

144, answered “present” 2, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]

YEAS—253

Abraham	Grothman	Peterson
Aderholt	Guinta	Pittenger
Aguilar	Guthrie	Pitts
Allen	Harper	Poe (TX)
Amash	Harris	Poliquin
Ashford	Hartzler	Pompeo
Babin	Heck (NV)	Posey
Barr	Hensarling	Price, Tom
Barton	Hice, Jody B.	Ratcliffe
Benishke	Hill	Reed
Bera	Holding	Reichert
Bilirakis	Hudson	Renacci
Bishop (GA)	Huelskamp	Ribble
Bishop (MI)	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (SC)
Bishop (UT)	Hultgren	Richmond
Black	Hunter	Rigell
Blum	Hurd (TX)	Roby
Bost	Issa	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Jenkins (KS)	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (KY)
Brat	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Bridenstine	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Brooks (AL)	Jolly	Rooney (FL)
Brooks (IN)	Jones	Ros-Lehtinen
Brownley (CA)	Jordan	Roskam
Buchanan	Joyce	Ross
Buck	Katko	Rothfus
Bucshon	Kelly (MS)	Rouzer
Burgess	Kelly (PA)	Royce
Byrne	King (IA)	Ruiz
Calvert	King (NY)	Russell
Carter (GA)	Kinzinger (IL)	Salmon
Carter (TX)	Kirkpatrick	Sanford
Chabot	Kline	Scalise
Chaffetz	Knight	Schweikert
Coffman	Kuster	Scott, Austin
Cole	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	LaHood	Sessions
Collins (NY)	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Comstock	Lamborn	Shuster
Conaway	Lance	Simpson
Cook	Latta	Sinema
Costello (PA)	LoBiondo	Smith (MO)
Cramer	Long	Smith (NE)
Crawford	Loudermilk	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Love	Smith (TX)
Cuellar	Lucas	Stefanik
Culberson	Lujan Grisham	Stewart
Curbelo (FL)	(NM)	Stutzman
Davidson	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
Davis, Rodney	(NM)	Thompson (PA)
Denham	Lummis	Thornberry
Dent	MacArthur	Tiberi
DeSantis	Maloney, Sean	Tipton
DesJarlais	Marchant	Trott
Diaz-Balart	Marino	Turner
Dold	Massie	Upton
Donovan	McCarthy	Valadao
Duckworth	McCaul	Veasey
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Vela
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Wagner
Emmer (MN)	McKinley	Walberg
Farenthold	McMorris	Walden
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Walker
Fleischmann	McSally	Walorski
Fleming	Meadows	Walters, Mimi
Flores	Meehan	Weber (TX)
Forbes	Messer	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	Mica	Wenstrup
Fox	Miller (FL)	Westerman
Franks (AZ)	Moolenaar	Westmoreland
Frelinghuysen	Mooney (WV)	Whitfield
Garrett	Mullin	Williams
Gibbs	Mulvaney	Wilson (SC)
Gibson	Murphy (FL)	Wittman
Gohmert	Neugebauer	Womack
Goodlatte	Newhouse	Woodall
Gowdy	Noem	Yoder
Graham	Nugent	Yoho
Granger	Nunes	Young (AK)
Graves (GA)	Olson	Young (IA)
Graves (LA)	Palazzo	Young (IN)
Graves (MO)	Palmer	Zeldin
Green, Al	Paulsen	Perry
Green, Gene	Pearce	
Griffith	Perry	

NAYS—144

Bass	Bonamici	Bustos
Beatty	Boyle, Brendan	Butterfield
Becerra	F.	Capps
Beyer	Brady (PA)	Capuano
Blumenauer	Brown (FL)	Cárdenas

Carney	Himes	Perlmutter
Carson (IN)	Honda	Peters
Cartwright	Hoyer	Pingree
Castor (FL)	Huffman	Pocan
Chu, Judy	Israel	Polis
Cicilline	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Clay	Kaptur	Rice (NY)
Cleaver	Keating	Ruppersberger
Connolly	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Conyers	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Cooper	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Costa	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Courtney	Kind	Schakowsky
Crowley	Langevin	Schiff
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
DeGette	Lawrence	Scott, David
Delaney	Levin	Serrano
DeLauro	Lewis	Sewell (AL)
DelBene	Lipinski	Sherman
DeSaulnier	Loeb sack	Slaughter
Deutch	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Dingell	Lowenthal	Speier
Doggett	Lowey	Swallow (CA)
Doyle, Michael	Lynch	Takai
F.	Maloney,	Takano
Edwards	Carolyn	Thompson (CA)
Ellison	Matsui	Titus
Eshoo	McCollum	Tonko
Esty	McDermott	Torres
Foster	McGovern	Tsongas
Frankel (FL)	McNerney	Van Hollen
Gabbard	Meng	Vargas
Gallego	Moore	Velázquez
Garamendi	Moulton	Visclosky
Grayson	Nadler	Walz
Grijalva	Napolitano	Wasserman
Gutiérrez	Nolan	Schultz
Hahn	Norcross	Watson Coleman
Hanna	O'Rourke	Welch
Hastings	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
Heck (WA)	Pascrell	
Higgins	Pelosi	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Castro (TX) DeFazio

NOT VOTING—35

Adams	Fattah	Meeks
Amodei	Fincher	Miller (MI)
Barletta	Fudge	Murphy (PA)
Blackburn	Gosar	Neal
Clawson (FL)	Hardy	Payne
Clyburn	Herrera Beutler	Roybal-Allard
Cohen	Hinojosa	Sánchez, Linda
Davis, Danny	Hurt (VA)	T.
Duffy	Jackson Lee	Sires
Ellmers (NC)	Lee	Stivers
Engel	Lieu, Ted	Waters, Maxine
Farr	Luetkemeyer	Yarmuth

□ 1258

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for Roll Call vote No. 296 on H. Con. Res. 112. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 289—I would have voted “no.” On rollcall No. 290—I would have voted “yes.” On rollcall No. 291—I would have voted “no.” On rollcall No. 292—I would have voted “yes.” On rollcall No. 293—I would have voted “no.” On rollcall No. 294—I would have voted “no.” On rollcall No. 295—I would have voted “yes.” On rollcall No. 296—I would have voted “yes.”

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), the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring of the schedule of 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, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Members are advised that later votes than normal are possible on Thursday and to keep their travel plans flexible.

No votes are expected in the House on Friday.

□ 1300

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

The House will consider H.R. 5053, the Preventing the IRS Abuse and Protecting Free Speech Act, sponsored by Representative ROSKAM. This common-sense bill prohibits the IRS from collecting donor information, which has been used by the IRS to improperly target tax-exempt organizations.

Finally, Madam Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 5293, the FY17 Defense appropriations bill, sponsored by Representative RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN. We expect a large number of amendments to be considered on this bill. So, again, Members are reminded to keep their travel schedules flexible at the end of next week.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information.

Today, we considered a third appropriations bill. It was a structured rule, which is not uncommon on both sides of the aisle to have a structured rule.

But next week, the gentleman has announced the Defense appropriations bill, and I am wondering whether or not that will be an open rule so that amendments will be able to be offered by Members without constraint of being limited?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, to answer the gentleman's question, yes, that will come under a structured rule. So Members will be able to offer amendments but before the Rules Committee and then have the debate on the floor prior to passage of the bill.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, does the gentleman mean by “structured rule” that we will simply require amendments to be filed as of a certain time, but that there will be no restriction on amendments that will be in order?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, it will be a structured rule exactly the same as we have used a structured rule before. Amendments will be presented to the Rules Committee, be debated, and then brought to the floor for a vote.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, to further clarify, my understanding, therefore, is that the majority leader expects the Rules Committee to choose which amendments will be made in order on the bill. Is that accurate?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, yes, it will be a very fair, wide open process in the Rules Committee looking at amendments—those that have not been able to be offered already in committee, where these bills have gone through subcommittee and full committee with amendments being offered, and then they will be brought to the floor so we can get the work done and move the bill forward.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I understand what the gentleman is saying.

And it appears to me that it is an abandonment of the Speaker and others' representations that when appropriations bills are brought to the floor that they will be brought to the floor with an open rule or a rule that will allow any and all amendments that seek to be offered by Members on both sides of the aisle to be offered.

From the gentleman's explanation, I believe that is not the case and a deviation from the announced policy at the beginning of the year. It seems to me, Madam Speaker, that it is a pragmatic judgment that some amendments are making it difficult on the gentleman's side of the aisle.

As someone who has been here for some period of time, that has been my experience when we were in the majority that the gentleman's side, under open rules, offered a lot of very difficult amendments that we had to confront. The Maloney amendment obviously was a difficult amendment for Members to confront on the gentleman's side and led to the defeat of apparently one of the bills, the Energy and Water bill, which failed on this floor.

Would I not be correct in saying that this is a policy that is now being pursued that is different from that which was represented at the beginning of the year where the floor would be open to any and all amendments and would be considered by the House on their merits?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, the gentleman has sat in this position that I have today as majority leader in the past, and the gentleman knows the history of bills he brought to the floor and the manner in which they did.

But if I could be frank with my friend, I am a little disappointed. This is not a place to play politics. This is not about one amendment. We have a

process for amendments for Members that are serious about making a passionate argument for a bill, not to kill a bill and not to have an amendment pass and then an entire side of the aisle vote against it.

What we are bringing forth is a process that the American people want to see. They want to see ideas get brought here, debated, and moved forward. If we look at the appropriations process in the Senate, they have amendments that go through. If the gentleman wants to go back and recite a history of the number of bills that were open here under his leadership, I more than welcome him to do that.

But we should be honest with one another. If Members want to offer an amendment and want to debate the amendment and want to make the bill, in their view, better, I would suspect that, if they win an amendment, they would vote for the bill. The gentleman has a long history here, and that is really probably the history that he remembers as well.

I want to see the work get done. So any ideas that get brought forth in committee, they are debated, they are offered, and they are voted on. Ideas will get brought forth further as the bill comes forward. If it is an amendment and someone wants to move it to the floor, so be it. But we are not going to sit back with the idea of people who want to play politics on the outside and play politics on the inside. I just expect more.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. Of course, 130 of his Members voted against that bill; 130 of his Members rejected that bill. I am hard pressed to think that the majority leader believes that our "no" votes were political and his "no" votes were principled. That defies logic from my standpoint. The fact of the matter is that bill lost because the gentleman's Members didn't support it. The gentleman has 247 Members.

I do remember being majority leader. Very frankly, I remember getting 218 Democrats for almost every bill we brought to the floor. So we passed them with our votes.

If 130 of the gentleman's Members had not voted against their own bill, it would have passed. And there should be no, Madam Speaker, misrepresentation or misinformation about how seriously Mr. MALONEY cared about his amendment. There should be none whatsoever. In point of fact, it enjoyed ultimately the majority of support here on this floor.

I will tell the gentleman, I have been here for sometime. He is correct on that, and I do offer amendments from time to time to improve bills that, even as improved, I don't like. So, in the final analysis, although I have improved them and been successful in adopting an amendment, I still do not think the bills are appropriate to pass and go into law.

This conversation started with the fact that we need to be able to offer

ideas. Very frankly, I understand the gentleman's position.

Today, we just voted on two bills that aren't going anywhere, a sense of Congress that you are not going to bring to the floor. They have no chance of passage. What did you want to do? You wanted to play politics. I don't mean you personally, Madam Speaker, but it was a political effort solely to bring two bills to the floor to express some sense of Congress, both of which I voted against because I thought they were playing politics.

So the accusation somehow that we are playing politics because we offer amendments that we care deeply about, that we want to see no discrimination allowed in our bills and that we want to defeat those constraints on an executive order that says to people who do business with the Federal Government, you can't discriminate against people, I will tell my friend, yes, we are going to continue to try to do that. Now, of course, on this last bill, we were not allowed to do that. We were shut down and shut up and precluded from voting on that particular piece of legislation.

So, when I tell my friend that this session started with a pledge for open rules on appropriations bills, I understand the gentleman's problem. Frankly, we had structured rules when we were in charge as well. We had not made any great representation about open rules; therefore, we, too, wanted to get the business of the House done.

Yes, I remember well 2007 when we were confronted with a filibuster by amendment. At some point in time, after 10 bills had been very difficult to pass, on the last two bills, we did have structured rules.

I tell my friend that I hope that he will accord to Mr. MALONEY or others the sincerity of their objectives, notwithstanding the fact that their amendment is adopted and articulates what I think is proper policy for our country, that is, not to discriminate. Everybody in our country apparently doesn't believe that, but Mr. MALONEY does. And I want to make it very clear that he was very sincere in that amendment. Those of us who voted for it were very sincere in that amendment. It was not politics; it was values.

Moving on, I want to congratulate the majority leader on his work on Puerto Rico. That was a difficult issue for us both, a difficult issue for our caucuses, a difficult issue for the executive department. We worked together. We got a bill done that certainly was not our favorite.

The bill included a lot of stuff in there that we didn't like, but I will tell the gentleman that we didn't play politics on that. We only lost 24 votes on a bill that was largely constructed by the gentleman's side of the aisle in terms of some of the issues unrelated, per se, to restructuring of the debt, which was the intent of the bill.

So I want the majority leader to know—he and I have a good relationship. I have great respect for him—we

are going to intend to try to work together on issues like that that are difficult but are necessary for the American people.

Toward that end, can the gentleman tell me what the status of the Zika issue is with reference to getting resources as quickly as possible to confront this challenge to our country's health?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his work on the Puerto Rico crisis. It is something that we worked on together very early from all leaders' sides, making sure that we protected the taxpayers from a bailout, and I think we met all the criteria for helping Puerto Rico move forward and protecting the taxpayer.

The gentleman is correct on Zika. We want to make sure the funding is there. As the gentleman knows, there is currently funding, and, as the gentleman knows, we have passed a bill on Zika and we have named our conferees. It is my understanding that the Senate is just now naming their conferees, so I am very hopeful that we can get that conference done very quickly and a bill brought back to the floor.

As of now, I had met with the Director of the CDC the week when we departed before the district work period. There are enough resources currently, but we need to get our work done as rapidly as possible.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. Obviously, this is an emergency confronting our country. Dr. Frieden of the CDC, Dr. Fauci of the NIH, and so many others have raised this as a critically important issue for us to confront and confront now.

So I would join the majority leader in whatever efforts are necessary to accelerate this process and give to the administration and our health officials the resources they need to protect the American people.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I rise to say that we have lost a great American, perhaps one of the most famous Americans in the world in Muhammad Ali.

Muhammad Ali was, for a portion of his life, reviled for the decisions he took. But through his life, he reflected a commitment to principle that all of us could well follow, an example of even in the light of extraordinary opprobrium from his fellow citizens who said, This is what I believe, this is where I stand, and I am prepared to take the consequences.

Many of us believe he was probably the greatest fighter that ever lived. As he fought so successfully in the ring, he fought successfully for his principles and his convictions.

□ 1315

I know that the American people and the House of Representatives would reflect the respect and affection for a great athlete and a great human being

and a great American. If my friend wanted to make a comment, I will yield to him.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank him for recognizing the life of Muhammad Ali. He touched so many of those who met him and those who did not, and there are so many stories out there of what he was able to do even privately on helping change people's lives and actually stand up for what he believed. I think so many times when you look at his life from where he rose and where he stayed rooted in his belief in this country, his belief in the courage to fight for what he believed in.

There was a quote he made. I just read it today. It was put up by Forbes as the quote of the week, but Muhammad Ali once said: "He who is not courageous enough to take risks will accomplish nothing in life."

I know they are going to honor his life today. He was one who took risks and had the courage to stand up when others didn't believe the same as he did.

One great foundation of this country provides the individuals the right to do that, to challenge others and to live a life that is very full. He lived his life to the fullest and reached many. In the athletic world, he reached the heights, and in reaching others, he did the same in his personal life as well.

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

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JUNE 10, 2016, TO MONDAY, JUNE 13, 2016

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, June 13, 2016, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

ENDING THE INSANITY OF THE OBAMA-CLINTON-KERRY IRAN POLICY

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

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, sadly, insanity is the only word that I can use to describe the foolishness of the Obama-Clinton-Kerry engagement with the Islamic Republic of Iran.

In January, the Obama administration cut a \$1.7 billion check to the Government of Iran. On May 18, Iran's Guardian Council voted to send all of this money to Iran's military. Secretary of State Kerry was asked in January whether this money would be used to fund terrorism. He responded:

I think that some of it will wind up in the hands of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps or other entities, some of which are labeled terrorists.

This week, we can sadly confirm that this has indeed come to pass, that the entire \$1.7 billion from the U.S. taxpayers will now be used to fund Iran's military and terrorism apparatus. This is the same Iran that routinely chants "Death to America," threatens to wipe Israel off of the map, captures and humiliates our U.S. sailors, and brazenly fires missiles in close proximity to America's naval vessels, and is responsible for the killing of hundreds of American troops.

Madam Speaker, this is utter foolishness, and these policies must end.

ISRAEL'S EFFORTS IN CYBERSECURITY

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, last month I had the opportunity to join my colleague on the Committee on Homeland Security, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE), on a trip to Israel to learn about their efforts in cybersecurity.

As we all know, the security threats Israel faces are enormous, and they extend well into the cyber domain. Israel's response to attacks on her networks has been truly extraordinary, as Israel is now the second largest exporter of cybersecurity products and services, second only behind the United States. The development of this industry, led in large part by the Prime Minister, has been catalyzed by public-private partnerships such as the CyberSpark initiative, which brings together public servants, academic innovators, and business leaders in Be'er Sheva in the Negev Desert, their version of the Silicon Valley.

The United States and Israel already collaborate very closely on so many issues, and I strongly believe that the United States and Israel can learn from each other in this emerging field, both in terms of cutting-edge technologies and novel policy approaches. I look forward to working to develop these partnerships. I thank the Prime Minister and the government for a wonderful learning experience.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SERVICE ACADEMY STUDENT NOMINEES

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I would like to extend heartfelt congratulations to Benjamin Wiggins of El Dorado, Kimberly Monterosso of Camden, Parker Ross of Hot Springs, Nicholas Amerson of Percy, and Krisanna Reynolds of Smackover. These star students from the Fourth District of