

Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Wagner

NAYS—138

Adams
Amash
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego

NOT VOTING—14

Bass
Brat
Brown (FL)
Doyle, Michael
F.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1327

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COUNTERING TERRORIST
RADICALIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5471) to combat terrorist recruitment in the United States, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 15, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 333]

YEAS—402

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Benishak
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney

Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascarella
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rigell

NAYS—15

Amash
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Clever
Clyburn

NOT VOTING—17

Bass
Brat
Brown (FL)
Clay
Doyle, Michael
F.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1338

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE
ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENT
PROCESS FOR H.R. 5485, FINANCIAL
SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017, AND H.R. 4768,
SEPARATION OF POWERS RESTORATION
ACT OF 2016

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, this week, the Rules Committee issued two

announcements outlining the amendment process for H.R. 5485, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2017, and H.R. 4768, the Separation of Powers Restoration Act of 2016.

The deadline for amendments to be submitted for H.R. 4768 has been set at 10 a.m. on Monday, June 20. The deadline for amendments to be submitted for H.R. 5485 has been set for noon on Monday. The text of each bill and more detailed information can be found on the Rules Committee Web site, and Members are welcome to contact the Rules Committee staff with any questions they might have.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 321, the fiscal year 2017 Defense Appropriations Act, I mistakenly voted “yea” when I intended to vote “nay.” This amendment prohibited the use of government data for our intelligence services, and I fully intended to vote “nay.”

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30.

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

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

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

The House will also consider the fiscal year 2017 Financial Services and General Government Appropriations bill sponsored by Representative ANDER CRENSHAW.

The House will also consider the veto message of H.J. Res. 88, disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to the definition of the term “Fiduciary.”

Additionally, the House will consider a package of bills, authored by Representatives LYNN JENKINS and ERIK PAULSEN, that would make it easier for individuals to contribute to their health savings accounts and allow people to use their accounts to purchase over-the-counter drugs.

Mr. Speaker, the House will also consider H.R. 4768, the Separation of Pow-

ers Restoration Act, sponsored by Representative JOHN RATCLIFFE, which will ensure that the laws Congress passes are adhered to rather than the interpretations of unelected agency bureaucrats.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the House may consider the conference report that includes additional resources to combat the Zika virus, if that measure is ready.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the schedule and would ask him, on his last point, on the Zika conference, does the gentleman have any information as to what might be the conference agreement? I don't have any information on that. Does the gentleman have any idea exactly where the conference is going and what we might expect?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

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

I know they are working very hard. They had met yesterday as well. I am hopeful that, in my conversations with the conferees, they are close to finishing, and I have been explaining to them, as soon as they are finished, we would like to bring it to the floor as soon as possible for passage.

I do want to thank the gentleman for his work on this effort as well.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, let's hope we cannot go home, as we went home one recess, without doing Zika. Let's hope we certainly don't go home this recess without meeting this health crisis confronting our people. I am hopeful that the conference will come to agreement and we can pass it here on the floor. Hopefully, it will be at a level necessary to fund the work that needs to be done to respond to that.

The administration obviously has asked for \$1.9 billion. The Senate was less; the House was less. Hopefully, we can come to a number that will be sufficient.

On the appropriations, the Financial Services bill will be on the floor. Obviously, there has been an announcement from the Rules Committee about when amendments will be received and the deadline for amendments, clearly indicating it would be a structured rule.

□ 1345

I would simply, again, express concerns. We had structured rules. The gentleman made that point, and I agree with that point. Very frankly, we went from open rules, which we started out with, to structured rules because, frankly, it was our perception that what we were having is filibuster by amendments—amendment after amendment after amendment—from your side of the aisle.

As the gentleman well knows, the amendment process largely has been more amendments from your side on your bills than from our side. So we clearly have not been doing that. The gentleman mentioned something about abusing the process. Frankly, the

Speaker said that as well. I totally disagree with that, and I don't think there is any indication of that.

As I pointed out in the Energy and Water bill, a majority of your Members voted against your own bill, largely because it precluded discrimination against LGBT, which some people expressed that was the reason they voted against the bill, which I think is deeply unfortunate.

I quote from the Congressional Quarterly: “The use of a so-called structured amendment rule abandons the open-ended process that GOP leaders had hoped to adopt as part of a return to ‘regular order’ for appropriations bills.”

Again, we did that, but we didn't make a big thing about not doing it. We didn't say that it is the wrong thing to do and the House was acting out of regular order. We did structured rules so we could get the bills done on time. I, frankly, see no evidence—none, zero—that we have delayed consideration of these bills in any way. That was not true, I guarantee you, when I was majority leader of the House. The strategy on your side of the aisle—not you, but on your side of the aisle—was to delay these bills and undermine them.

Now, we had a lot of amendments offered by your side that we didn't like. It was very uncomfortable politically for a number of our people. But those amendments were provided for. And you are absolutely correct, when it got to a point where we obviously couldn't get the bills done in a timely fashion, we did go to a structured rule. So I don't criticize so much the fact that you are having structured amendments as I am the fact that you so complained about that not being regular order, and as soon as you had a difficult amendment, the LGBT discrimination amendment, thereafter, within days, you announced that, oh, no, you were going to go to a structured rule because the amendment process was being abused.

Now, I don't want to belabor the point any more than I have, but, again, on the Defense bill, we have seen an egregious, tragic, and horrific event. And, Mr. Speaker, this is on policy and what I firmly believe is a mistake that we are making. Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York wanted to offer an amendment to say you shouldn't discriminate against citizens who are members of the LGBT community.

We saw a horrific event Sunday morning where a hate crime was committed, a hate crime directed at LGBT members and, perhaps as well, members of the Latino community by an American citizen—not by foreigners, not an international, however he may have been motivated. But it was clear the animus was a hate crime.

To the extent that we allow discrimination or do not prevent discrimination, I suggest respectfully that we, in a way, convey that it is okay to discriminate, it is okay to not like these