Sluckis said: ''He got along with everybody. He was somebody who was always smiling. He was an outstanding guy, and we're going to miss him.'' Mr. Speaker, that is how he will be remembered.

In the days since this tragedy, it has been truly inspiring to see the Auburn, Leicester, and surrounding communities come together to support Officer Tarentino's wife and three children. My heart goes out to them, and I know I am not alone in saying that Officer Tarentino will never be forgotten.

RECOGNIZING SCOTT MEADOR

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a local act of courage.

Earlier this week, in my hometown of Newburgh, Indiana, a car wreck at a local gas station quickly turned into a life-or-death situation. In what was described as a scene from an action movie, Boonville native Scott Meador, who was a bystander to the incident, bravely pulled the driver to safety before the car was consumed by flames, saving the driver's life.

Scott Meador is a hero and an example for us all. Because of his selfless action, a family remains whole. That is what it means to be a Hoosier—to come to the aid of your fellow citizen when they are in need.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to highlight the positive things that happen daily in our country. Regardless of what may be going on around us, events like this remind us what is really important in life.

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, Platte, South Dakota, September 17, 2015:

Nicole Westerhuis, 41 years old;
Connor Westerhuis, 14;
Michael Westerhuis, 16;
Jaeci Westerhuis, 10;
Kailey Westerhuis, 9.

Piketon, Ohio, April 22, 2016:

Kenneth Rhoden, 44 years old;
Christopher Rhoden, Sr., 40;
Gary Rhoden, 38;
Dana Manley Rhoden, 37;
Hanna May Rhoden, 22;
Hannah Hazel Gilley, 20;
Clarence Rhoden, 20;
Christopher Rhoden, Jr., 16.

Macon, Georgia, December 12, 2014:

Derrick Jackson, 38 years old;
George Henley, 34;
Corey Hollingshed, 25.

Dallas, Texas, January 4, 2015:

Deborah Lou Stanley, 57 years old;
Max Vester McEwen, 54;
Jose Alfredo Lopez, 21.

Norfolk, Virginia, January 1, 2014:

Melvin Alston, 32 years old;
Marcus Deering, 22.

REMEMBERING HILLIARD POLICE OFFICER SEAN JOHNSON

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

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Hilliard, Ohio, Police Officer Sean R. Johnson, who passed away last week in a tragic training accident.

Officer Johnson's dedication to public service was evident when he made the decision to join the Air Force right out of high school in 1988. After serving in the military and earning the rank of senior airman, he was hired at the Fairfield County Sheriff's Department, where he served until 1997.

Officer Johnson joined the Hilliard Division of Police in October 1999 and would stay with the department for the next 16 years. Throughout his 16 years with the Hilliard Division of Police, he was distinguished as one of the most valuable members of the police department. He was awarded multiple achievement citations during his time for his service above the normal call of duty in dangerous circumstances.

He earned his associates degree in law enforcement from Columbus State Community College and was a father of two children, all while working to keep our community safe.

I want to recognize Officer Sean Johnson for his incredible service to our community in Hilliard.

I also want to offer my deepest condolences to his family at this difficult time.

ZIKA VIRUS

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, a new CDC study shows a 13 percent risk that the Zika virus will result in microcephaly, causing incomplete fetal brain development.

Already, nearly 300 pregnant women in the United States have acquired Zika. In light of these risks, how can this Congress continue to obstruct, delay, and deny the necessary funding for a response?

On many issues, this Congress is divided. I get it. But this is our most basic job. This emergency will test us as Americans, and it will test us as an institution. Will we come together to prevent a Zika outbreak? Will we protect these families? Will we act in the common good, or will we continue to play politics, ignore the science, and disregard these serious risks?

The study's author, CDC biologist Michael Johansson, said: ''We need to do whatever we can to help women avoid Zika virus infections during pregnancy.''

Let's listen to him. Let's do our job.

IN SUPPORT OF VERIZON WORKERS AND UNITED STATES CALL CENTER WORKER AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 39,000 Verizon workers currently on strike. These hardworking members of CWA and IBEW are on strike for a number of reasons, but the number one reason is to keep their jobs and prevent them from being shipped overseas to the Philippines or India.

What Verizon is doing is not unique. In fact, it has been the experience of too many families in my district in Houston and Harris County and families throughout the country.

As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to fight for these jobs and improve the lives of average Americans. This spring, I introduced bipartisan legislation, the United States Call Center Worker and Consumer Protection Act, H.R. 4604, that would make companies that offshore American jobs ineligible for Federal grants or loans and put them at the back of the line for Federal contracts. This legislation will not stop all offshoring, but it is a strong first step to protect these middle class jobs.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this bipartisan legislation, H.R. 4604.

RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2577, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 751 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 751

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution—

(a) the House hereby takes from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concurs in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-56; and

(b) it shall be in order for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee to move that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2577 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLY of Mississippi). 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 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. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule to expedite consideration of legislation that would deal with the imminent threat of the Zika virus. The rule provides that the House concur in the Senate amendment with a further amendment consisting of the text of H.R. 4974, H.R. 5243, and H.R. 897, as passed by the House, and provides a motion from the chair of the Committee on Appropriations to request a conference with the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, as I said last week, the debate between Republicans and Democrats is not over whether or not to address the Zika threat, but whether to pay for it or just to add it to the national credit card.

This rule would provide for a conference between the House and the Senate on the Zika response legislation, as passed by the House. As opposed to the Senate approach, which adds an additional $1.2 billion to the national debt, the House approach acts responsibly by using existing funds designated for Ebola and other infectious diseases to pay for our response to the looming Zika threat.

□ 0915

Mr. Speaker, many of my friends on the other side have claimed that the House Republicans' response to the Zika threat has been wholly insufficient. Frankly, I disagree with that view. In our view, our response is, really, the second of three tranches of funds directed at Zika.

First, Chairman ROGERS, Chairman GRANGER, and I directed the administration to use existing funds for Ebola and other infectious diseases to deal with the immediate threat. Thus far, the administration has used nearly $600 million to support efforts to combat Zika.

The second tranche of money that is included in this legislation would provide an additional $622 million for Zika.

Finally, I want to assure my colleagues that we will commit additional resources in the FY 2017 appropriations process to ensure that the administration request is fully fulfilled, providing nearly $1.9 billion, which is the amount requested by the administration to combat Zika.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to reiterate that I do not disagree with my friends about the need to confront the Zika virus quickly. In fact, I have been to Brazil. I have been to Argentina.

I have visited the infected areas and have spent a lot of hours in talking to our people on the ground there who are both investigating the disease and working with local governments to try and take care of some of the outbreak down there.

We have visited extensively with our friends up here at the National Institutes of Health and at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The only difference I have with my friends is whether or not we pay for the activity.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that, if we already have the resources to confront the crisis, which we do, we should do so within our existing capabilities as opposed to adding to the deficit.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in conference, through regular order, to ensure a bipartisan agreement can be reached. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), my good friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me start by saying how disappointed I am by the inadequate and long overdue response by this Republican majority to the Zika crisis.

With nearly 1,400 Americans, including more than 275 pregnant women who are currently infected with the virus and well over a million cases expected before the end of the year, it is absolutely shameful that this House has failed to act on legislation to adequately fund a response to this potentially devastating crisis.

Mr. Speaker, Zika is not coming to the United States. It is here. As summer arrives, along with mosquito season, the mosquito that carries the Zika virus will be active and knocking on the doors of our southern States and territories.

This is an emergency, and it should be treated as such. But my friends on the other side of the aisle have spent months in delaying action and in making excuse after excuse after excuse about why we don't need to provide the full funding that our Nation's public health experts say we need.

I appreciate the fact that my friends on the other side of the aisle consider themselves public health experts, but there are people who are trained to be public health experts who tell us that what we are doing here today is underfunding an adequate response to this crisis.

I suppose I shouldn't be surprised by this, as my friends in the majority have made it a habit of ignoring the advice of scientists and of experts in favor of appeasing a small group in their Conference on the extreme right.

In February, President Obama requested $1.9 billion to address the public health threat that is posed by the Zika virus. Instead of taking the swift action that was needed to confront this crisis, the House delayed and delayed and delayed as the Zika crisis continued to spread.

We should have sent a bill to President Obama's desk months ago, but, instead, this leadership allowed months to go by without there being any action on this issue until last week, when they brought to the floor a completely inadequate $622 million package that provides only one-third of the funds that have been requested by the administration.

House Democrats, under the leadership of Leader PELOSI and Appropriations Committee Ranking Member LOWEY, have tried to bring to the floor meaningful emergency funding to address Zika, only to be blocked by House Republicans five times.

While the administration has taken significant steps to help keep Americans safe from the Zika virus, significant additional appropriations are needed. In a letter to Speaker RYAN, OMB Director Shaun Donovan and National Security Advisor Susan Rice said, without emergency supplemental funding, mosquito control and surveillance may need to be suspended.

State and local governments that manage mosquito control may not be able to hire personnel for mosquito mitigation efforts, and vaccine developments, which require multiyear funding commitments, may be jeopardized.

To make matters worse, Mr. Speaker, House Republicans sent to the floor last week and again this week a bill to undermine the Clean Water Act and protections for our waterways under the guise of helping to contain the Zika virus.

But the truth of the matter is that the legislation is nothing more than a carve-out for pesticide special interests and it would have absolutely no effect on spraying pesticides to combat the spread of the Zika virus.

It is a bill my friends have brought to the floor in the past, but they just couldn't help themselves in using this crisis as an excuse to further undermine environmental protections.

Instead of working with Democrats to address this public health emergency in a serious bipartisan way that puts the health and safety of the American people first, the Republican leadership has once again brought to the floor partisan legislation that will not adequately meet the needs of the CDC, of the NIH, of the USAID, and of other governmental agencies that are on the front lines in responding to this crisis.

Let me close, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I have great respect for the gentleman from Oklahoma. When he says that he intends to support every effort to make sure that adequate funding is available, if I thought this whole decision were up to him alone, I don't

think I would be as nervous as I am at this particular point, but his party that is in control has shut this government down.

We have seen them lurch from one crisis to another crisis and underfund one priority after another priority. Quite frankly, I don't trust the people who are running this House to do the right thing, to be able to get a majority of their majority to go along with providing the appropriate funding.

Yes, we all want to be fiscally responsible, but let me tell you this: if all you are worried about is the bottom line—and that is the cost—by not adequately funding what is needed to combat this crisis, the costs that will result if this crisis gets out of control will be prohibitive. You ain't seen nothing yet.

So we can nickel-and-dime this all we want, but we do so at our own peril. We ought to be concerned primarily with the safety and well-being of the citizens of this country.

But if that is not enough to prompt my friends on the other side of the aisle to support the President's request, I would suggest that the cost of ignoring this problem of not adequately funding an appropriate response will be a cost like you have never seen before.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule and to bring up strong bipartisan legislation that will fully fund the administration's request. This is a public health emergency, and we must act now.

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

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

I begin by pointing out to my good friend that, actually, we are doing, in a sense, what he is urging us to do right now. We are moving expeditiously to go to conference with our friends in the Senate, who have passed one version of the Zika response.

We will have our version. We will sit down and work out a compromise, and I suspect we will be able to move pretty smartly through this. What we are doing here today is exactly what I know my friend wants us to do, and that is to move and respond.

I also point out—and it gets lost in the rhetoric sometimes around this issue—that there is not one thing the Federal Government has proposed to do about Zika that it has been unable to do because of a lack of money. The Federal Government has had every cent that it has asked for.

Frankly, it was HAL ROGERS, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who solicited Ms. GRANGER, the chairman of the Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Agencies, and I, as the chair of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, to write the administration and tell them to start spending money immediately from the things they had. Then that money would be backfilled as needed during the normal appropriations process.

That is exactly what has been done. No measure has failed to be implemented because of a lack of money. There has been no delay in money for the Zika response, and there are substantial efforts to move ahead in this regard.

My friend made the point that we sometimes seem to ignore the advice of scientists. That is just simply not true. For Ebola last year, the administration got the response it wanted out of this Congress immediately. Frankly, it has gotten an immediate response out of Zika.

I point out to my friend—he may not be aware of this because he is not on the Appropriations Committee—that last year the President of the United States asked for $1 billion for additional research at the National Institutes of Health. We gave him $2 billion.

He asked for a certain amount of money—forgive me for not remembering the exact figure—for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. We gave him more money than he asked for. This year we will do that again. He has made requests for additional money.

We will go beyond what he has requested at both the National Institutes of Health and at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. So in suggesting we are not funding these efforts robustly, the truth is, if you look at the numbers, we are actually spending more money than the President asked for because we think these are national priorities.

While we listen to scientists, we also listen to economists. They tell us that running up a national debt willy-nilly is not a very good thing to do. In this case, we have the money and we have the time to deal with this in a thoughtful and prudent way and to advance the efforts without running up the national debt. It is the appropriate way to proceed.

I would just ask my friend to think back. When we hear this figure, this is only a third of the response. Somehow my friends on the other side have forgotten that the first third is already done. That was the first $600 million that is being deployed as we speak. This is the next third.

Frankly, it reaches not only the balance for the remainder of this fiscal year, but it reaches into next year. This is more money, once we pass this, than the administration has proposed to deploy in this fiscal or even this calendar year.

Then, in the normal appropriations process, which is underway right now—the bill will probably be presented sometime in the middle of June to the Appropriations Committee—you will see additional money in both the State and Foreign Operations bill and in the Labor-H bill that is targeted toward Zika. The one difference is it will all have been paid for.

I think that is what shocks my friends the most. They would much prefer to save that money so as to spend it someplace else. We think it is a crisis. We have the money. We ought to spend the money right now and take care of Zika.

We are going to continue to work with our friends, and I think we will arrive at a good place. My hope is that that measure that we enact at the end is fully paid for. That is what we are trying to achieve here.

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

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

I think what we are concerned about on this side of the aisle—and I know some thoughtful Republicans are also concerned about this—is the fact that, without certainty, a lot of the research projects and a lot of initiatives that need to be done at the Federal and State levels will not happen because no one knows whether the money is going to follow for what is needed.

I think there is a lack of certainty because we are in a House of Representatives that has shut the government down before. If people don't get their way, people have a tantrum and they shut the government down. That is the history of this House of Representatives.

I quote here from Dr. Anthony Fauci, the Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases at the National Institutes of Health, whom I actually have a great deal of trust in.

He says:

> If we do not get the money that the President has asked for—the $1.9 billion—that is going to have a very serious, negative impact on our ability to get the job done.

That is Dr. Fauci. That is not I. That is a highly respected scientist, whom I think we all have a great deal of respect for in this House. We ought to listen to him more than to the Tea Party wing of the Republican Party.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my friends to defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule that modifies the House amendment by replacing the Zika virus provisions with the text of H.R. 5044, which is the Democratic alternative that fully funds the administration's request.

The Republican majority's current plan is to pass creatively named bills that have nothing to do with Zika and to offer short-term spending commitments that will, unfortunately, fail to properly incentivize the private sector to help develop a vaccine.

□ 0930

Our alternative would give our scientists and our doctors the resources they need to mount a longer-term, robust response to the growing Zika crisis.

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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, to discuss our proposal, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, before I make my statement, I just want to respond to our distinguished chair of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies.

Has the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations introduced subcommittee allocations for either the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies or the Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs?

The answer is no.

Has the chairman set markup dates for either the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies or the Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs bill?

The answer is no.

So there is no chance that Congress will send either appropriations bill to the President by September 30. This really is a charade. CDC Director Tom Frieden says 3 months is an eternity for control of an outbreak. There is a narrow window of opportunity here, and it is closing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can support a robust and aggressive response to an imminent public health emergency.

Researchers at Harvard and CDC reported that pregnant women who contract the Zika virus in their first trimester face as high as a 13 percent chance that their baby will have microcephaly. Nearly 300 pregnant women in the United States and its territories are terrified that their child will have a devastating birth defect, and that number increases every day. Every day we learn more about the devastating virus, and each piece of news is more alarming than the last.

That is why President Obama acted responsibly and requested $1.9 billion to research and develop vaccines and diagnostic tests, invest in mosquito vector control, and implement an aggressive public education and outreach campaign.

Yet, the House Republican Zika bill would provide a mere $622 million, which is less than one-third of the $1.9 billion that public health experts tell us is necessary to protect American communities. To make matters worse, the bill robs Peter to pay Paul, stealing funding still needed to protect against Ebola and increase public preparedness at home.

The spread of the Zika virus is taking a severe toll on Brazil and other South and Central American countries. It has spread to Puerto Rico, and the outbreak is knocking at our door.

Why are my friends in the majority acting more like bureaucrats and accountants than responsive representatives of hardworking Americans?

Protecting American communities is the foremost responsibility of the Federal Government. Yet, the majority has failed to lead the way to a response worthy of this emergency.

If the previous question is defeated, Mr. MCGOVERN 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 me colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. He is obviously a very thoughtful member of the Committee on Rules and a fine member of our Committee on Appropriations.

I believe we have something really important to discuss today, and that is that today really does mark a return to regular order for our appropriations bills and process. That statement is so significant that we need to pause and recognize it as a tremendous achievement. This has been the intense focus of Appropriations Committee Chairman HAL ROGERS for more than 5 years. And the committee's esteemed ranking member, too, Mrs. LOWEY, has been equally determined to have regular order restored. They have worked relentlessly to get us to this place, which is, in fact, a better place. So I commend Chairman ROGERS and Mrs. LOWEY and appreciate the support of the House leadership to make this happen. This is the best way to serve our citizens, our Federal agencies, our veterans, our military services, and the members and their families.

It is also my honor to have the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies appropriations bill move forward as part of the conference committee. That is very significant to me as chairman of that subcommittee. Of course, we are also going to deal with the Zika threat as we must and as we should, and that will be part of these discussions. I am sure we are going to be able to come to an agreement with the Senate just on how we will proceed on that very important issue, and I think everybody here is committed to moving forward both on the MILCON piece of this as well as Zika.

H.R. 4974—and that is the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies bill—demonstrates our firm commitment to fully supporting our Nation's veterans and servicemembers. Our investment of $81.6 billion for Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, at $1.8 billion over last year's level, is unprecedented. The bill will address issues to help veterans in every part of the country, every congressional district, and our troops throughout the world.

The bill provides comprehensive support for servicemembers, military families, and veterans with $7.9 billion. It supports our troops with facilities and services necessary to maintain readiness and morale at bases here in the States and, again, overseas. It provides for the Department of Defense schools and health clinics that take care of our military families.

For the VA, this bill includes $73.5 billion in discretionary funding. The bill funds our veterans healthcare systems to ensure that our promise to care for those who sacrificed in defense of this great Nation continues as those men and women return home. We owe this support to our veterans and we are committed to sustained oversight so that programs deliver what they promise and taxpayers are well served by the investments that we make.

So I certainly support this motion to go to conference. I certainly urge adoption of this motion so we can deal with taking care of our servicemembers, our veterans, and their families. We must do this. Of course, we must also deal with the Zika threat that is affecting so many of us. I commend everybody involved in that issue.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to commend Chairman COLE for his efforts on this issue. I serve with him on the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies. I know he has been in constant communication with our friends at the NIH and the CDC to make sure we get the resources necessary to them so they can help us deal with this very real threat.

Again, I am very pleased that we have returned to regular order and that we are going to conference this bill on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, and on Zika. It is great for the Congress, great for the country, and we need to move forward.

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

I have great respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I agree with him that there are a lot of issues that he has championed here.

He used the words ''regular order.'' We have no allocations, no budget resolution. We know that many of the appropriations bills will never see the light of day on the House floor. There will be this mad rush after the election to put together some big omnibus package that most people will never be able to read. If that is regular order, we have a very strong difference of opinion of what regular is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD a letter that was sent to the House leadership signed by close to 70 health organizations—every major health organization in the country—calling for

new funding rather than repurposing money from other high-priority programs to combat Zika, also supporting the President's request. It talks about how we have a brief window of opportunity to slow the spread of the Zika virus and avert a wave of preventable birth defects and urging Congress to act certainly in a much more aggressive way than what we are doing here today.

APRIL 5, 2016.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.
Hon. HAL ROGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. FRANK PALLONE,
Ranking Member, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.
Hon. NITA LOWEY,
Ranking Member, Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI, CHAIRMAN UPTON AND REPRESENTATIVE UPTON, AND CHAIRMAN ROGERS AND REPRESENTATIVE LOWEY: The undersigned organizations committed to the health and wellbeing of our nation's families and communities urge you in the strongest terms to immediately provide emergency supplemental funding to prepare for and respond to the Zika virus here in the United States. We also urge that Congress provide new funding rather than repurpose money from other high priority programs at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and other federal agencies that ensure our health security and public health preparedness.

As you know, the Zika virus has been linked to microcephaly, a serious birth defect of the brain, in babies of mothers who contracted the virus while pregnant. Thousands of devastating birth defects have been observed among infants born in South and Central America in recent months. Zika has already been diagnosed in travelers returning to the U.S. from these areas. As the summer months approach and we enter mosquito season, our nation can expect to be exposed to mosquitos that can spread this virus. Over four million babies are born in our nation each year, and many of their mothers could be at risk for contracting Zika during pregnancy.

With emergency supplemental funding to respond to the Zika virus, state and local public health professionals would have access to increased virus readiness and response capacity focused on areas with ongoing Zika transmission; enhanced laboratory, epidemiology and surveillance capacity in at-risk areas to reduce the opportunities for Zika transmission and surge capacity through rapid response teams to limit potential clusters of Zika virus in the United States. Moreover, supplemental funding will assist the CDC and USAID in efforts to contain the Zika virus in Zika-endemic countries and ensure that there are resources for surveillance, vector control and services for affected pregnant women and children.

If we take immediate action, we may be able to dramatically slow the spread of Zika, giving scientists time to develop and test a vaccine. Without action, however, we fear the number of newborns born with debilitating birth defects will only continue to rise. In addition to the human toll on children and families, the CDC estimates that the average lifetime cost of caring for each child born with microcephaly will likely be millions of dollars per child. For hard-hit communities, an epidemic of severe birth defects could quickly overwhelm health care and social services systems, and put extreme pressure on educational and other institutions.

The President has requested emergency funding to educate Americans about protecting themselves, reduce the mosquito population, and accelerate Zika vaccine research. Each of these steps is vital to reducing the likelihood that pregnant women will be exposed to the Zika virus.

Our nation has a brief window of opportunity to slow the spread of the Zika virus and avert a wave of preventable birth defects. We urge you to act immediately to provide the emergency resources necessary to protect pregnant women, infants and children from this devastating infection.

Sincerely,

Academic Pediatric Association, American Academy of Family Physicians, American Academy of Pediatrics, American Association for Clinical Chemistry, American Association for Pediatric Ophthalmology and Strabismus, American College of Nurse-Midwives, American College of Preventive Medicine, American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, American Medical Association, American Nurses Association, American Pediatric Society, American Public Health Association, American Sexual Health Association, American Society for Clinical Pathology, American Society for Reproductive Medicine, Association for Professionals in Infection Control and Epidemiology, Association of Maternal & Child Health Programs, Association of Medical School Pediatric Department Chairs, Association of Public Health Laboratories, Association of Reproductive Health Professionals, Association of Schools and Programs of Public Health, Association of State and Territorial Health Officials, Association of Women's Health, Obstetric and Neonatal Nurses.

Children's Environmental Health Network, Children's Hospital Association, Commissioned Officers Association of the U.S. Public Health Service, Inc., Cooley's Anemia Foundation, Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists, Easter Seals, Every Child By Two, First Candle, GBS/CIDP Foundation International, Healthcare Ready, HIV Medicine Association, Infectious Diseases Society of America, Intrexon, Johnson & Johnson, March of Dimes, National Association of County and City Health Officials, National Birth Defects Prevention Network, National Association of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners, National Council of La Raza, National Environmental Health Association, National Foundation for Infectious Diseases, National Hispanic Medical Association, National Medical Association.

National Network of Public Health Institutes, National Organization for Rare Disorders, National Partnership for Women & Families, National Recreation and Park Association, Novavax, Inc., Nurse Practitioners in Women's Health, OraSure Technologies, Inc., Oregon Public Health Association, Pediatric Infectious Diseases Society, Pediatric Policy Council, Public Health Institute, Research!America, Resolve: The National Infertility Association, Save Babies Through Screening Foundation Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America, Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine, Society for Pediatric Research, Society for Women's Health Research, The Arc, The Newborn Foundation, Trisomy 18 Foundation, Trust for America's Health.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to take meaningful action to address the public health crisis that the Centers for Disease Control recently called scarier than we originally thought, and to support the President's request for supplemental funding for the Zika virus as outlined in H.R. 5044, the FY16 Zika supplemental appropriations.

I thank Appropriations Ranking Member NITA LOWEY and Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee Ranking Member DELAURO for their ongoing leadership to help protect our constituents.

More than 120 Floridians now have the Zika virus, including 36 pregnant women. Last week there were an estimated 157 pregnant women in the continental United States and 122 more in the territories who have contracted Zika.

The House must take real action to protect our citizens. It is an outrage that we are not adequately responding to the calls of public health officials at the Federal, State, and local levels who are clanging the alarm bells, imploring Congress to act.

Last week the House approved a Zika bill that is absolutely unacceptable. The bill the House passed would raid existing public health accounts, a dangerous precedent to set for appropriately responding to public health crises. This is an approach that Dr. Fauci of the National Institutes of Health, the so-called Zika czar, has called illogical. Furthermore, it only authorizes use of funds through September 30th. Let me assure you that mosquitos carrying the Zika virus do not adhere to a congressional calendar.

The Republican bill does nothing to specifically help Puerto Rico where Zika is wreaking the most havoc and where close to 1,000 people have been infected.

We need more funds now to equip our local health centers with testing kits. We need to assure the National Institutes of Health that there is sustained funding to develop a vaccine as well as a cure, and we need to protect our constituents. That is our responsibility.

It continues to baffle and frustrate so many of us that the majority wishes to address this crisis, this public health crisis, by combatting Zika through robbing Peter to pay Paul. That is irresponsible. It is immoral. And the majority will have to look in the eyes of the mothers who have contracted the Zika virus beyond the point of which we will have lost control of the ability to contain this virus and this public health crisis, look those mothers in the eye and explain why they did nothing to ensure that their babies were not born with birth defects. It is unconscionable, and we need to act now.

I urge the House to support the full request for funds and vote ''no'' on the previous question.

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

Mr. Speaker, what is unconscionable is to make charges that are simply untrue, and to suggest that there is money that has not been deployed that would otherwise have been spent is untrue. Everything the administration has wanted to spend, it has been able to spend.

Now, we hear a lot of talk about raiding funds. Let's talk about raiding funds. The administration took $500 million out of emergency response money—I believe in December or earlier this year—and redirected that to the global climate fund. That is money that was set aside that could have been used for Zika. Instead, it is in a global climate fund. The administration, in its own budget, took $40 million out of the Ebola fund and directed it into a worthy cause, malaria suppression. So we don't have objection, but the idea that this money isn't used is untrue.

Now, when we hear discussions about the Ebola money, that is money that was not to be spent in the next weeks or the next months, but in future years. We don't even know if it is enough or if it is too much. So the idea that using some of it now in an immediate emergency is wrong with the idea and the commitment that that would be replenished later, as needed, is the responsible thing to do.

As for NIH funding, in the Zika bill that this House passed, there are $230 million that fully funds the NIH's request for vaccination research for all of next year. So, again, the idea that money is not available and they don't know what to do if we pass this legislation is untrue.

□ 0945

So I would just suggest again we look at the real difference here. It has nothing to do with Zika response. It has everything to do with whether or not you want to pay for it when you have the money available or you just want to add another $1.9 billion to the national credit card.

It is thinking like that that got us into a situation where we were running $1.4 trillion deficits when my friends were in control on the other side. Where we still have a $450 billion, roughly, deficit for this fiscal year—and it will go up next year—we ought to be doing this in a prudent way.

Now, Zika response does not happen in a single day. It is something that will last, frankly, over multiple months and years. The administration's request for $1.9 billion is not for just today. It is for at least a period of 2 years.

So they have the money they need right now. The bill provides the next amount of money they need, and we will provide additional money in the course of the appropriations process.

I want to assure everybody that nothing will not be done because the money was not available. To date, the administration has been able to do everything it wanted to do. This debate that we are having here today is actually another step in that process.

This moves us toward conference. My friends probably look on the Senate bill with more favor than they do the House bill. Fair enough. We will go to conference with the Senate. So the process is underway. It is moving as it should.

When the administration asked for emergency funding, they immediately got a response from Chairman ROGERS, saying: Spend whatever you need to spend right now. We will back you up. We have made good on that commitment. We are going to continue to make good on that commitment.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. As my colleague knows, I have great respect for the distinguished chairman of the Labor-HHS Subcommittee, for which we don't even have a number right now, so we don't know how much we have to spend.

But I also would like to respond to your comments about we have enough now, we may have enough next year. We don't in the United States of America respond to crises on the installment plan. As you well know, Dr. Frieden and Dr. Fauci have said: This is the request. We need the money.

This isn't extra money that we are requesting. This is what the experts have requested to address this crisis now.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just again make clear so that everybody understands this that this House Republican Zika bill provides less than one-third of the funds requested by the President to respond to the Zika threat. The House bill also cuts the request for research and development of vaccines, treatments, and diagnostics by $132 million, or 28.4 percent.

The House bill does not replace the more than $40 million taken from States and cities for public health and emergency preparedness that HHS was forced to move into the Zika response due to the inaction by Congress. The House bill also does not replace the more than $500 million taken from Ebola funds that HHS was forced to move into Zika response due to Congress' inaction.

Finally, to make matters worse, the House bill rescinds $622 million to pay for the Zika package, including taking an additional $352 million from Ebola. So the total being taken from Ebola efforts under the House Republican approach reaches nearly $900 million.

Now, I appreciate the fact that we don't want to keep on adding to our national credit card, but we have no problem adding tens of billions of dollars to the national credit card for war.

Well, this is also a war, a war for the health and welfare of the American people and for the health and welfare of many women and children in this country. This is a big deal. This is an emergency. Shame on us for not stepping up to the plate and doing what is right.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion this morning about the Ebola fund and how it is being used and in what ways it is going to be used. Let me just go back and make a few points to clarify that situation.

When Congress acted, it appropriated almost $6 billion for Ebola. That money was to be spent over years. It wasn't really clear whether it was too much or, frankly, not enough. We simply didn't know.

Now, the reality is, even after the amounts of money that my friend has talked about that have been shifted from Ebola to deal with Zika, that fund still has over $1.7 billion in it, more than enough to finance all the planned activity not only for this fiscal year, but all of next fiscal year.

This is a multiyear fund. When you are in an emergency, it makes sense to take money like that and move it over, particularly with the assurance that that money will be replaced, as needed, in the regular appropriations process.

The administration itself is doing the same thing. In its own budget, it proposed taking money out of the Ebola fund and spending it on something else that it thought was more immediate. So the idea that this is somehow unprecedented or different than what the administration is doing is simply not true.

Now, the reality is—again, my friends seem to imply or perhaps believe that there is something that hasn't been done to date that the Federal Government wanted to do on Zika. That is not true.

They have had the funds to do everything they have wanted to do. They will continue to have the funds to do everything they want to do. So to suggest that somehow they are not being funded is just not the case.

Frankly, we have effectively in the Zika bill advance funded money for the NIH to actually begin research and have given them all the money in that bill they asked for for next fiscal year on the vaccine side of this.

So we will continue to work the process. We will continue to make sure that the resources are available to fight Zika because we all believe it is a danger. We will continue to do it in a responsible way by using the funds that are available, putting them on an immediate problem, and replenishing accounts as we need to.

Again, I remind my friends that that is something the administration itself has been doing not only with Ebola funds, but with other funds, when it has moved emergency response money to the global climate fund. I mean, goodness, that was $500 million that,

had it been left there, would have been available right now for Zika for the response in other parts of the world.

So it is easy to get lost in the thicket of numbers here and this much from this pot and this much from that pot.

The reality is, number one, everything that the Federal Government has wanted to do to date they have had the money to do.

Number two, it has been paid for.

Number three, we are proposing to continue that, making sure they have all the funds that are needed, as needed, but we pay for them.

Number four, we are actually moving the process forward to sit down with the Senate by passing this rule and the underlying legislation and going to conference and actually hammering out a common bill that will be acceptable to all sides.

I appreciate the concern. I know it is genuine, quite frankly, but I also know that we are acting and acting effectively to deal with the problem.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his forceful arguments against this reckless rule that is before us today.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, in strong opposition to the rule and, really, in a state of wonderment, wonderment about how on earth this Congress of the United States can be so insensitive to a challenge to the American people.

It is our responsibility to honor our preamble to the Constitution, to promote the general welfare. That is in the preamble of our Constitution, which we take an oath to defend.

The distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, whom I respect, said just be patient. No. No. Ninety-four days since the President of the United States asked for the amount of resources necessary to address the Zika crisis, an amount of money that was requested by the scientists, documented by the urgency of this challenge for the research and for the prevention and for the resources needed to address this public health emergency.

I rise not only as the House Democratic leader, I rise as a mother and a grandmother, and I speak to parents and grandparents in this body because that is all I am allowed to speak to.

The questions that I have for you are: How can we ignore the President's scientifically based request expressed in the words of Dr. Fauci, the Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases at the National Institutes of Health, a person, a healthcare leader in our country, a researcher, a scientist who has been described by President George Herbert Walker Bush as a hero—as a hero—in his work for the American people and their public health?

Dr. Fauci says: If we don't get the money that the President has asked for, the $1.9 billion, that is going to have a very serious negative impact on our ability to get the job done.

Another scientist, Dr. Tom Frieden, Director of the Centers for Disease Control, the public health agency to stop this threat, said: Never before in history has there been a situation where a bite from a mosquito can result in devastating fetal malformation.

Testimony went on to say that we are talking about children with irreversible brain damage who will never be able to walk, talk, see, or hear, children whose care over a lifetime is estimated to cost more than $10 million.

The money is one thing. The devastation to that child and to that family is far more consequential. So the $1.9 billion is a great deal of money.

It is an emergency. It is a small price to pay to prevent irreversible brain damage in our children. It is a small price to pay instead of saying to families: Don't think about having children now because of this epidemic.

The Republicans are treating the threat of Zika with so little seriousness that they decided to use the crisis as an opportunity to eliminate protections for the water that our children drink.

The so-called Zika Vector Control Act the Republicans are adding to this package this morning that they are asking you to vote for is nothing but a longstanding and craven repackaged Republican effort to gut the Clean Water Act. It is a pesticide Trojan horse that will do nothing to protect Americans from Zika.

This is really a dishonoring of our responsibility to protect and defend our fellow Americans. As our distinguished member of the Committee on Rules mentioned, this is a defense issue. It is about protecting the American people.

This proposal today puts forth one-third of what the President has asked for—one-third. People say: Aren't you happy with one-third of a loaf? It is not one-third of a loaf. It is one-third of a shoe. You cannot get there from here with one-third.

It is really an insult to the scientists who have spoken out. Actually, it is one-third of the President's request, but it is one-fifth of what the CDC has requested for the public health activities.

We must elevate the importance of the public health responsibility that we have. If we had a natural disaster, FEMA has funds to come to the rescue of the American people. That is our compact with the American people, to help them in ways that they could never help themselves because of the scope of the challenge.

This is no less a challenge. In fact, it would probably result in more loss of life, malformation of unborn children. On top of that, think of the negative impact it will have, distrust to travel to certain regions in our country.

This is so reckless. Just when I thought I had seen it all on the part of the Republicans in the Congress to disregard meeting the needs of the American people, along comes this incomprehensible explanation to anybody why this might be a proposal worthy of the floor of the House, worthy of the public health challenge to the American people, worthy of our concerns about the American people.

□ 1000

My Republican colleagues, you have outdone yourselves today. What you are doing is reckless. In this bill, we should be meeting this challenge the way we meet emergencies: with adequate resources, which will end up saving money because they will be an investment in the health of the American people. It has been over 90 days since the President has made the request.

I will just say this one other thing. It is not our role to instill fear, but we have to face the challenge in a very clear-eyed way. The virus from this mosquito is sexually transmitted. We have no idea—it could be as long as 18 months—how long it would reside in a gentleman who might be bitten by the mosquito. It could be over a year, it could be shorter, but it is not one night.

Secondly, if you get bitten by this mosquito when you travel someplace where it might be pervasive, you not only get bitten yourself, you bring it home. Again, it is sexually transmitted.

It is transmitted in even more pervasive ways. Any other garden variety mosquito that would bite you, who have already been bitten by the other mosquito, now is a carrier of that virus. We turn garden variety mosquitoes into an army on the assault of the public health of the American people.

So, again, as a mother and a grandmother, as a parent, and for the fathers and grandfathers who serve here, think of the children, think of the risk, think of the responsibility that we have. Think of the irresponsibility of this bill before us today and the reckless disregard for public health in our country that the Republicans are putting forth in this legislation, and vote ''no.''

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 13 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 11 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by saying I also have a great deal of respect for the distinguished minority leader. She used in her remarks and made the point that the President had asked for a number of things.

Last year, the President asked for a billion dollars more for the NIH. We said: You know, we didn't think you asked for enough, so we are going to give you $2 billion.

Somehow, that seems to get lost.

Last year, the President sent down his request for the Centers for Disease

Control. We said: You know, we don't think you are spending enough on public health, Mr. President. We are going to spend more money than you asked for.

This year, when the President submitted his budget, he decided: I am going to take a billion dollars of discretionary spending away from the National Institutes of Health and spend it someplace else.

We said: No, Mr. President; we think that is pretty reckless.

By the way, my Democratic friends agreed with that, too.

We said: We are not going to let you take a billion dollars of discretionary money away from the NIH and spend it someplace else. We are going to keep it right there. And, by the way, we are going to put more money than you asked for in this agency when the bill comes out, and we are probably going to do the same thing for the Centers for Disease Control.

So, to suggest that the President hasn't gotten what he has asked for is to, frankly, misstate the facts.

We have had a great deal of mention that the President has had the request for 94 days. What we have not had is one shred of evidence that, in those 94 days, he has not had the money to do every single thing he wanted to do. Indeed, the chairman of the committee urged him to start spending money immediately to do that. So there has been no loss of effort, and the bill in front of us now funds it for the rest of the fiscal year. It also funds the research on the vaccine at the NIH into next year.

So, again, I am just going to simply disagree with my friend that money has not been available. It has been available; and, frankly, to the appropriate agencies, more money has been available than the President has asked for. More money will be available next year than he asked for.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee and my good friend.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman, not only a member of the Rules Committee, but an appropriator who is directly in line with and understands the needs of not only the American people as it relates to the NIH, but also the funding mechanisms.

Mr. Speaker, I stand up to really disagree with the gentlewoman from California. To call my party and our efforts reckless and irresponsible, I believe, is unfair.

I believe it is unfair because, last night at the Rules Committee, we had this virtually same discussion. And the discussion started with me when I said that I had Republicans and Democrats, only Monday, with the Director of NIH, Dr. Francis Collins, and the Director of the Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, Dr. Anthony Fauci, and we talked directly about this issue.

What we learned, Mr. Speaker, is that there was a request for additional money and that the NIH had some $600 million that was sitting in a fund from Ebola that had not been completely used. A determination was made—including the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), HAL ROGERS, and NITA LOWEY, who were engaged in the decision—that said we will allow the money to be switched over if you would like to do that. Switch it over and use that money for this specific event that we are now looking at. What happened is they used the money very quickly. They accelerated spending the money—that is fine; we want them to do what they need to do—some $600 million.

As soon as that was known, the gentlewoman Mrs. LOWEY, the gentleman Mr. ROGERS, and the gentleman Mr. COLE went about looking at a request to fill for the next 5 months what would be some $1.2 billion that would be spent just this year remaining—we are in May—just until the end of September.

The President asked for $1.9 billion for 5 years, and we gave $1.2 billion of that $1.9 for 5 months. We are accelerating the money that is necessary to NIH.

The minority leader outlined how terrible this destructive behavior can be to a child, to an embryo. We agree. But to suggest that Republicans are reckless is not fair.

What is fair to say is that we are responding appropriately, we are responding immediately, and we are putting it together before we are gone next week on a district work period. We are doing it this week. We are moving it as quickly as possibly. If we weren't, we would be accused of the reverse, evidently.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party, the gentleman Mr. COLE, the gentleman Mr. ROGERS, and our Speaker care about people. We are doing the right thing.

Now, in the Rules Committee, the gentleman Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS, acknowledged some other frailties that he sees from the administration's point, and that would be: Where is the alert to cities? Where is the administrative action to say let's do something about alerting travelers? Where is the information that is going to public health officials? Where are we preparing ourselves to look at what would happen in Brazil? What is the administration doing other than just accusing us of not spending more money?

Mr. Speaker, we all live in glass houses. We need to look at this the same way, and calling each other names is not a way to get there.

So, Mr. COLE will be responsible and reasonable; HAL ROGERS, the chairman of our Appropriations Committee, will responsible. I said to my committee last night, as quickly as we need to get together, the Rules Committee will come in, even if it is on an emergency basis, to handle this, based upon a request. And that is what we are going to do.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I just will say, what my colleague, Mr. SESSIONS, just said: that the NIH had $600 million in unused Ebola money, that really is false. The NIH has used all of its Ebola funds that Congress allocated. So the statement of the gentleman from Texas is not factual.

The Zika virus is a public health emergency. It is a crisis, and we must treat it as such. As of last week, there were almost 1,400 confirmed cases of Zika in the United States and its territories. Nearly 300 of them are pregnant women. And one person has died.

This Congress, when we appropriate money for defense or defense spending or for wars, Republicans say: Listen to the generals in the field; they are the ones who know best. Well, we are in the midst of a war against the Zika virus, and we should be listening to the generals and the experts in the field. And who are they? They are at the Centers for Disease Control; they are at the National Institutes of Health; and they are the scientists in our country.

We need to give them the resources that they need, and they have told us that they need $1.9 billion. We should do the right thing. We should fund their request. One-third of that request, which is what the House Republicans have proposed, is not adequate.

Typically, microcephaly occurs in 0.02 percent to 0.12 percent of all U.S. births, but The Washington Post reported yesterday that, among Zika-infected pregnant women, that risk is as high as 13 percent.

This summer, every woman who is pregnant or trying to get pregnant will be afraid: afraid to go out on the patio, afraid to take your kids to the Little League, afraid to go to a barbecue. It is our duty here to do everything that we can to ease those fears, to stop this disease from spreading any further.

We must not put American women in a predicament of choosing whether or not they should get pregnant or, if they are already pregnant, wondering whether or not their baby is going to be okay.

Ron Klain, the Ebola czar, wrote in The Washington Post: ''It is not a question of whether babies will be born in the United States with Zika-related microcephaly—it is a question of when and how many. For years to come, these children will be a visible, human reminder of the cost of absurd wrangling in Washington, of preventable suffering, of a failure of our political system to respond to the threat that infectious diseases pose.''

According to the CDC, pregnant women are already facing unacceptably long delays in learning Zika results. CDC Director Tom Frieden has said that experts estimate a single child with birth defects can usually cost $10 million to care for—or more. That says

nothing about the life of that child with microcephaly. They cannot eat; they cannot speak; they cannot walk.

I do not often quote Senator MARCO RUBIO, but last week, he said:

> It is a mistake for Congress to try to deal with the Zika virus on the cheap. If we don't spend money on the front end, I think we are going to spend a lot more later, because this problem is not going away.

We could not agree more. We have stolen $44 million from our States to deal with this crisis, and the Republican bill does not reimburse our States for the money that they need for dealing with emergencies such as this.

We should defeat the previous question, and we should consider the Lowey-DeLauro-Wasserman Schultz amendment and fully fund the President's request of $1.9 billion. It is the responsible and moral thing to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. Months from now, when the results of our inaction become apparent, we will ask ourselves: Why did we delay? Why did we wait?

We must take appropriate action now. We must reject the previous question. We must do what is the morally right thing for the people of this country who put their faith and trust in us to come and represent their best interests and the public health.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 6½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

□ 1015

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

I want to thank Ms. DELAURO, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies.

Mr. Speaker, this is the story in The Washington Post. It is front page. It is about the crisis that we confront, about the danger to Americans' health, about the dangers that young children will be born with microcephaly.

Dr. Frieden, the head of our communicable disease operation and defense force, if you will, says it will cost $10 million per baby born with microcephaly; $10 million per child. That does not count the heartache that will be counted.

I want to tell my friend, Mr. COLE—and he is a dear friend and a good legislator—the action you take today belies the representation you have made.

What do I mean by that?

If there is enough money now, as Mr. COLE argues, why take this action?

This was not scheduled earlier this week. This was not have a rule until 9:30 last night. So if the gentleman's proposition is correct, that there are sufficient funds right now, we don't need to act on this bill today.

So why, my friends, are we acting on it today?

Because the public believes we ought to act. And the Republicans are trying to protect themselves against the attack, that they took no action until 94 days into the President's request because, if Mr. COLE is right, we need not worry: there is plenty of money available.

But they know the American people don't agree with that. So 9:30, in the dead of night, they passed this rule, brought it to the floor so that they can say: Oh, we have acted.

Nothing, my friends, will happen as a result of what we do today. The Senate passed a bill with 69 votes, $1.1 billion, not taking from Ebola defense, not taking from the other health needs of America, as our bill does, but saying: this is an emergency.

Now, very frankly, my friends on your side of the aisle, Mr. COLE, when you want $18 billion from defense, you have no problem not paying for it. You take it from OCO, which is not scored. No problem. But when the President asks for $1.9 billion, about a tenth of that, well, my goodness, this is a problem. It is, after all, not the Taliban. It is not Iran. We have to protect against that. It is a health crisis in America, and we have fiddled for 94 days.

If, in fact, Mr. COLE's representation is correct, there is no need to act. But if the actions that they are taking speak loudly that, yes, there is a need to tell the American people: we get it; there is a crisis; we are going to act, the problem is nothing will happen as a result of this action, other than a bill will go over to the Senate, with which the Senate does not agree. They passed a bill with 69 votes. Half of the Republicans, all of the Democrats, said we need the $1.1 billion.

Now, the President asked for $1.9 billion, but what they didn't do is steal from Ebola, steal from other health priorities.

And I hear the gentleman talking about how much money is out there, but if that is true, why did we need to act in the dead of night last night and today, just as we walk out the door?

We have not dealt with Zika. We will not have dealt with Zika.

We haven't acted on the Puerto Rican debt. We haven't acted on a budget resolution. We haven't acted on the Flint water crisis. We haven't acted on criminal justice reform. And we haven't acted on the Voting Rights Act.

This is a cover vote. Vote ''no.''

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to reply to my very good friend from Maryland, whom I have not only great esteem for, but, frankly, great personal affection for, and I want to respond to his question. This is not a cover vote.

First of all, the main item here is actually veterans and military construction that is over $83 billion; that, through normal order, is moving forward. Now, to also move the Zika bill with it makes a lot of sense.

Frankly, one of the things in this bill—and I disagree with my friend's characterization—we want to make sure that misguided environmental regulations don't stop us from deploying pesticides that we may need. That is in this bill. That is pretty important to move forward.

The funding is also important. Now, my friends seem to forget, again, the long record here of who has been willing to support the NIH and who has been willing to support the CDC. We gave the NIH twice what the President asked for in additional new money last year. That is being spent right now, by the way. We also gave the Centers for Disease Control more money than the President asked for. This year, when the President tried to take $1 billion of discretionary money away from the NIH, both Republicans and Democrats on the Appropriations Committee said: No, Mr. President, we are not going to let you raid NIH and take money away and weaken the healthcare apparatus of the United States.

I made the point then—and I can assure my friends we will be happy to back it up—that we will put more money into NIH this year for next fiscal year than the President actually requests.

Now, in terms of Zika, the moment there was a crisis, the chairman of this committee, HAL ROGERS, immediately sent a letter to the President and said: Spend all the money you need. There are whole pots of it in different spots. We will replace the dollars as they are needed.

So taking money out of funds that were meant to be spent over years and using them in immediate crises is not unusual. Indeed, the administration itself has done this twice in recent months: once taking $500 million from the Emergency Response Fund in the Department of State and spending it on climate change, instead of an emergency response; $40 million in their own budget out of Ebola money that they were going to spend on malaria money.

I don't condemn them for that, by the way. They just simply were using something and they said: This is an account that is going to take several years. We want to deal with malaria right now. Let's take some of that money. If we have got a problem later, we will fix it.

That is all that is going on here. At the end of the day, the amount of resources that are necessary will be made available. The only difference here is one side wants to pay for it and not add to the national debt. The other side really doesn't think that is a big consideration. That is a debate worth having. I don't mind having that debate.

But we heard the word ''reckless'' earlier. It is also shameless to exploit a crisis for political gain, and I think we are seeing some of that here today. Some of it is sincere, but some of it is great theatrics. It doesn't change the fact that when the President made his request, he has had every dime he has needed for that 94 days.

When my friends say the Republican bill only provides a third of the money, they somehow forget a third had already been provided. This is the second third. The rest of it will come. The money is to be spent as the administration requested, not over weeks or days, but over months and years. That is how they have proposed to deploy it. So giving them the money as they need it instead of writing them a blank check and not even paying for it ahead of time seems to us to be the prudent and responsible thing to do.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Thomas Frieden, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, just recently said in response to the way this House has handled funding for the Zika crisis:

''This is no way to fight an epidemic. Three months is an eternity for control of an outbreak. There is a narrow window of opportunity here and it's closing. Every day that passes makes it harder to stop Zika.''

So whether it is Dr. Frieden, or Dr. Fauci, or any of our Nation's leading scientists or medical experts who all say that what is going on here today is grossly inadequate, my friends on the other side of the aisle seem to think that they know more than our scientists and medical experts; at least they have convinced themselves that they know more.

Well, they haven't convinced me and they haven't convinced the majority of the American people who are watching this in disbelief.

This is an emergency. This is a crisis. Why aren't we acting more aggressively?

I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter to Congress from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and our National Security Adviser, in which they talk about the importance of multi-year funding, long-term funding because they have multiyear commitments that they need to make to the private sector in order to prioritize Zika, in order to develop vaccines and other prevention to protect the American people.

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 requites 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 Advisor.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here today represents a failure, a miserable failure. This represents a failure of this Congress to do everything humanly possible to protect the people of this country. It is shameful. It is unbelievable.

A rigid, right-wing ideology is trumping common sense, is trumping doing what is right, what I think most of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle understand.

We need to aggressively fight this crisis. And here is the deal: if we don't get this right, all the talk about fiscal responsibility and controlling the debt goes out the window because the cost of this crisis getting out of control is astronomical.

Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle can explain away or rationalize or justify this inadequate response all they want, but it is reckless and irresponsible.

And for the life of me, I can't understand why on this issue, as we are confronted with this health crisis, we all can't come together and do what is right.

When it comes to wars halfway around the world, nobody cares about paying for it; but when it comes to a war to confront a healthcare epidemic, crisis, to confront an epidemic, my friends can't find the money.

Please vote ''no'' on the previous question so we can actually have an amendment to properly fund this. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question and ''no'' on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to respond quickly to some of my friend's points, Mr. Speaker, and I want to go back to the essential reality that we are facing.

Number 1, last year, when the President asked for $1 billion more for NIH, we said: That is not enough. We are going to give you two.

Last year the President submitted a request for CDC. We looked at it and said: You know, it is not enough. You evidently don't care enough about public health, Mr. President. We are going to spend more money.

This year he brought us a request to try and take $1 billion of discretionary funding away from NIH. My friends on the other side were as appalled as we were. We said: No, Mr. President, you are not going to take $1 billion out of NIH in a dangerous time of disease. We are not only going to keep that money there, we are going to put more money, additional money than you asked for.

We said the same thing about the CDC, and so we will do it.

In terms of what has been done, the minute the Zika virus appeared and the administration asked for emergency money, HAL ROGERS, the chairman of the committee, responded and said: Spend whatever it takes.

And, indeed, the administration has done that.

My friends seem to suggest that there is something that hasn't been done, yet they never tell us what that one thing is.

The reality is the administration has had the money to do everything it has wanted to do. This bill provides more money on top of that. Our Senators are proposing even more, so we go to conference to figure out the appropriate amount and whether or not and to what degree it should be paid for. I would hope it is all paid for. It should be because we have the funds to do that.

So to suggest that there is some sort of failure of funding is simply not true, and my friends know it is not true. To suggest that we are not willing to put the money here would suggest that recent history has no relevance, because we have put more money here than the President asked us to put, and we have committed to put even more going forward.

The only difference here, and what drives my friends into a frenzy, is that we actually want to pay for this. They simply don't. They think, let's just put another $1.9 billion on the national credit card. This is a great excuse to do that.

Well, we are not prepared to do that, but we are prepared to respond to the legitimate needs of the American people and use the resources that we have.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I agree with my colleagues on the other side. We should address the issue. We disagree with the other body on how to do it, and we will go on from there.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues in conference on these important issues.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 751 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

On page 2, line 4, insert ''as modified by the amendment specified in section 2 of this resolution'' before the semicolon.

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

SEC.2. The amendment referred to in section 1(a) is as follows: Strike divisions B and C and insert the text of H.R. 5044 as introduced.

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 Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. 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. MCGOVERN. 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.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 743 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5055.

Will the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE) kindly take the chair.

□ 1030

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5055) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, with Mr. RIBBLE (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on May 25, 2016, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through 80, line 15.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS) having assumed the chair, Mr. RIBBLE Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5055) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry