Senate, and being signed by the President.

Does the gentleman have any thoughts on that? Because, if you are contemplating an appropriations process, Mr. Leader, with all due respect, past history would tell us, over the last few years—again, forgetting about who is to blame for it—the appropriations process does not get done in a timely fashion.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, the Appropriations Committee has already marked up three bills. The gentleman having served on Appropriations, he also understands that that is where you get a lot of questions answered, that that is where you get a lot of the good information from both sides of the aisle.

There is close to \$600 million for Zika right now. I have the same concern that you have. That is why I am telling the administration and the agencies that it would be very helpful if they would answer the questions needed.

Where would this money go? There are so many from the perspective of: Is Ebola no longer a public health risk? You have \$2 billion, unobligated, sitting in there that we could use.

If we want to solve the Zika problem, I think we should all work together. I am looking for the administration to answer some questions. I think that is the most responsible way to go about solving this problem.

I haven't given up on the appropriations process. I think it is a perfect opportunity, and I would think, for Members on both sides of the aisle, maybe it would give them a little incentive, in knowing the challenges that are out there for the American public, that this is the process that was created. And we could all have input.

One thing that we know, since this majority has taken over, is that we have an open process in appropriations as well; so, anybody can offer an amendment. I think that would be the best place to deal with this.

I do have a very personal compassion in talking about water. I know the situation that happened in Flint. I have lived with water problems in California for quite some time. For the last three Congresses, I have fought very hard to solve that for California.

Unfortunately, the other Chamber has done nothing. I have kids in the Central Valley who do not have water, people who are on bottled water they bring in, people who have portable water, where they have to come in and bring the tanks.

We have lived this for quite some time; so, you will find, on this side of the aisle, someone who is very compassionate about it and who wants to deal with that water issue at the same time as well. I think it would be appropriate.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments and for his concern, which I think is sincere, about California.

Let me say to him that I would certainly be open on this side of the aisle, as, I am sure, my Members would be, to working with him to address those issues.

It is not a question of Flint, per se, but it is a question of some 6,000 to 9,000 children who have been exposed immediately, and it is an emergency now as they are not able to drink the water; they are drinking bottled water.

My point is not that we ought not to address problems in California or, very frankly, in Maryland or in Ohio or in Florida or wherever else they may occur in league with the States and municipalities. Obviously, this is a partnership, not just our responsibility.

□ 1145

I would again reiterate, Zika and Ebola are both emergencies that need to be dealt with now. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct that we ought to know how much is needed, how it is going to be spent, and what effect it will have.

I will tell you that one of my members in the whip meeting this morning, Mr. Leader, said that her understanding from her local health department was that their efforts with respect to Ebola and other infectious diseases are being adversely affected by the fact that that \$589 million, which didn't just come out of the air, was transferred, as you pointed out and as I pointed out, to the Zika response. It was money that was—not obligated—planned to be spent in communities and in other areas to effect a solution to the challenge that confronts us.

So it is not just as if that \$589 million didn't have a purpose when we originally appropriated it. The gentleman supported it and I support it, so

we allocated that money. I know the Appropriations Committee supported it. And I presume, as the gentleman points out, they had hearings to know exactly the answers to the questions. But we will work with you on getting answers to those questions from the administration.

We would urge that, within the next few weeks, we have a supplemental on the floor, having those questions answered and being confident that the money is going to be spent, but knowing full well that people's health is at risk in this country. We have an empathy and a concern about that and want to respond to it. So I would hope that we could move it before the appropriations process because I think, unfortunately, the experience is, under all the parties that have been in control of this House over the years, that sometimes it happens slower than this emergency requires.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, APRIL 21, 2016, TO MONDAY, APRIL 25, 2016

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11:30 a.m. on Monday, April 25, 2016.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KATKO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATING KENNETH KANE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Kenneth Kane of Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District, who will be honored at a banquet tomorrow night in State College, Pennsylvania, as an outstanding alumnus of the Penn State University School of Forest Resources.

I have long been impressed by Ken's broad knowledge on forestry policy and regarding our Commonwealth's forests. Kenneth served in a variety of positions for forestry organizations, including as chairman of the Allegheny Society of American Foresters, chairman of the Penn Chapter Association of Consulting Foresters, northeast regional director of the Association of Consulting Foresters of America, and as an adviser to various State-level planning committees, including the Pennsylvania Game Commission and the Pennsylvania Joint Legislative Task Force. When I am looking to draw on expertise regarding Pennsylvania's forests, including the Allegheny National Forest, Ken Kane is one of the first people I turn to.

In addition to that, I am proud to call him my friend. I congratulate him

on this honor, and I look forward to his future work on forestry policy.

NUCLEAR FORCES BUDGET

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the rising cost of our Nation's nuclear forces budget.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that between 2015 and 2024, the administration's plans for nuclear forces will cost us about \$348 billion. That is about \$35 billion a year on our nuclear enterprise. According to the CBO, this is about 5 to 6 percent of the total cost of the administration's plans for our national defense for the next 10 years.

Next week, the House Armed Services Committee will mark up the fiscal year 2017 National Defense Authorization Act, our military bill, if you will.

One of my main priorities in the committee has been to reduce our Nation's nuclear weapons spending and to reduce our nuclear stockpile. Unfortunately, year after year, the Congress authorizes funding for more weapons while capping the funding that we use to dismantle nuclear weapons. I think it is a far safer world without these nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, rather than spend on the legacy of the cold war, we should be investing in our most important military asset: our men and our women in uniform.

EARTH DAY

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Earth Day.

As an Eagle Scout and a Scoutmaster for many years, I know firsthand why we must all work to strengthen conservation programs and other policies that promote public health, protect our environment, and keep our air and waterways clean. I care deeply about protecting our environment, and I am committed to preserving the outdoors.

The 10th Congressional District of Illinois borders one of the Nation's greatest treasures, Lake Michigan, which provides miles of beaches, natural habitat, recreation for millions across the Midwest, and drinking water to millions of Americans. That is why I am a strong supporter of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative and a cosponsor of legislation to ensure that this vital program is reauthorized and funded at robust levels.

I have also introduced the Great Lakes Water Protection Act, which will stop sewage dumping in the Great Lakes and provide clean water for future generations.

In commemoration of Earth Day, I encourage all of my colleagues to join