

with several large hotels built there before the turn of the 20th century.

Although it was the railroad that built Renovo and its mountain location that attracted travelers, the lumbering industry formed the bedrock of the town's heritage and economy. Clinton County's timber industry continues to thrive, contributing more than \$90 million to the economy of that county.

Many celebrations are planned in May to mark Renovo Borough's anniversary, including a parade along Erie Street, the opening of a time capsule, and a firework display.

I want to commend the local officials and the residents of Renovo and the surrounding areas of western Clinton County for this recognition of their long history.

#### RECOGNIZING THE RICHMOND HILL HIGH SCHOOL MARCHING BAND

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Richmond Hill High School marching band for being selected to perform in the 2016 National Cherry Blossom Parade.

The Richmond Hill band has gained many accolades and enjoyed numerous successes since its beginning 9 years ago. Membership in the band has become popular among students, as it has grown from an original 90 musicians to nearly 200. The band has also competed and performed across the State of Georgia and twice at Universal Studios in Florida.

The selection process to perform at the National Cherry Blossom Parade is highly competitive. High schools, universities, and specialty marching bands from all across the U.S. apply to march in the parade. Crowds of people line the streets, and thousands at home watch on TV as these bands march down Constitution Avenue.

The band also used the visit to Washington as an educational experience. The students spent time visiting many museums and monuments on The National Mall.

It is with great pride that I rise today to honor the members of the Richmond Hill marching band for their hard work, determination, and perseverance to become a successful marching band. It is truly an honor for them to perform at the parade.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4498, HELPING ANGELS LEAD OUR STARTUPS ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 701 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 701

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the

House the bill (H.R. 4498) to clarify the definition of general solicitation under Federal securities law. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; (2) the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation, which will benefit small innovative companies and startups by ensuring that they have access to the necessary capital to succeed, grow, and create jobs in their companies.

But I also stand up today to make sure that we are here for a marketplace that is fair and equitable to all Americans, regardless of whether they work for a small company or a large company, whether they are a big-time investor or whether they are a person who is looking at the marketplace, perhaps, with ideas and opportunities.

Last night, the Rules Committee met and reported a structured rule for H.R. 4498, the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups, or the HALOS, Act. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chair and ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

I also want to point out that the Rules Committee asked all of our Members of this body to submit their ideas and amendments. As a result, this resolution makes in order all of the amendments that were submitted. That is important because what this Rules Committee is attempting to accomplish is to ask all of the Members for their feedback about how to make

bills better; and in this case, when something was germane, it was made in order.

The Securities and Exchange Commission has a three-pronged statutory mission in overseeing U.S. capital markets: to protect investors; to maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets; and to facilitate capital formation.

Unfortunately, the SEC historically has ignored its mandate to facilitate capital formation in the absence of congressionally mandated rulemaking.

□ 1230

The SEC's inability to fulfill its statutory mandate is ultimately to the detriment of entrepreneurs, smaller companies, and startup ventures, such as Teladoc, the Nation's first and largest telehealth platform, which had it not received startup investment, may not have existed at all.

To remedy the SEC's inaction on capital formation, my colleagues and I passed the bipartisan Jumpstart Our Business Startups, or JOBS Act, which was signed into law on April 5, 2012. The recognition that we had problems in the marketplace for smaller companies and smaller groups of people to bring their ideas to the marketplace was a huge impediment based upon the SEC, and that is why this JOBS Act was created.

Although startups and small businesses are at the forefront of technological innovation and job creation, they often still face significant and unnecessary obstacles in obtaining funding in the capital markets. The JOBS Act lifted the burden of certain securities regulations to help small companies obtain access to these important markets, but we are back at the table again.

Unfortunately, when the SEC promulgated rules to implement the JOBS Act, it classified events held by angel investors as general solicitations, and thus, they were subject to accredited investor mandates, yet another example of the Federal Government's creating unnecessary red tape, stifling innovation, and quite honestly, making it hard for smaller, single entrepreneurs to participate in a worldwide marketplace.

This new classification is burdensome and it jeopardizes educational and economic development for events like demo days. Demo days are held in marketplaces all across our country. It is an opportunity for not just investors, but for general communities to come, primarily in the tech field, and learn about the newest startups as they are occurring. When startups interact with angel investors and venture capitalists, it means that best ideas can then be brought forward to create more jobs, investment, and can move forward so an idea that perhaps was on somebody's blackboard goes directly to the marketplace.

Demo days have been an important part of the entrepreneurial financing

process for decades—nothing new—often with lead sponsorships by Federal, State, and local governments, which are bringing these best ideas into play for the marketplace to see not only about the idea, but for it to become a reality in an economic development format.

To be clear, demo days have existed long before the passage of the JOBS Act and have created collaborative and engaging educational environments that have brought together startups, leading-edge thought leaders, young programmers, people who are looking to network, and, I think, an overall more diverse network of individuals that is looking to exchange ideas. These are the kind of educational incubators that our country needs more of, not less of.

We are here today because the SEC developed rules that would change demo days greatly—and other activities like this—to the detriment of the marketplace, yes, but, more importantly, to the detriment of small business and entrepreneurs.

To address the SEC's burdensome rule, Congressman STEVE CHABOT from Ohio, the chairman of the Committee on Small Business, introduced H.R. 4498, the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act. This legislation defines an "angel investor group" and clarifies that the Securities Act's general solicitation limitations do not apply to a presentation, communication, or event conducted on behalf of an issuer at an event that is sponsored by certain organizations; where any advertising for the event does not reference any specific offering of securities by the issuer; or where no specific information regarding an offering of securities by the issuer is communicated to or distributed by or on behalf of the issuer.

What does this mean?

This means that these demo days that are regularly held across the country are opportunities whereby a presenter of an idea or a person who represents that idea might bring forward those ideas, many times to hear about a collaborative basis, where there may be someone who recognizes he could add on to that idea or be a part of that idea or work with that idea or be a programmer for that idea or to host or to sponsor something that would enable that idea to get further down the road.

What the SEC did is throw a wet blanket across it and said: You can't do these.

We are trying to segment that out and say: For the purpose of a demo day, when it does not relate to a specific offer or ask for funding, it still can take place.

This is not a narrow interpretation. The intent is to understand that the purpose of a demo day should be to get ideas further down the road so they can gain not only the opportunity for investment, but so they can make their ideas even better.

H.R. 4498 provides essential protections for States, municipalities, trade

associations, and other venues that facilitate such meetings between investors and fund managers.

It is important for Congress to act. Just because we are not aware of how marketplaces work does not mean we should wait for the Federal Government to regulate them and then find out, whoops, they made a mistake. Members of Congress need to be active to understand that the SEC should live up to its statutes, that it should live up to its mission statement, and that it should not stifle innovation, but, rather, allow for the creative opportunity and development of these issues and ideas to come forth in order to better not only employment and ideas, but, more specifically, employment within the United States so consumers will then have better options over time. To ensure that angel investors play an active role in startups is why we are here today.

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for the customary 30 minutes.

I rise in opposition to this structured rule, which provides for the consideration of H.R. 4498, the so-called Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act, otherwise known as the HALOS Act. I also oppose the underlying legislation unless through the amendment process we can improve it.

The gentleman from Texas said something that I agree with: "It is important for Congress to act."

I think where we differ is: Act on what? What should Congress be acting on right now? Should we be talking about this? Or should we be talking about other things, quite frankly, that are much more important to this country and to the American people?

Four days from now, Puerto Rico faces a \$422 million debt payment. Given the items listed for consideration in the House this week, it appears as though the Republican majority has no plans to act on legislation to address the debt crisis in Puerto Rico.

I understand that my Republican friends in the majority are having a difficult time in coming to an agreement within their Conference on how to move forward, but I urge my colleagues to continue working with Leader PELOSI and Ranking Member GRIJALVA toward a bipartisan solution that allows Puerto Rico to restructure its debt. This is a big deal. The Senate is waiting for us to act, the people of Puerto Rico are waiting for us to act, and our constituents are waiting for us to act. Rather than acting on that which is urgent, we are doing this.

Another thing we might want to think about acting on and is an area in

which the House Republican leadership has also failed to act is that of the public health emergency created by the Zika virus. This is a big deal. It is the public health. The well-being of our citizens is a big deal, or at least it should be, but you would never know it if you are following the proceedings on the House floor. My colleague from New York, Congresswoman LOWEY, has an emergency supplemental bill to help to fund what is necessary to protect our people from this virus, but we are told that is on the back burner.

What about doing something in response to the terrible tragedy that unfolded in Flint, Michigan, where that community was poisoned by the water that came out of their faucets? Why aren't we addressing that emergency?

By the way, Flint is not unique, unfortunately. There are other places across this country where the levels of lead in the drinking water are unacceptably high, are dangerously high. We need to make sure that our infrastructure in this country is up to the point at which people don't have to worry about drinking the water that comes out of their faucets. We should be addressing that issue, but for some reason we don't have the time.

There are lots of young people here who are visiting the Capitol this week. Why aren't we doing something about student financial aid so that people can afford to go to college, creating a situation by which young people who go to college are debt free when they get out of college, lowering the interest rates on college loans or eliminating the interest rates on college loans, thus making college more affordable?

That is a huge priority. That is important, but we don't have time to talk about that here in the people's House.

This Congress also continues to shirk its constitutional duty to vote on an authorization for the war against ISIS. In the past week, the Pentagon announced that the United States will send 250 more troops to Syria and 200 more to Iraq. In Iraq alone, the official number of U.S. troops is now over 4,000, but this House still can't seem to find time to debate and vote on an AUMF.

I have great reservations about the President's policy with regard to these wars. I think we ought to debate those wars and I think we ought to go on record as voting to authorize those wars. Instead, we don't want to talk about it. We are putting the lives of young American men and women in harm's way. We are sending them halfway across the world to be engaged in an effort, in my opinion, in which there is not a clearly defined mission.

We are not living up to our constitutional responsibility, which is we ought to debate and deliberate and vote on these wars. That is our constitutional responsibility, and we are not doing it. We don't have the time, or maybe we are just too cowardly to be able to tackle some of these important issues.

The American people are tired of endless wars, and it is our responsibility to

debate these escalations that continue to invest more American tax dollars, add more firepower, and put more U.S. troops closer to the front lines; but, again, this leadership isn't focused on these very serious situations that call for immediate action.

Just so you know, we are not paying for most of these wars. While my friends like to talk about our debt, I would point out that most of these wars are unpaid for. They just go on the credit card. We don't even have the guts to have a vote on whether to pay for these wars. Instead, we are doing this today.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, House Republicans missed the legally mandated deadline for Congress to enact a budget, and it appears as though we are not going to see a budget resolution on the floor this week or anytime soon. On the most pressing issues facing our country today, my friends in the Republican majority have failed—and they have failed miserably—to do their job, plain and simple.

So what is the House debating today? What is so urgent to debate today that all of these other things can be put to the side?

We are debating legislation, the so-called HALOS Act, that will undo an important investor protection that Democrats fought to include in the 2012 JOBS Act.

I supported the JOBS Act, which expanded opportunities for small business capital formation. Since the JOBS Act became law in 2012, companies have raised roughly \$71 billion of capital by using the new general solicitation and advertising exemption.

□ 1245

But it is important to balance our desire for capital formation with their need to protect investors, particularly unsophisticated retail investors.

The JOBS Act removed the ban on solicitation in advertising to the general public for private offerings, provided that companies verify the purchasers of their offerings are accredited investors.

The legislation before us today repeals that verification requirement when companies solicit their offers at a wide range of sales events.

The private securities marketplace is already under limited SEC oversight, and many of us share the concern that this legislation could unnecessarily expose investors to risks that they are unprepared to absorb.

Now, my friend, Ranking Member MAXINE WATERS, will offer an amendment later today to restore some of the investor protections that would be eliminated by the underlying legislation. I urge my colleagues to support that amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the House is set to adjourn on Friday for yet another weeklong break and we have yet to consider any of the priority legislation that I had just spoken about earlier. We need to focus on important issues.

We need to focus on urgent issues rather than taking away important investor protections.

So I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I do appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) bringing up these issues. We try and talk about these issues up at the Rules Committee. There is always a wide-ranging list of not only issues and ideas, but I certainly know that, as we talk about these, we are all after action on the floor.

I don't know the exact answer, but I believe, as it relates to the problem with the Zika virus, that we are dealing with some \$600 million. I note that Mrs. LOWEY, the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, has come on the floor and I am subject to being corrected by her.

But it is my understanding that right now, in an account that would be allowed to be exchanged, some \$600 million is left over in that fund that is unspent from the Ebola crisis and that negotiations between our appropriators, the CDC, and other Federal agencies have said: We do recognize from the House perspective that this is a very, very serious issue. We acknowledge that.

I have acknowledged that up at the Rules Committee. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has several times, in the spirit that I appreciated and that was very complimentary to a proper answer, brought this issue up, that this is what he is looking at, that it is an issue in our country.

The responses that I continue to, I believe, receive back is that our appropriators, on a very professional basis, have allowed use of the funds to be used for that issue.

So I would like to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I do understand his concerns and, really, Mr. MCGOVERN, I appreciate it.

I appreciate you, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. POLIS, and Judge HASTINGS bringing these issues up. But we try and go and clarify what I think are proper or sustainable answers to your ideas. The ideas about other pieces of legislation we will get to.

Where there are emergencies, I do agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). I do not think an AUMF, which is a discussion about military use of force, is necessarily in line right now, but I know that Republicans are preparing that. I know that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) could bring his effort forward and will at the appropriate time for his ideas. They will all fit.

Today, however, what we are here for is something that has been in line for some period of time that is a major issue. The gentleman very appropriately said the last time we brought

forth legislation that it created \$71 billion worth of entrepreneurial funding, funding that helps our country's research and development, new ideas in medicine, new ideas in communication, new ideas that employ people, money to the marketplace.

That is why we are here today. We think this is just as powerful. After we passed the JOBS Act, the SEC got most of it right, not all of it right, and we are trying to politely—this is the way we do things in a democracy. We try and work with government agencies to say: You got some of it right, but congressional intent needs to be done a little bit further.

Will it bring \$71 billion to the marketplace? I don't know. Will it mean that a brighter future exists for innovation, job creation, and investment that keeps America's leading edge as opposed to ideas going somewhere else around the world? Yes.

I would argue that Speaker PAUL RYAN is aware of all the issues that need to be debated. Today we feel like jobs and job creation and perhaps an opportunity to stimulate, whether it is \$71 million or \$71 billion worth of new stimulating activity for new ideas, is important.

That is why we are here today. That is why people took a number, got in line, and developed their activity. STEVE CHABOT measured twice, brought his legislation here, and understands what it is about.

I would also say, as Mr. MCGOVERN I believe politely alluded to, this is a good idea because it does not say we will only form these opportunities in Republican districts, but we will form them in districts all over the country.

It is a good, bipartisan piece of legislation that helps smaller, less sophisticated people. It helps the marketplace. I think it is important.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want to say to the gentleman from Texas that I appreciate the fact that he appreciates the concerns that I have raised, but I would appreciate him even more if we could bring some of the legislation to the floor that would actually solve some of the problems and deal with some of the challenges that I outlined.

I had brought up earlier the issue of the Zika virus, which has infected 891 individuals in the U.S. States and territories, including at least 81 pregnant women. This is a big, big deal.

Some of us are not interested in robbing from Peter to pay Paul to deal with this. We don't want to be dipping into the Ebola fund, which is still an issue, to deal with the Zika crisis. I mean, we have multiple challenges that we have to deal with.

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, just a polite dialogue. Do you believe in any

way, because we have not moved a bill, that the Federal Government is stopping and waiting and doing nothing on this issue?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time.

We are doing something, but I think what people who are dealing with this crisis would feel better about is if there was a certainty that the resources were going to be there.

Those who are fighting the Ebola crisis are concerned that, if you are going to take money from Ebola to put into Zika, that maybe you are not going to replenish the monies to deal with Ebola. We have some serious public health issues that we are trying to deal with.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge that we defeat the previous question. If I do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up a bill that would provide desperately needed funding to combat the Zika virus.

The administration requested this funding more than 2 months ago, and it is reckless to delay our response to this public health crisis any longer. Yes, we are doing things to respond to it. We can be doing a lot more. I think the American people want us to do all that we possibly can to protect the public health of the citizens of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my 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, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, with great respect for our distinguished chair with whom we work very collegiately, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question in order to provide the funding needed to mount a robust response to a pressing public health emergency.

More than 2 months ago the administration requested funding critical to respond to the Zika virus, a public health emergency tied to microcephaly and other neurological disorders in infants.

It is unconscionable that, when nearly 1,000 people in the U.S. and territories have contracted Zika, the majority continues to drag their feet on meeting our most basic responsibility.

The majority's inaction has forced the administration to redirect funding needed to meet other basic responsibilities, shortchanging still-needed investments to protect against Ebola and to help States and cities improve domestic public health.

The majority's claim that the administration has provided insufficient detail on the request doesn't make any sense. Every cent has been accounted

for. Yet, we continue to wait to sit on our hands.

Further, the majority holds this emergency to a new standard, requiring offsetting cuts before providing needed resources. This literally holds emergency funding hostage to unrelated political fights.

This simply cannot go on. Are we waiting for the height of summer when mosquito control will be infinitely more difficult? Are we waiting for this emergency to spiral out of control?

I urge my colleagues to stand with me and defeat the previous question so we can meet our responsibility to protect against Zika.

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

I am delighted that the gentlewoman from New York, who is a regular visitor to the Rules Committee and who really, I believe, adequately and fairly not only represents the needs of this Nation, but really argues many times on behalf of things that are common sense—I want to thank her for being here today.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an argument at all about the Zika virus, about Ebola. The Ebola circumstance to the United States in the United States actually occurred first in Dallas, Texas, within the congressional district that I am so lucky to represent. It did constitute not only an immediate threat and danger to not only that hospital in Dallas, Texas, but, really, all across our country, and it evoked a scare. It did.

Well, we have that same type of circumstance today. That is why, in retouching base with our Appropriations Committee, I now can speak what I believe is from them directly as opposed to what I thought I heard, and that is that the appropriators have said that immediate funding needs for Zika should be provided from unobligated funds that are already available, which would then be backfilled in 17 appropriations bills as needed, which means that there still is money that the approval, the authorization, has been given.

Instead of us delaying through our process here, we have said that we concur this is of immediate nature. Here is a bucket of money. Here is a bucket of money.

As an example, there are some \$400 million that is available that was a part of the Ebola funding that is unobligated and is intended to be spent in future years. There is money available to meet the immediate need.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, in working with Speaker RYAN, has made sure that the money is available, can be used for this need, and Republicans agree it is the right thing to do.

□ 1300

I do appreciate Mrs. LOWEY coming down. I do appreciate the gentlemen, Judge HASTINGS and Mr. MCGOVERN, seeking these questions.

Mr. Speaker, we are trying to make sure that this body understands the money is available. It is there to be used properly, as with any other taxpayer money, but that it may be used for this purpose. Quite honestly, I am very proud of what we are doing to match up the needs of this Nation and its great people.

Mrs. LOWEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman's eloquent remarks. However, I want to emphasize again that this is an emergency. People are severely, severely, being impacted because of the Zika virus. This is an emergency. We should be doing it immediately.

I understand that it may be tempting to transfer money from another account. However, to have to find offsets here when people are suffering, dying, perhaps having deformed infants doesn't make any sense now.

I would just say in closing, I thank the gentleman for his concern, and I do hope that we can pass this emergency supplemental as soon as possible because so much of where the money is going to go is long-range planning. Vaccines. We have to make sure that we prevent additional cases of Zika, and developing a vaccine can't be done in a month or 2 months. It takes time.

So if, in fact, the administration has requested \$1.9 billion, and we have responded, and the administration has responded to the very sincere questions provided to us by the chair, Chairman ROGERS of the committee, we think it has been documented very carefully.

I would ask again my colleagues to consider that this is an emergency, \$1.9 billion is what has been documented in detail. It is all in writing. I thank the gentleman for listening.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, you are witnessing here a colloquy on the floor between groups of people who can work together. Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Judge HASTINGS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. POLIS represent not just the Democratic Party, but millions of people across the country.

I want to forthrightly try again to answer, if I can. I do hear them, Chairman ROGERS hears them. There is at least \$500 million—granted, only one-third of what has been requested—that we believe is available for it to be transferred right now.

I talked to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). I said: Mr. MCGOVERN, do you believe in any way that something is being held up?

He said: No, sir. We are working. This government is working feverishly.

As a parent, I understand this. While I have an advantage of having a disabled child as a son, that does not mean that I would want anyone else to have a disabled child. I get this.

I have satisfied myself, and I believe my party has, through our great young Speaker, PAUL RYAN, satisfied ourselves that pending the time when we

can get at a supplemental—perhaps later in the year there will be wildfires, perhaps later in the year there would be a hurricane. We have the money available. No one disputes that the money right now is usable, it is fungible. The question is: When will it be backfilled?

I have properly said here today that Chairman HAL ROGERS has the ear—and we have his ear—of every Member of this body who does understand when we need to get more money and when the new cycle begins, and we will be starting this just in the next few weeks, that that would be available as an option for Chairman ROGERS to take Mrs. LOWEY's request, to take her detailed analysis of if it is a billion-some, would be able to implant that into a priority for this Conference, for this Congress, for these bodies to understand, and that we would hope to work forth then with the United States Senate, with the President of the United States, and work it well together.

Mr. Speaker, what you have seen here is a prime example of people talking, people getting closer to an answer. I am trying to respond back that I believe our Speaker, PAUL RYAN, I believe HAL ROGERS, I believe myself as an instrument of a messaging back and forth properly are responding: The money is available. Please go get your work done. As we get further down the line, we will be further down the process.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, what we are trying to do here is sound the alarm bells that we need to do something much more robust than is currently being done. I include in the RECORD the letter that we have referred to from the administration signed by Shaun Donovan, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and Susan Rice, the National Security Adviser. This is a letter to Speaker PAUL RYAN.

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

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

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

Since the time the Administration transmitted its request, the public health threat posed by the Zika virus has increased. After careful review of existing evidence, scientists at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) concluded that the Zika virus is a cause of microcephaly and other severe fetal brain defects. The Zika virus has spread in Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the U.S. Virgin Islands and abroad. As of April 20, there were 891 confirmed Zika cases in the continental United States and U.S. territories, including 81 pregnant women with confirmed cases of Zika. Based on similar experiences with other diseases

transmitted by the *Aedes aegypti* mosquito—believed to be the primary carrier of the Zika virus—scientists at the CDC expect there could be local transmission within the continental U.S. in the summer months. Updated estimate range maps show that these mosquitoes have been found in cities as far north as San Francisco, Kansas City and New York City.

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

While this immediate infusion of resources is necessary to enable the Administration to take critical first steps in our response to the public health threat posed by Zika, it is insufficient. Without significant additional appropriations this summer, the Nation's efforts to comprehensively respond to the disease will be severely undermined. In particular, the Administration may need to suspend crucial activities, such as mosquito control and surveillance in the absence of emergency supplemental funding. State and local governments that manage mosquito control and response operations will not be able to hire needed responders to engage in mosquito mitigation efforts. Additionally, the Administration's ability to move to the next phase of vaccine development, which requires multi-year commitments from the Government to encourage the private sector to prioritize Zika research and development, could be jeopardized. Without emergency supplemental funding, the development of faster and more accurate diagnostic tests also will be impeded. The Administration may not be able to conduct follow up of children born to pregnant women with Zika to better understand the range of Zika impacts, particularly those health effects that are not evident at birth. The supplemental request is also needed to replenish the amounts that we are now spending from our Ebola accounts to fund Zika-related activities. This will ensure we have sufficient contingency funds to address unanticipated needs related to both Zika and Ebola. As we have seen with both Ebola and Zika, there are still many unknowns about the science and scale of the outbreak and how it will impact mothers, babies, and health systems domestically and abroad.

The Administration is pleased to learn that there is bipartisan support for providing emergency funding to address the Zika crisis, but we remain concerned about the adequacy and speed of this response. To properly protect the American public, and in particular pregnant women and their newborns, Congress must fund the Administration's request of \$1.9 billion and find a path forward

to address this public health emergency immediately. The American people deserve action now. With the summer months fast approaching, we continue to believe that the Zika supplemental should not be considered as part of the regular appropriations process, as it relates to funding we must receive this year in order to most effectively prepare for and mitigate the impact of the virus.

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

Sincerely,

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

SUSAN RICE,  
National Security  
Advisor.

Mr. MCGOVERN. The letter basically says that the existing appropriations are not enough. This is what the letter says: "Without significant additional appropriations this summer, the Nation's efforts to comprehensively respond to the disease will be severely undermined. In particular, the administration may need to suspend crucial activities, such as mosquito control and surveillance in the absence of emergency supplemental funding. State and local governments that manage mosquito control and response operations will not be able to hire needed responders to engage in mosquito mitigation efforts. Additionally, the administration's ability to move to the next phase of vaccine development, which requires multiyear commitments from the government to encourage the private sector to prioritize Zika research and development, could be jeopardized."

I mean, I go right down the list on all the warnings here. This is a big deal. This is a big deal. If my friends on the other side are trying to rationalize putting this off, I would suggest to reread this letter. Reread this letter. Talk to the scientists. Talk to the experts. We need to have the necessary resources to be able to combat what might come our way in terms of the Zika virus. I want to do this so that we don't have a loss of life here in this country, so we are prepared.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question. I ask Members to defeat it so that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) can offer an amendment for this House to immediately consider legislation to confront the Zika crisis. There are already 891 confirmed cases of the Zika virus in the United States and its territories, and 81 of them are pregnant women. This is an emergency.

We do have a disaster relief fund in this Congress. It is about \$8 billion so that when there is a flood, when there is a fire, when there is a hurricane, we can immediately move to take that

money and address the costs of life and other costs from that disaster.

Unfortunately, we don't have a public health emergency fund, which is why the President is asking for \$1.9 billion. This is an emergency. We cannot afford to wait another day to approve the President's request. Every day we delay, we redirect crucial resources away from city and State emergency preparedness funding. We are robbing Peter to pay Paul. Cities and States across the country are being robbed of emergency preparedness grants, \$44 million in total. Not only will these States have fewer resources to address public health crises, they will have fewer resources to address the Zika virus itself. Already in addition to that \$44 million, the administration has reprogrammed \$510 million from the Ebola crisis funding, and that crisis is not over in western Africa.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am going to include in the RECORD a list of all of the States and the amount of money that they have already lost in emergency grants for preparedness for health emergencies.

California, almost 10 percent loss; Florida, almost 10 percent loss; North Carolina, 8 percent; Texas, almost 10 percent in money taken away from preparedness grants.

Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable that in the midst of a global health crisis, we cannot appropriate emergency funds to save lives and instead resort to gutting our States' emergency preparedness.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to think of the women across our country and the predicament that they face today of choosing whether or not they should get pregnant or, if they are already pregnant, wondering whether or not their baby is okay. We must fund the President's request. It is the responsible and moral thing to do.

Yes, today, physicians are divided as to whether or not they should tell women of the United States not to get pregnant. Is that the message we want to send to American women? I don't think so.

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

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

In closing, I again urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question so we can bring forward a bill that we believe can help adequately prepare this country to deal with the Zika virus, something that I think the majority of Americans support, whether they are Democrats or Republicans.

This should not be a controversial issue. If it is, then people can vote against it if it comes to the floor, but what we do know is that what we have done up to this point in terms of our responsibility here in Congress in pro-

viding the funds has not been adequate. I read earlier from the letter from the White House all the things that could be on hold or not move forward if we don't adequately fund the necessary infrastructure to deal with this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I would also say that it seems to me that dealing effectively with the Zika crisis is a heck of a lot more important than what we are being asked to vote on and debate today. I have been saying this every time I come to the floor and handle a rule, but it seems that legislation that has minimum impact or that in some cases might even be trivial takes precedence over legislation that actually might do something to help lift up the lives of people in this country or, even in this case, protect the lives of people in this country.

We ought to come together in a bipartisan way to make sure that at least priority items come to the floor of the House. This is supposed to be the people's House, and that is where the people's business is supposed to be done. We are not doing it. By not addressing the Zika crisis more forthrightly, we are not doing the people's business.

So, again, vote "no" on the previous question and vote "no" on the rule.

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

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

What a great day to be on the floor for us to really bring forth our ideas. The obligations that we have here as Members of Congress to work with each other, to listen to each other is apparent to me, but I don't think apparent to every single person.

We have allowed, meaning Chairman ROGERS has allowed, in consultation with the Speaker, for money to be reprogrammed, which is aplenty right now. We have agreed this is an immediate crisis. We have made sure the administration is not wanting for a penny. We recognize that in the processes that will take place, we will go through in a regular order procedure getting these funds reprogrammed and allocated to fill back up the bucket.

□ 1315

I have satisfied myself that we are trying to do the right thing. I have great concern that the American people understand we do care about the children and the families. I get this. We do care. And until we go through this process to further develop it and add money, the administration has the money necessary to do as they see fit to protect the American people, to combat this virus—this disease—and to make sure that we get a handle on it.

Mr. Speaker, the value of startups, which is why we are here today, cannot be understated.

Founded in 2013, back home in Dallas, Texas, which I have the pleasure of representing, is the Dallas Entrepreneur Center, or DEC, which is a nonprofit created to help entrepreneurs

start, build, and grow companies. According to the DEC, over 1,000 jobs were created in the past 2 years and another 500 are expected to be hired by Dallas startups in 2016. That is the power of what we are talking about.

The SEC has gotten in the way of this, not only with red tape, but with consternation directly back at the process that the free enterprise system has to make these jobs happen.

Investment in startups has been done in Dallas. Companies like Edition Collective, Rise, PICKUP, and Visage Payroll in Dallas, Texas, are prime examples of the success that could take place all across this country, not just in Dallas, Texas, but in other places where entrepreneurs should be king also. And they are king because they are providing jobs—good-paying jobs—for people.

Mr. Speaker, the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act is a bipartisan, bicameral bill that provides small, innovative companies and startups access to the capital they need, just as we have talked about that exists in Dallas, Texas. We are helping them succeed. We are helping them to innovate and grow jobs and turn them into opportunities for our Nation to have better products and services.

As ANGUS KING, a Senator from Maine who is one of the Senate's cosponsors, said: "By fixing flawed Federal rules, the HALOS Act will remove unnecessary roadblocks and help startups grow and thrive."

I couldn't have said it better myself. He needs it in Maine. We need it in Dallas, Texas. We do not have all the jobs we need. There are still too many people unemployed in our country. That is why we are here doing this.

In particular, two Dallas startups, iSIGHT Partners and Bottle Rocket, are revolutionizing the field of cyber threat intelligence and mobile strategy development, respectively. Imagine for just a moment what it took them, despite these problems in the marketplace, to get started and get done. I think it is time that we allow others the opportunity to make life a little bit easier.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support this rule. This awesome legislation and what it represents is bipartisan, is bicameral, and has no boundaries of who may participate.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 701 OFFERED BY  
MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5044) making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2016 to respond to Zika virus. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair



and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 5044.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

AMERICAN MANUFACTURING COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2016

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4923) to establish a process for the submission and consideration of petitions for temporary duty suspensions and reductions, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4923

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

*This Act may be cited as the "American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act of 2016".*

**SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE NEED FOR A MISCELLANEOUS TARIFF BILL.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) *As of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States imposes duties on imported goods for which there is no domestic availability or insufficient domestic availability.*

(2) *The imposition of duties on such goods creates artificial distortions in the economy of the*

*United States that negatively affect United States manufacturers and consumers.*

(3) *The manufacturing competitiveness of the United States around the world will be enhanced if Congress regularly and predictably updates the Harmonized Tariff Schedule to suspend or reduce duties on such goods.*

(4) *Creating and maintaining an open and transparent process for consideration of petitions for duty suspensions and reductions builds confidence that the process is fair, open to all, and free of abuse.*

(5) *Complying with the Rules of the House of Representatives and the Senate, in particular with clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, is essential to fostering and maintaining confidence in the process for considering a miscellaneous tariff bill.*

(6) *A miscellaneous tariff bill developed under this process will not contain any—*

(A) *congressional earmarks or limited tax benefits within the meaning of clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; or*

(B) *congressionally directed spending items or limited tax benefits within the meaning of rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate.*

(7) *Because any limited tariff benefits contained in any miscellaneous tariff bill following the process set forth by this Act will not have been the subject of legislation introduced by an individual Member of Congress and will be fully vetted through a transparent and fair process free of abuse, it is appropriate for Congress to consider limited tariff benefits as part of that miscellaneous tariff bill as long as—*

(A) *in the case of a miscellaneous tariff bill considered in the House of Representatives, consistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives, a list of such limited tariff benefits is published in the reports of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives accompanying the miscellaneous tariff bill, or in the Congressional Record; and*

(B) *in the case of a miscellaneous tariff bill considered in the Senate, consistent with the Standing Rules of the Senate—*

(i) *such limited tariff benefits have been identified through lists, charts, or other similar means; and*

(ii) *the information identified in clause (i) has been available on a publicly accessible congressional website in a searchable format at least 48 hours before the vote on the motion to proceed to the miscellaneous tariff bill or the vote on the adoption of a report of a committee of conference in connection with the miscellaneous tariff bill, as the case may be.*

(8) *When the process set forth under paragraph (7) is followed, it is consistent with the letter and intent of the Rules of the House of Representatives and the Senate and other related guidance.*

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—*It is the sense of Congress that, to remove the competitive disadvantage to United States manufacturers and consumers and to promote the competitiveness of United States manufacturers, Congress should, not later than 90 days after the United States International Trade Commission issues a final report on petitions for duty suspensions and reductions under section 3(b)(3)(E), consider a miscellaneous tariff bill.*

**SEC. 3. PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF PETITIONS FOR DUTY SUSPENSIONS AND REDUCTIONS.**

(a) **PURPOSE.**—*It is the purpose of this section to establish a process for the submission and consideration of petitions for duty suspensions and reductions.*

(b) **REQUIREMENTS OF COMMISSION.**—

(1) **INITIATION.**—*Not later than October 15, 2016, and October 15, 2019, the Commission shall publish in the Federal Register and on a publicly available Internet website of the Commission a notice requesting members of the public who can demonstrate that they are likely beneficiaries of duty suspensions or reductions to*