

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 716

Whereas the 100th anniversary of the 1916 Easter Rising has a particular resonance in the United States;

Whereas, from the foundation of the United States, Irish people and the millions of United States citizens of Irish descent have helped to shape its history;

Whereas, in the words of President John F. Kennedy, "No people ever believed more deeply in the cause of Irish freedom than the people of the United States";

Whereas 5 of the 7 signatories of the 1916 Proclamation of Independence spent periods of time in the United States that significantly influenced their thinking and actions;

Whereas the United States is the only foreign country specifically mentioned in the Proclamation;

Whereas the contemporary ties between the United States and Ireland are of extraordinary depth and breadth;

Whereas continued United States engagement in the Northern Ireland peace process is vital to safeguarding the gains made since the Good Friday Agreement;

Whereas the 100th anniversary of the 1916 Easter Rising offers an opportunity for remembrance, reconciliation, and reimagining of the future;

Whereas, on the 17th and 18th of May 2016, the Taoiseach (Prime Minister of Ireland) will visit Washington, DC, for events commemorating the 100th anniversary of the 1916 Easter Rising; and

Whereas more than 200 other commemorative events will take place across the United States to mark the anniversary: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recalls the special ties between Ireland and the United States, continually sustained and strengthened throughout the intertwined history of both countries;

(2) welcomes the program of commemorations in the United States marking the 100th anniversary of Ireland's 1916 Rising, including the events taking place in Washington DC; and

(3) recognizes the importance of nurturing and renewing the unique relationship between the United States and Ireland and their peoples into the future.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF NEW YORK

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the text at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the House of Representatives—

(1) recalls the deep and abiding friendship between Ireland and the United States, sustained and strengthened by the ties between our peoples and our shared values;

(2) calls for the enhanced cooperation between the United States and Ireland in undertaking multi-lateral humanitarian missions and international peacekeeping operations; and

(3) supports efforts to continue to increase political, economic, scientific, educational, and cultural ties between the United States and Ireland, including ongoing work to consolidate peace and reconciliation in Northern Ireland.

Mr. KING of New York (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MR. KING OF NEW YORK

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the preamble at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the more than 35 million Americans of Irish descent strengthen the friendly relations between the United States and Ireland;

Whereas throughout our history Americans of Irish descent have made significant contributions to the United States and have helped to shape its history;

Whereas in April 1916, through the Easter Rising, an attempt was launched to secure Irish independence;

Whereas signatories to the 1916 Proclamation of the Irish Republic were influenced by the experience of the United States and therefore included the United States as the only foreign country specifically mentioned in the Proclamation;

Whereas the United States recognized and established diplomatic relations with the Irish Free State in 1923;

Whereas Ireland is a valued partner in international fora, including the United Nations, the NATO Partnership for Peace Program, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and the World Trade Organization;

Whereas the United States and Ireland continue to share deep and abiding ties across a host of areas, including economic, scientific, and educational cooperative efforts, and international development cooperation;

Whereas the United States and Ireland enjoy a thriving and mutually beneficial trade and investment relationship, with the United States being the largest exporter to Ireland of services, and the second largest exporter of goods;

Whereas the United States and Ireland enjoy broad scientific cooperative programs, to the benefit of the United States, Ireland, and Northern Ireland, facilitated by the United States-Ireland Research and Development Partnership, which prioritizes joint research in the areas of nanoscale science and engineering, sensor networks, telecommunications, energy and sustainability, and health;

Whereas the United States and Ireland support thriving bilateral educational exchange programs, which Ireland has promoted in recent years with the establishment of Student Ambassador programs, increasing scholarships, and being a contributor and Lead Signature Partner in the U.S. Generation Study Abroad Program;

Whereas the Governments of Ireland and the United Kingdom have worked closely, with the ongoing support of the United States, in promoting peace and reconciliation in Northern Ireland; and

Whereas the 100th anniversary of the 1916 Easter Rising offers an opportunity for re-

commitment to strengthening the relationship between the United States and Ireland for the benefit of future generations in both countries: Now, therefore, be it

Mr. KING of New York (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "Recognizing the deep and abiding friendship between the United States and Ireland and recommending actions to further strengthen those ties."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4974, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5243, ZIKA RESPONSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 736 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 736

Resolved, That (a) 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. 4974) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, 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 Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. Clause 2(e) of rule XXI shall not apply during consideration of the bill. (b) During consideration of the bill for amendment—

(1) each amendment, other than amendments provided for in paragraph (2), shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent;

(2) no pro forma amendment shall be in order except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate; and

(3) the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule

XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read.

(c) When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, 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. (a) (a)

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5243) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, to strengthen public health activities in response to the Zika virus, 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. Clause 2(e) of rule XXI shall not apply during consideration of the bill. 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 Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Section 514 of H.R. 4974 shall be considered to be a spending reduction account for purposes of section 3(d) of House Resolution 5.

SEC. 4. During consideration of H.R. 4974 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to this resolution, it shall not be in order to consider an amendment proposing both a decrease in an appropriation designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and an increase in an appropriation not so designated, or vice versa.

SEC. 5. During consideration of H.R. 4974 pursuant to this resolution—

(a) section 310 of House Concurrent Resolution 125, as reported in the House, shall have force and effect in the Committee of the Whole; and

(b) section 3304 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 11 shall not apply.

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

Mr. COLE. 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.

□ 1230

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of both H.R. 5243, the Zika Response Appropriations Act of 2016, and H.R. 4974, the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2017.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 5243 under a closed rule with an hour of debate equally divided and con-

trolled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, along with a motion to recommit.

In addition, the rule provides for an open rule for consideration of the MILCON-VA appropriations bill for FY 2017. It also provides for a motion to recommit on the MILCON-VA bill.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule includes three budget provisions, which allow for the enforcement of the OCO firewall, allow for Members to deposit savings from their amendments in a spending reduction account, and provides limitations on advance appropriations consistent with the budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present H.R. 5243 to the House for its consideration. As I said in the Rules Committee yesterday, the debate over this legislation isn't about whether or not we provide resources for Zika, it is about whether or not we pay for it through our existing resources or just add it to the national debt. I am pleased that we have chosen the former course.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5243 provides an additional \$622.1 million, for a total of over \$1.2 billion to fight the Zika outbreak. H.R. 5243 provides additional money to the Centers for Disease Control for mosquito control and programs for prenatal care, delivery, and postpartum care. In addition, we provide the NIH with the resources needed to develop vaccines and diagnostic tests.

In addition, as opposed to the President's request, this legislation maintains important oversight restrictions on the use of these funds. Understandably, they must be used solely for Zika. The President's supplemental request, in addition to not being paid for, would allow the so-called emergency funds to be used for almost anything.

Importantly, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is fully offset by using leftover, unobligated Ebola funds and the unused Health and Human Services administrative funding. In addition, Mr. Speaker, this legislation reflects the emergency of this situation by making these funds available through the end of this fiscal year.

Yesterday, Chairman ROGERS told the Rules Committee that a standalone piece of legislation stands the best chance of becoming law. If we were to attach this measure as part of one of the fiscal year 2017 appropriations bills, as the Senate has done, there is no guarantee that it would be enacted swiftly. In my opinion, the best way to ensure its quick enactment is through standalone legislation, like H.R. 5243.

In addition to the Zika response appropriations bill, this rule allows for the consideration of the first appropriations bill considered by the House for FY 2017, the MILCON-VA appropriations bill.

I am pleased that the House is, once again, going through regular order and considering appropriations bills under an open process. As a member of the

Appropriations Committee, I am always proud that we can bring these bills up under an open process where all Members have the opportunity to bring their ideas for an up-or-down vote by the entire House.

H.R. 4974 provides \$73.5 billion in discretionary funding for the Veterans Administration, a 3-percent increase over FY16. In addition, it includes important oversight and good government provisions, like preventing the closure of Guantanamo Bay, prohibiting bonuses for all VA Senior Executive Service personnel, and increased oversight, like requiring large-scale construction projects to be managed by an outside entity so that mistakes like the Denver VA health facility, now \$1 billion over budget, will never be repeated.

I am encouraged by the hard work of Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY for their commitment to regular order and ensuring that the power of the purse is one that this House can continue to exercise. Both the Zika Response Appropriations Act and the FY 2017 MILCON-VA bill demonstrate our commitment to that end.

I urge support for the rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to debate the rule for H.R. 4974, the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, and H.R. 5243, the Zika Response Appropriations Act.

There are many things to praise in the military construction and VA appropriations bill. This is the first of the FY17 appropriations bills to reach the floor, and I hope that we soon have the opportunity to vote on other important appropriations packages.

The legislation, as pointed out by my good friend, provides \$81.6 billion in total discretionary funding for fiscal year 2017 to fund military construction projects and programs within the Department of Veterans Affairs. It provides funding to hire 242 new VA staff to help reduce the VA's backlog in processing claims, as well as important funding for mental health programs and suicide prevention outreach. Certain VA medical services, including long-term care for veterans and support services for caregivers, are also included in this bill, which increase health program funding by approximately 5 percent as compared to the last fiscal year.

As co-chair of the Congressional Homelessness Caucus, I also welcome the inclusion of the President's full fiscal year '17 request for veterans homelessness outreach programs in this legislation. We have made great progress in our work to end veteran homelessness, and these programs play a critical role in getting our veterans off the streets.

However, despite these points, the bill is not without criticism. The additional language that indiscriminately denies performance awards as well as the inclusion of other ideologically divisive provisions that are outside the scope of this legislation, to me, are problematic. Because of these provisions, the President has indicated that he will veto this legislation in its current form. So it is my hope that we can work together to present a final package that will be able to become law, providing the important funding that our military servicemen and -women, their spouses, and our veterans need and rightly deserve.

I now turn to debate the Republican majority's so-called response to Zika. Despite any hope I had that the generally bipartisan effort crafting the military construction and VA appropriations bill may perhaps signal that my friends in the majority are suddenly able to govern responsibly, I am beyond disappointed in the inadequate measure presented here today.

Nearly 3 months ago, the President requested Congress to provide \$1.9 million to combat the spread of the Zika virus. This number was based on what our Nation's top experts and scientists at the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control, and elsewhere believe is needed to meet the challenges of this impending public health emergency.

Dr. Anthony Fauci, Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases at the National Institutes of Health, our national top expert on infectious diseases, has warned that if we don't provide funding at this level, and I quote him, "that is going to have a very serious negative impact on our ability to get the job done."

So, naturally, after these warnings and nearly 3 months after the administration's request, what have my friends in the Republican majority presented today? A bill with a funding level less than one-third of the amount our Nation's top doctors tell us is needed to win the fight against the Zika virus.

I fear that in trying to address the Zika virus, my Republican colleagues are many days late and many dollars short. This decision risks worsening an already severe crisis. As of May 11, the Centers for Disease Control reports the following: In the continental United States, there have been 503 reported travel-associated cases of Zika. In the United States territories, including Puerto Rico, American Samoa, and the United States Virgin Islands, there are 698 locally acquired vector-borne cases reported.

□ 1245

While these numbers may seem small, we must take into account that we are not even in the summer months, and mosquito season has not even started. Despite these troubling figures, if you want to learn what is most important to the majority and their response to this emergency, one need

look no further than the summary of this bill prepared by the Committee on Appropriations Republicans. At the top of that summary, they noted for their Members that the funding was "entirely offset." This statement was underlined, bolded, and italicized.

Mr. Speaker, we are facing a public health emergency, and apparently the most important thing to my friends on the other side isn't that we address this emergency head-on with adequate and robust emergency funding but, rather, that we make sure what little funding they are allocated doesn't cost new money to do so. I guess my Republican friends will be at ease in the face of this looming public health emergency knowing that their response to pay for it is "offset."

One would think that the duty to provide an appropriate level of funding to respond to a national health crisis would be enough to garner a "yes" vote from the Republican majority. Apparently not.

I represent one of the States that everyone agrees will be hardest hit by the Zika virus. Indeed, Florida already reported 106 travel-related cases. Twenty-two of the cases in Florida are from Palm Beach and Broward County, areas that I represent. When the summer months come and this emergency worsens, I don't think my constituents will be at ease knowing that at least the money Republicans approved of was an offset.

Later, Mrs. NITA LOWEY, the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, the subject matter for today, is going to make statements. I haven't had an opportunity to talk with her this morning, but yesterday in the Committee on Rules I asked her whether or not, when other emergencies have come up, it has been required that they be offset, and her response was that it was not.

She, like myself, has been here during a lot of emergencies that we must and, rightly, should address for the American citizenry. This happens to be one more, and here we are haggling about offset rather than addressing the seriousness of this public national health emergency.

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

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

I want to begin by agreeing with my friend in terms of the appropriations process itself. He is right to celebrate the appearance of one of the bills down here under an open rule, just as I am sure my friend is aware, the Committee on Appropriations, under Mr. ROGERS' and Mrs. LOWEY's able leadership, has actually produced a series of bills ready and lined up. So I have no doubt this is the first of many bills—I would hope all bills—that we eventually see on the floor that every Member has an opportunity to come down here and amend as they see fit.

I also want to appreciate what my friend had to say about the VA and

military construction bill. I think he is absolutely correct. That is one of our very best subcommittees. Chairman DENT and Congressman BISHOP are chair and ranking member. They work together extremely well. While I know my friend has some concerns with specific provisions of that, again, this is a process. As he knows, this is our opening process. We will see what happens. I think at the end of the day, that particular legislation will garner a great deal of bipartisan support, in part because of the very points my good friend made in talking about the bill.

Now let's move to Zika. Here, we obviously have a different point of view. Let me posit some things, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps those watching this debate and discussion aren't aware of.

First, \$600 million has already been deployed for Zika. That was out of money set aside for both Ebola and other infectious diseases. That money, by the way, totaled over \$5 billion originally. There is still close to \$3 billion of it left. It was to be spent over several years.

So when the President made his request, the initial response from Chairman ROGERS was, spend this money now. Don't wait on Congress to act. You have got available resources. The administration eventually agreed with that point of view.

So to this point, nothing has been left undone because of money. Everything the Federal Government has wanted to do has been fully funded. And, indeed, in that fund, there is still well over \$2 billion, so literally everything it plans to do in the timeframe it plans to do it can be done. So that is \$600 million of the \$1.9 billion immediately available.

This bill would provide another \$622 million, which is actually more money than the administration plans to spend in this fiscal year. So they will have more than enough resources. In the bill, there is actually money included for the National Institutes of Health that will not be spent until next year as they work through the process of developing vaccines and diagnostics. So there is more than adequate funding here.

Finally, in the remainder of the year, when we get to the Labor-HHS bill and the foreign operations bill, we will put in literally hundreds of millions more money for fiscal year 2017. That \$1.9 billion isn't to be used right now. It is to be used over a 2-year period, so you don't need all of it right now.

The key difference is not the amount of money. The key difference is, number one, this is offset. My friend is correct about that. It is paid for. Rather than saying we are going to just immediately add an additional \$1.9 billion to the national debt, say: Look, we have money set aside; we have got money here we can offset through other unused funds, and we have got money in the regular appropriations process for next year.

All of this can and should be paid for. Frankly, it is not like a Hurricane

Sandy or a Hurricane Katrina with massive damage, immediate response required. This is actually smaller, more manageable, and these are monies spent over not a short period of time, but over a couple of years. So this is actually the prudent way to actually move forward on this money.

But again, the important thing to know is everything that has needed to be done has been done. There hasn't been anything delayed. Nothing has been set back. Frankly, what Mr. ROGERS offers us will actually speed money to the process.

The debate, here again, as I said in my opening remarks, isn't about Zika; it is about whether or not you want to pay for the response, and that requires some tough choices to be made. That means other things that aren't emergency might not get as much funding.

The administration, like anybody else, if they can have their cake and eat it too, is delighted to do so. The more prudent path is to actually pay for the emergency that you have if you can. If you can't, then you move to something bigger. But in this case, we have the ability to do that, and I think we ought to do it.

I would hope our friends work with us on this. We see that this is an emergency. We have provided money immediately. We are moving now, prudently, to provide additional money, more than is needed in the short term and, frankly, as the bills roll out, you will see that there will be additional money yet to come—money that, by the way, was not intended to be spent until next year anyway. So there is no reason to spend it all right now.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the Democratic alternative Zika bill that provides the administration with the \$1.9 billion its top scientific and medical experts say is needed to mount a robust response to the Zika crisis without jeopardizing its ability to address other public health threats, like Ebola.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations and my good friend, to discuss our proposal.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Zika bill provides \$622 million, about one-third of the \$1.9 billion requested. The bill also steals more Ebola funding as an offset instead of replenishing what was already redirected to Zika. We don't offset spend-

ing to respond to emergencies, and we certainly don't steal from prior emergency response efforts still underway when a new emergency arises.

Let's just consider, my friends, recent history.

Emergency funding was provided to respond to both Ebola and H1N1. In last year's omnibus, Congress used emergency funding without offsets to pay for wildland fire suppression, mostly in the West. Congress also provided emergency funding to respond to two hurricanes and flooding in the Carolinas and Texas, again without offsets.

When those disasters struck, we didn't steal money from prior disaster response, like the emergency funding provided for hurricane damage in Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida; or storms in West Virginia; or tornadoes in Oklahoma and Kentucky. In fact, after the 2013 Oklahoma tornadoes, my friend, Chairman ROGERS, said: "I don't think disasters of this type should be offset. We have an obligation to help these people."

Now that the Zika public health emergency has ravaged Brazil, spread to Puerto Rico, and threatens an outbreak in the continental United States, suddenly Republicans insist on short-changing efforts to ensure the deadly Ebola virus doesn't reemerge to pay for Zika response. The money they would take from Ebola isn't nearly enough to prevent the spread of the deadly Zika virus that especially endangers pregnant women and children who could be born with very severe disabilities.

If the previous question is defeated, Mr. HASTINGS will amend the rule to offer my bill, H.R. 5044, as a substitute, providing the full \$1.9 billion the administration requested without offsets to ensure an adequate response to Zika that doesn't rob our Ebola response. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question.

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

Let me begin by thanking my good friend for her wonderful work on that committee. She has had the opportunity to serve on her subcommittee when she was a subcommittee chairman and now to work with her ranking member. There is no better person than NITA LOWEY on that committee.

However, we are going to disagree a little bit here. First of all, when you say the bill only provides a third, of course, you have already got a third. The first \$600 million is the first third. That has already been deployed. It is being spent. This is the next third. The remaining third is money that will be spent—by the way, not this year, but next year—and it will be presented in the normal appropriations bills.

I happen to chair one of those committees, the so-called Labor-HHS Subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. We will have hundreds of millions of dollars in that bill for next year's Zika response. So to suggest that somebody is being short-

changed, the money is just being prudently laid out at an appropriate pace and paid for along the way. That is point number one.

Point number two, again, this isn't a debate about the disease. It was this committee and our chairman who immediately responded and said: You have extra money left.

Now, by the way, the Ebola money, if you go back and look at the legislation, is Ebola and other infectious diseases.

□ 1300

In other words, when Congress appropriated that, they knew they might be appropriating more than was needed for Ebola and there might be other crises to come up. So that money is being used exactly the way it is supposed to be used.

The Appropriations Committee has assured that both the CDC and the NIH and the administration that, should additional money be required—and there is still almost \$2 million of Ebola money—and if you need more and you are going to spend it over the next several years, come back and we will sit down and we will work with you and get you the money.

So this suggestion that somehow the fight against Ebola has been sidelined or cut short or shortchanged, again, is simply not true.

My friends use a lot of rhetoric here, largely to hide the fact that while we have got plenty of available money both set aside in the normal appropriations process and certainly in this bill of Chairman ROGERS to pay for things, they just simply want to add it to the national debt. They don't want to use available resources. They don't want to operate within the normal Appropriations Committee, I guess because they want to spend that money someplace else.

To suggest that anybody is disingenuous or shortchanging either Zika or Ebola simply doesn't square with reality. It was Congress, after all—a Republican majority in the House and a Democratic majority in the Senate, but, frankly, a genuinely bipartisan effort—that voted the \$5 billion-plus for Ebola in the first place.

Last year, the President asked for a billion-dollar increase at the National Institutes of Health. We gave him a \$2 billion increase. I can't remember the precise number last year, but I do remember we appropriated more for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention than the President requested.

So it is not as if these things are not a priority. I think they are a priority on both sides of the aisle. We have proven that by bringing appropriations bills to the floor beyond what the President requested. But we think the prudent thing to do is not just willy-nilly add \$1.9 billion worth of debt on the American taxpayer, particularly when the money is at hand to pay for what we need right now and we have an appropriations bill coming up in June

where the rest of it can be taken care of and we can actually monitor this thing.

On the Ebola crisis, we may well have appropriated more than we needed to. That is why we have the other infectious diseases. In fact, if you look at the administration's budget proposal, they actually were taking \$40 million out of this same pot of money to spend on unrelated malaria suppression abroad.

I am not quarreling with that—that is fine—but it suggests, again, even the administration thought, “Well, maybe there is more money than we need in here for Ebola, or we can count on Congress to come back,” which, by the way, is true if they need more money.

This is all about trying to circumvent the appropriations process and trying to add debt when there are sufficient resources available. If there were not, then that would be another matter. I agree with my friends: the response is important. But in this case, because the response is spread out over 2 years, you have plenty of time. And this is a relatively modest amount of money. This isn't like an \$80 billion expenditure that we had for Hurricane Sandy. We can do this in a thoughtful and prudent way and avoid the debt that is associated with emergency spending.

We want to continue to work with the administration. We have demonstrated in the past that we are willing to fund NIH and CDC above administration-recommended levels. We responded quickly during the Ebola emergency. We think this is the appropriate way to go.

The Senate is moving a vehicle, as we all know. At some point, if we pass this—and I think we will—we will sit down with our friends, and we will hammer out a common response. But, again, do remember that nothing is not being done for lack of money. Everything the administration has wanted to do to date, it has had the resources to do. And we will continue to make sure that it does.

At the end of the day, we think they ought to be paid for, since we have the ability to do that. And that is what we are trying to accomplish: keep debt off the back of the American taxpayer, if we possibly can. In this case, we can and we should.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, before yielding to my good friend from Texas, I include in the RECORD a letter from the White House over the signature of Shaun Donovan, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and Susan Rice, National Security Adviser, directed to the Speaker of the House, PAUL D. RYAN, on April 26, 2016.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, April 26, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: As you are aware, on February 22, the Administration transmitted to Congress its formal request for \$1.9 billion in emergency supplemental funding to address the public health threat posed by the Zika virus. Sixty-four days have passed since this initial request; yet still Congress has not acted.

Since the time the Administration transmitted its request, the public health threat posed by the Zika virus has increased. After careful review of existing evidence, scientists at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) concluded that the Zika virus is a cause of microcephaly and other severe fetal brain defects. The Zika virus has spread in Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the U.S. Virgin Islands and abroad. As of April 20, there were 891 confirmed Zika cases in the continental United States and U.S. territories, including 81 pregnant women with confirmed cases of Zika. Based on similar experiences with other diseases transmitted by the *Aedes aegypti* mosquito—believed to be the primary carrier of the Zika virus—scientists at the CDC expect there could be local transmission within the continental U.S. in the summer months. Updated estimate range maps show that these mosquitoes have been found in cities as far north as San Francisco, Kansas City and New York City.

In the absence of action from Congress to address the Zika virus, the Administration has taken concrete and aggressive steps to help keep America safe from this growing public health threat. The Administration is working closely with State and local governments to prepare for outbreaks in the continental United States and to respond to the current outbreak in Puerto Rico and other U.S. territories. We are expanding mosquito control surveillance and laboratory capacity; developing improved diagnostics as well as vaccines; supporting affected expectant mothers, and supporting other Zika response efforts in Puerto Rico, the U.S. territories, the continental United States, and abroad. These efforts are crucial, but they are costly and they fall well outside of current agency appropriations. To meet these immediate needs, the Administration conducted a careful examination of existing Ebola balances and identified \$510 million to redirect towards Zika response activities. We have also redirected an additional \$79 million from other activities. This reprogramming, while necessary, is not without cost. It is particularly painful at a time when state and local public health departments are already strained.

While this immediate infusion of resources is necessary to enable the Administration to take critical first steps in our response to the public health threat posed by Zika, it is insufficient. Without significant additional appropriations this summer, the Nation's efforts to comprehensively respond to the disease will be severely undermined. In particular, the Administration may need to suspend crucial activities, such as mosquito control and surveillance in the absence of emergency supplemental funding. State and local governments that manage mosquito control and response operations will not be able to hire needed responders to engage in mosquito mitigation efforts. Additionally, the Administration's ability to move to the next phase of vaccine development, which requires multi-year commitments from the Government to encourage the private sector to prioritize Zika research and development, could be jeopardized. Without emergency

supplemental funding, the development of faster and more accurate diagnostic tests also will be impeded. The Administration may not be able to conduct follow up of children born to pregnant women with Zika to better understand the range of Zika impacts, particularly those health effects that are not evident at birth. The supplemental request is also needed to replenish the amounts that we are now spending from our Ebola accounts to fund Zika-related activities. This will ensure we have sufficient contingency funds to address unanticipated needs related to both Zika and Ebola. As we have seen with both Ebola and Zika, there are still many unknowns about the science and scale of the outbreak and how it will impact mothers, babies, and health systems domestically and abroad.

The Administration is pleased to learn that there is bipartisan support for providing emergency funding to address the Zika crisis, but we remain concerned about the adequacy and speed of this response. To properly protect the American public, and in particular pregnant women and their newborns, Congress must fund the Administration's request of \$1.9 billion and find a path forward to address this public health emergency immediately. The American people deserve action now. With the summer months fast approaching, we continue to believe that the Zika supplemental should not be considered as part of the regular appropriations process, as it relates to funding we must receive this year in order to most effectively prepare for and mitigate the impact of the virus.

We urge you to pass free-standing emergency supplemental funding legislation at the level requested by the Administration before Congress leaves town for the Memorial Day recess. We look forward to working with you to protect the safety and health of all Americans.

Sincerely,

SHAUN DONOVAN,
Director, The Office of
Management and
Budget.

SUSAN RICE,
National Security Ad-
viser.

Mr. HASTINGS. Excerpting from that letter a portion of the first paragraph on the second page, let me read what is said, in partial response to my good friend from Oklahoma:

“Without significant additional appropriations this summer, the Nation's efforts to comprehensively respond to the disease will be severely undermined. In particular, the administration may need to suspend crucial activities, such as mosquito control and surveillance, in the absence of emergency supplemental funding.

“State and local governments that manage mosquito control and response operations will not be able to hire needed responders to engage in mosquito mitigation efforts. Additionally, the administration's ability to move to the next phase of vaccine development, which requires multiyear commitments from the government to encourage the private sector to prioritize Zika research and development, could be jeopardized.

“Without emergency supplemental funding, the development of faster and more accurate diagnostic tests also will be impeded. The administration may not be able to conduct followup of children born to pregnant women with

Zika to better understand the range of Zika impacts, particularly those health effects that are not evident at birth.

“The supplemental request is also needed to replenish the amounts that we are now spending from our Ebola accounts to fund Zika-related activities. This will ensure we have sufficient contingency funds to address unanticipated needs related to both Zika and Ebola. As we have seen with both Ebola and Zika, there are still many unknowns about the science and scale of the outbreak and how it will impact mothers, babies, and health systems domestically and abroad.”

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), my good friend.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned. I am concerned because, while the mosquito is not the unbeatable foe, it is the deadliest living organism on the Earth. The deadliest life form is the mosquito.

Annually, the mosquito kills 1 million humans, mostly from malaria. I must tell you, but I must tell you that they also kill by way of the West Nile virus. In Houston, Texas, we have had people contract the West Nile virus. We have people die. I would also mention that they are the greatest survivors. They survived the dinosaurs.

We are dealing with a deadly foe. Make no mistake, the size should not in any way cause us to believe that this is something we can take as less than a deadly enemy that we have to confront.

The World Health Organization has indicated that there may be as many as 4 million cases of the Zika virus from Zika-carrying mosquitoes in the Americas. As of February 1, we had seven confirmed cases in Houston, Texas.

It appears, from what I have read, that standing water activates them. It appears that rain can activate these mosquitos. If this is true, in Houston, Texas, given that we have just had the so-called tax day flood and because we are still being inundated with rain quite regularly—an 80 percent chance of rain today in Houston, an 80 percent chance tomorrow—it appears that we have the makings of a special problem in Houston, Texas.

So, I am gravely concerned. I hope that we do all that we can to make sure that we get the necessary equipment and the necessary funding so that this enemy can be confronted properly.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by actually agreeing with my friends and, certainly, my good friend from Texas. He is right about the danger that we are dealing with. My friend from Florida is certainly right about the severity of this. I think where they are wrong is the suggestion that nothing has been done; \$600 million has been deployed.

This bill is actually a response to the very letter that my good friend from Florida read. This does provide the next third of the requested money by

the administration. And, frankly, the bill extends this into next year to address the concerns my friend expressed about having a multiyear commitment.

The money in here for the National Institutes of Health, which is the lead agency in developing vaccine and diagnostics, is fully funded for what they have asked to be funded for next year. So this actually does that.

Now, we will have an additional bill through committee in June where we will provide additional resources for the CDC for next year and whatever other things needed.

The total spending here on both sides is about the same. It is being deployed right now. This is a response to some of the concerns. What concerns my friends, I think, is they would just prefer not to pay for it. They would just prefer to add it to the national debt. Well, gosh, that is a great thing to do, but that is probably how we ended up with a deficit of over half a billion dollars for FY 2017 and a national debt of over \$19 trillion.

If this were something that we couldn't handle any other way—that we only had an emergency—I would agree with my friends. I did that when we had the Sandy relief. There was no other way for something that large. That is not the case here. This is \$1.9 billion. Most of that money is coming out of the Labor-HHS bill, which, by the way, spends \$163 billion a year.

If you can't fund \$1.9 billion spaced over 2 years in a bill that provides in that period of time around \$320 billion, you are just not trying.

This is all about being able to spend someplace else. And, again, not one thing has not been done. Everything that anybody in the Federal Government has wanted to do, they have been able to do. In addition, the Ebola money is not just the Ebola money; it is Ebola and other infectious diseases. That is what it was there for. It was not just meant to be spent only on Ebola.

Even after the \$600 million, even after the money that is offset in this bill, which is roughly at \$350 million, that fund still will have almost \$2 billion in it that can deploy any way against infectious diseases that the administration says it needs, and it has the commitment of Appropriations, which has demonstrated again and again that it will do this: If you run short in this area, we will backfill. That is why we have appropriations bills moving now. We can take care of you. But we can do it within the budget limits negotiated with the administration. That is prudent management of the money.

So, given the track record here, both in responding on Ebola and putting more money in the NIH and the Centers for Disease Control than the administration expected and now moving quickly to be helpful here, I think we have either a misunderstanding or a manufactured crisis.

There is no crisis. There is a real challenge, and money needs to move

toward it now. That is exactly what we have done. That is exactly what we are doing in this bill. That is exactly what we will do in the appropriations bills that will be presented in Congress as the appropriations season progresses.

With that, I want to reassure my friend that the resources will be there. They have been there thus far. They will continue to be there.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), my good friend.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the indifference by some in this Congress to a looming public health crisis is truly stunning.

This Republican bill cuts the emergency funding request for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention by 80 percent. That is \$4 out of every \$5 it asks for that will be eliminated.

The Zika virus is a terrible virus. It eats away at the brain of a fetus and results in a family tragedy of a child who is born with very severe birth defects. It will require costly lifetime care.

□ 1315

Zika can be sexually transmitted, and it has spread to many parts of Texas. We have Texas-tough mosquitoes, and the season is just beginning there. We are on the cusp of an epidemic spreading across our region; meanwhile, the Republicans are refusing to provide the resources to prevent it.

Now, I appreciate the very reassuring words that we have been hearing here, but just this morning I sat down and met with the Director of the Centers for Disease Control, Dr. Tom Frieden, and I asked him: What difference does it make that \$4 out of every \$5 you have asked for are being cut?

He said in our discussion: If this Republican bill is approved to deny this vital CDC and NIH funding, we will not be able to develop the tools to diagnose the virus, combat the mosquitoes, and develop a safe and effective vaccine against it.

He said: We cannot monitor all of those who are being infected, have already been infected, and the neighbors around them that another mosquito bite might transmit the virus to them.

He said: We cannot get back to Texas and other States' general emergency preparedness funds that we have taken away in order to try to fight the Zika virus.

To do the job effectively, this Administration needs more than four months of temporary funding. It needs long-term contracting authority to get at this crisis and to prevent it.

I think that disease control and prevention represents some of our best and most effective investments in health. We can save a lifetime of suffering to so many families, and we can save millions of dollars of public and private monies that these children

born with severe birth defects will have.

The gentleman is correct that the Republican Senate is considering this matter. In fact, it not only considered it, but, finally, yesterday it approved legislation that offers almost twice as much in the way of resources to address this crisis as the bill the gentleman is promoting today includes.

I say let's join together and reject this rule—reject it, and demand that the Republican leadership respond with the funding necessary to protect families across America from an emerging Zika tragedy.

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

I want to always recognize my good friend from Texas, who is really one of my good friends in this body.

But I am not surprised that the Senate bill is twice as much money because it runs for twice the time. This bill runs to September 30th. The Senate bill runs until September 30, 2017, so they are not materially that different.

What we have said is we would deal with next year's problem in the appropriations process for this year.

Now, again, I know my friend's concern is legitimate. I do. I don't have any doubt about it. But I point out one more time, \$600 million has been appropriated or has been made available. This is an additional \$600 million. This \$1.2 billion for the time of this fiscal year is actually more than the administration had planned to spend in this period. It reaches into next year, but they will have it available for this year if they need it.

They have another nearly \$2 billion in Ebola/other infectious diseases money, and they have the assurance that additional things are coming.

The only difference here is, are you going to pay for it? Or are you just going to add it to the national credit card, another \$2 billion, roughly, on the national debt, when you have the resources and the time available to operate within the appropriation system?

So this debate, as I have said repeatedly, isn't about Zika. It is about whether you pay to deal with Zika, or whether you would just like to do whatever you want to do and forget about paying for it.

Unfortunately, we don't have that luxury indefinitely. So this is a responsible, well-thought-through measure. It is fully paid for.

Nobody is short of resources, nobody will be short of resources. The money is available to do whatever the administration wants to do. It is well aware of that fact. And these are additional resources deployed here, with the assurance of other resources that will be deployed during the course of the normal appropriations process.

So I fail to see, when the amount of money is essentially the same on both sides over essentially the same period, why we keep going back and acting as if this \$600 million is all there is. There

is another 600 that has already been spent. There is more coming. It is coming in a regular way.

The only thing that upsets my friends on the other side is it is being paid for. I mean, how outrageous: we are actually going to pay for a government activity that is important for us to accomplish, with the assurance that if more is needed, more will be made available.

Mr. Speaker, that is the simple difference here, despite all the discussion about the disease, about readiness, is who is willing to pay for what needs to be done and who, frankly, would just prefer to put on it the national credit card.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), my very good friend.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Members, I thank my colleague from the Committee on Rules and my classmate for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and to H.R. 5243.

The last three Democratic speakers are from Texas. The Southeastern States are ground zero for Zika and other diseases. It is the first known vector-borne disease to cause microcephaly and other severe fetal brain defects.

Our knowledge of the disease and how it is transmitted and its complications have evolved rapidly since the epidemic began, but there is still a lot unknown. We do not have rapid diagnostic tests or an effective vaccine against this virus.

The mosquito vector is actively present in several parts of the United States, including Houston and the Southern States. Current vector control efforts are uncoordinated and inadequate.

Cases of Zika are being introduced frequently by returning travelers, and mosquito season is rapidly approaching our community.

As of May 11, there were more than 1,200 confirmed Zika cases in the continental U.S. and U.S. territories. Robust action is required to protect Americans, and this bill falls dramatically short of the response this epidemic demands.

H.R. 5243 only provides a third of the funds necessary to respond to a Zika outbreak and, even worse, a large portion of the funding is taken from money Congress has appropriated to respond to the Ebola crisis. We are taking money away from researching Ebola cures to put on Zika. Ebola will not go away. We cannot rob Peter to pay Paul.

My good friend from Oklahoma, I know in 2003, we sent legislators up to his district. I hope in Texas we don't send mosquitos up to his district, because that could happen.

Congress has a constitutional and moral duty to protect the health and

welfare of our country. I am saddened to say this bill fails to uphold our responsibilities to the American people.

Crises of this magnitude demand robust, multi-year investments in our public health infrastructure, vaccine, diagnostic development, and transmission control.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Funding to fight the Zika virus must be treated as an emergency that is similar to past emergencies, like Ebola and H1N1 viruses. It should not be offset or use previously appropriated funds for other public health priorities. Doing so will only continue the broken cycle of lurching from outbreak to outbreak.

Even worse, this bill only funds the Department of Health and Human Services' response until September 30. Mosquitos don't follow our fiscal year. This threat is real, immediate, and grave.

On behalf of American families, mothers, and the next generation, we must do better.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill and bring meaningful legislation to the floor that adequately and responsibly funds our response to the Zika virus.

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

My good friend, Mr. GENE GREEN—and he is my good friend—as I recall, those Texas legislators were called the Killer Bees. And if you want to compare them to mosquitos, I will leave you that luxury and that political risk. We just call Texas legislators welcome guests. So they are welcome to come any time.

In terms of the point, though, I think I agree with much of what you say, other than the last part of what you said about adequately, responsibly funding. That is exactly what we are doing.

The total amount of money here we are talking about, my friends keep forgetting about this \$600 million that has already been deployed, and they keep suggesting that this is like only Ebola money.

That is not the way the legislation is written. It is written for Ebola and other infectious diseases. In other words, we are using that money exactly the way we are supposed to use it, not shortchanging anybody.

If we need money later—because this is money that is to be spent over multiple years—we will come back and put it in. But that money, frankly, if it had not been available, there would not have been an immediate response possible. It was available, so it is being used in the appropriate way.

This is the next third. So when we hear this talk about only a third of what the administration requested, we have already done a third. We are getting ready to do the next third, and we are telling you, in bills that are coming

to the floor, both State and foreign ops, and Labor-HHS, that there will be additional money that will essentially total about what the administration has asked to spend.

We recognize that these things do develop, do change. Our understanding of them changes over time. This is actually a thoughtful way to do this. But the assurance has been made: if you need more money, then you have got it. We will work with you. We will find a way to do it. Our assistance is, if we can pay for it, then we do pay for it; and that is exactly what we do in this bill.

We hear comparisons, erroneous comparisons, you are only doing half as much as the Republicans in the Senate. No. We are doing it through September 30 of this year. They are doing it through September 30 of next year. The amounts are essentially about the same.

The difference, then, is also the same, frankly, with all due respect to my friends in the Senate, we are offsetting and paying for this. And that just seems, to us, the prudent way to do it, not to put more debt on the back of the American taxpayer when you don't have to.

If we had some emergency that called for hundreds of billions of dollars or something of that nature, that would be different. That is not what we are dealing with here.

Now, I have a lot of respect for my friend's concerns, but the chairman of our committee actually led a delegation to South America partially on this issue recently. I happened to have the privilege of going along with Chairman ROGERS.

We stopped in Peru, where there is a Naval research station we have operated for decades. It normally focuses on tropical diseases—we have a lot of issues with that when our military is deployed in those areas—but it is working around the clock on Zika and is doing some great work.

Then we went to Brazil, which is really the epicenter of this outbreak; sat down and talked with the Centers for Disease Control people on the ground, which we did; talked with the Brazilian government, which we did; saw, as Brazil was deploying literally hundreds of thousands, 220,000 of its own military personnel, to go door to door.

So I think probably Chairman ROGERS has as good a grasp, with all due respect, as anybody in this body on what is being done, what needs to be done, and how to proceed.

At every step along the way, he has shown that resources are going to be made available. They have been, but they are being made available in a responsible, prudent way, with appropriate oversight, in a timely manner, but in a manner which is offset and paid for.

That is what I think the American people want us to do: take care of what is important, do it right, do it respon-

sibly, and pay for it if you have the funds available before you automatically add it to the credit card that our kids and grandkids are going to someday have to pay off.

So we will continue to work with our friends. We will work with our colleagues in the Senate. But to suggest for 1 minute that the Federal Government doesn't have the resources it needs, when it has much more than it has asked sitting still unobligated in funds, is just simply not the case. It has the money it needs. It is getting the resources in the right way. We are simply paying for them.

I know that is hard for some of my friends to accept, but it is actually the appropriate way to proceed. We actually should do more of this in this body rather than less.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it has become clear that the Republican leadership has either abdicated its authority to govern to the far right of its party, or never had the wherewithal to do so in the first place.

□ 1330

Either way, the American people are tired of this majority's inability to address the issues facing our country.

During the 114th Congress, Republicans have brought to the floor bills with absolutely no hope of becoming law, strictly partisan measures that were more messaging bills than serious legislative proposals. We saw it a couple of weeks ago with a string of bills attacking the Internal Revenue Service to score political points during tax day.

None of that is going to become law. We have seen it with bills to weaken environmental protections or to limit a woman's right to choose. Now we see it with a bill that the President has threatened to veto because Republicans have included ideological riders. The majority seems to be more focused on scoring political points than actually getting to the business of governing.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle attempt to merely swat away the looming public health crisis posed by the Zika virus. This approach is as lacking in leadership as it is callous. I can guarantee you that the mosquitos carrying the Zika virus do not care if you are a Democrat or a Republican. They do not care if the money used to stop them is offset. But I can promise my Republican friends, pinching pennies on basic investments to address a public health emergency will inevitably heighten costs—in dollars and lives—down the road.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank, as always, my good friend from Florida. He is truly a delight to work with, one of the really

great Members in this body. Not surprisingly, he knows I disagree with him on his characterization of the current Congress, because saying that we haven't done anything is forgetting what has actually happened.

This is the first Congress to pass a multiyear highway bill since 2005 and the first one to overhaul common education since 2002. Last week, we had opioid legislation on this floor that we all know is critical and is certainly going to come into law, and it will be funded. We had the first real human trafficking bill; an overhaul of the Veterans Administration; a budget agreement that meant we had no closures and no debt crisis; more funding for the National Institutes of Health—it has been one of the central issues in this debate—than the President asked for last year, more new funding; and the same thing for the Centers for Disease Control. So I actually argue it has been a pretty productive Congress in many, many ways.

In terms of Zika, though, let's again get back and just clarify things. The President asked for \$1.9 billion in emergency funding. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee immediately said: You have got plenty of money. Use whatever you want; \$600 million of that was used. If you need that replenished, we will replenish that in the normal course of appropriations.

He now brings to the floor a bill that carries the next third of the funding that the administration has asked for, fully offset, money that is more than they expect to spend from now until September 30. Some of that money is available into next year, certainly the money that the NIH would need for diagnostics and vaccines. We will bring to the floor the rest of it.

So the only thing that we really differ on is should we pay for this major effort or not when we have the resources. We have the resources. Ours is paid for. The administration's proposal is not. It is just that simple. Do you just want to add \$1.9 billion, or do you want to responsibly work the problem?

This committee, the Appropriations Committee, has been at the forefront of responding to this every step along the way. It will continue to do so. We will work with our friends.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, the Constitution gives the Congress the power of the purse. Article I, section 9 gives that authority to Congress. While the President has every right and duty to submit a supplemental appropriations request, it is the duty of Congress to examine that request and provide for the funds and conditions it feels appropriate to execute them. That is exactly what we have done on Zika, and that is exactly what we have done on MILCON-VA.

With that in mind, I would encourage my friends to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 736 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

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

SEC. 6. 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. 5044) making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2016 to respond to Zika virus. 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 chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. 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. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XLX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 5044.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Rep-

resentatives, (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. COLE. 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 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4909, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 735 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 735

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4909) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 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.

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 shall rise and report the bill to the House with such further 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.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 735 provides for continued consideration of H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.

The resolution provides for a structured rule and makes in order 120 amendments. These amendments are on top of the 61 amendments that were made in order by yesterday's rule. That is a combined 181 amendments on one bill.

As I mentioned during yesterday's debate, the NDAA process has always been bipartisan. In fact, Congress has successfully passed the NDAA for each of the last 54 years. That is a really impressive accomplishment. I hope this year is no different.