

side in a bipartisan fashion for these important issues.

I will be brief on this, but I can tell you that it is not the brevity of my words that will instill the seriousness of this issue. When the chairman mentioned that this is some of the most important legislation we have ever done on cybersecurity, I echo that sentiment because the nature of the threat is real, growing, and constantly changing.

The ability for us to be able to be adaptive in real time to communicate with the private sector and the government facilities to protect our homeland is critical.

A second point—and that is significant as well—is very real attention was paid to the issue of privacy, recognizing the individual desire to be assured that private information is not inappropriately utilized or misapplied by anybody, let alone the government.

This bill was the product of work that was done in detail with over 300 different meetings working through the complexities of this particular issue. As has already been articulated, it is one of the few bills that I would imagine in this Congress—or any Congress—that has strong endorsement from the Chamber of Commerce and the ACLU simultaneously.

Lastly, by organizing by sector, this creates the framework. This is the important foundation. There is still so much more to be done, but this is the foundation of the house, of the structure that will allow us to create and continue to create the kind of edifice that will enable our private sector, our government sector, and indeed all of those who are engaged in this issue in the country to be better positioned to protect Americans, their information, and their safety.

I strongly endorse this, and I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the ranking member for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2519, the National Cybersecurity Protection Act of 2014. We have worked long and hard to develop and describe how DHS can best accomplish its complex cybersecurity mission. I am pleased that our bipartisan and bicameral negotiations have been fruitful and look forward to the progress that the Department can make next year.

In closing, I would like to express what an honor it has been to serve under the leadership of Ranking Member THOMPSON, Chairman MCCAUL, and alongside Chairman MEEHAN in service to the homeland security mission of our Nation.

I look forward to our continued collaboration as I move to my new assign-

ment on the Energy and Commerce Committee in the 114th Congress.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation and thank my principal partner in the House, Chairman MCCAUL, for his unwavering commitment to this issue and willingness to work across the aisle to get it done.

I also want to recognize the contributions of the chairman and ranking member of the Cybersecurity Subcommittee, Representatives MEEHAN and CLARKE, and our Senate partners.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge staff that helped us get this to this point, Rosaline Cohen and Chris Schepis on my staff and Brett DeWitt and Alex Manning on the majority staff.

Again, let me compliment the chair for not giving up and for staying the course. Even doing it on the last day gets it done.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yea” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I too want to recognize all the Members involved, the Senate, and staff. To my ranking member, BENNIE THOMPSON, I guess, as Churchill said:

Never, ever give up.

Here we are on the last day of this Congress getting this done. What a gratifying experience it is. What a great moment it is not just for this Congress but, more importantly, for the American people and what it represents.

Seventy-three years ago this week, this Nation was attacked at Pearl Harbor. There are a lot of people that make analogies to what would be a cyber Pearl Harbor if we are caught unprepared. I believe this bill will go a long way to defending the Nation from what would be called a cyber Pearl Harbor event.

My father served as a B-17 bombardier in the European theater. He flew over 32 missions, including the air campaign in advance of the D-day invasion and the Battle of the Bulge. They dropped kinetic bombs.

In the cyber world that we live in, we have to worry about digital bombs and how we can stop that from hurting the United States, from impacting the United States, from bringing the United States to its knees. I believe this is the first step of many, and I look forward to working on more legislation next Congress, but this is the historic first step that we have taken in this Congress to move forward on this very important issue and get it done to protect the American people.

With that, let me again thank everyone for their efforts. This has been a great day for America.

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

□ 1030

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2519.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 83, INSULAR AREAS AND FREELY ASSOCIATED STATES ENERGY DEVELOPMENT; WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 776 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 776

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 83) to require the Secretary of the Interior to assemble a team of technical, policy, and financial experts to address the energy needs of the insular areas of the United States and the Freely Associated States through the development of energy action plans aimed at promoting access to affordable, reliable energy, including increasing use of indigenous clean-energy resources, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-59 modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for 80 minutes, with 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of the motion specified in the first section of this resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 122 shall be considered as adopted.

SEC. 3. The chair of the Committee on Appropriations may insert in the Congressional Record at any time during the remainder of the second session of the 113th Congress such material as he may deem explanatory of the Senate amendment and the motion specified in the first section of this resolution.

SEC. 4. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of December 12, 2014.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend,

the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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 have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration for the fiscal year 2015 omnibus appropriations bill. The resolution makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations that the House concur in the Senate amendment of H.R. 83 with an amendment consisting of the text of the FY 2015 omnibus appropriations bill.

The rule provides 80 minutes of debate, 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

In addition, the rule provides the chair of the Committee on Appropriations the authority to insert any explanatory information.

Finally, the rule provides same-day authority through December 12, as is customary at the end of session.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to this House the culmination of the Appropriations Committee's work for the fiscal year 2015. In this legislation, 11 of the 13 appropriations bills are fully conferenced and fully funded through the end of the fiscal year. However, the Homeland Security bill is funded under a temporary continuing resolution until February 27, 2015.

Mr. Speaker, I carried the initial rule for consideration of the first two appropriations bills considered in the House back on April 30, 2014, and I believe the record of the House and the House Appropriations Committee has been good. We considered 7 out of 12 appropriations bills on the floor under an open process, considered 11 of 12 appropriations bills in committee. Contrast that to the Senate, which was unable to consider even a single appropriations bill on the floor.

So I am proud, Mr. Speaker, of the work we have been able to accomplish. The omnibus legislation abides by all the terms set in the Ryan-Murray budget agreement, providing a top line funding level of \$1.013 trillion.

But at the same time, this legislation contains important policy provisions that prevent the government from reaching into the lives of ordinary American citizens, provisions like those which prevent the Army Corps of Engineers from regulating farm ponds and irrigation ditches, or provisions

like those preventing the Federal Government from regulating the lead content in ammunition or fishing tackle.

This bill maintains historic pro-life provisions and includes new ones, like requiring ObamaCare plans to disclose whether they provide abortion services, and countless others.

At the same time, this omnibus enacts important commonsense priorities on the direction of this government. It cuts funding for the IRS by over \$345 million. Indeed, the IRS has been cut by more than \$1.2 billion since 2010. It prohibits the IRS from targeting groups for scrutiny based on their political beliefs. It cuts EPA funding for the fifth consecutive year, bringing staffing to the lowest level since 1989. It implements a government-wide prohibition on the painting of portraits. It makes commonsense decisions, like prohibiting funding for inappropriate videos or conferences that shouldn't be funded by taxpayers in times of surplus, much less in times of deficit.

But this legislation doesn't just cut funding from programs. It takes those cuts and reallocates them to programs that are truly in need. For example, it provides \$30 billion for the National Institutes of Health, an increase over funding from FY14, enhancing funding for Alzheimer's, cancer, and brain research.

It funds the Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act, a bill I authored with GREGG HARPER and Eric Cantor, at \$12.6 million, shifting those dollars from funding political conventions to research into pediatric diseases.

It increases the health care and educational funding to some of our poorest and most needy constituents—Native Americans—and it provides funding to deal with crises like those associated with the outbreak of Ebola or the militant activity of ISIL, the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

I could go on and on with all the good things included in this bill; however, I am sure others will speak to those items.

I believe it is important to take stock in where we have come over the last 4 years. We have taken an annual budget deficit of \$1.4 trillion and lowered it to \$468 billion, still too high, but one of the most rapid, if not the most rapid, declines of the deficit in American history. We prevented additional burdens and regulations from being foisted upon the American people.

Our work is certainly not done, however. One must always remember appropriations and appropriating is a process. The bureaucratic welfare state built by decades of Democratic control cannot be dismantled in a single blow; however, it can be reduced piece by piece, and this legislation does just that.

Some of my friends will raise objections to the process, where we are left with a frustrating choice between the passage of a large omnibus bill to fund all government or a government shut-

down. To my friends, I say that I agree with you, as do my fellow members of the Appropriations Committee.

There are some things in this bill I disagree with and some, certainly, that I agree with; but I do believe that, under regular order, those with different points of views should be able to make their case to the entire House.

The House has led by example in this regard. We considered seven different appropriations bills on this floor in an open amendment process, all of which were passed by bipartisan majorities. The House would have considered even more appropriations bills had the Senate been willing to consider even a single appropriations bill on the floor. In fact, the last time the Senate passed an individual appropriations bill was November 1, 2011, more than 3 years ago.

Madam Speaker, this isn't the way to govern. I hope that in the next Congress the House will have a partner in the Senate, which is willing to consider individual appropriations bills in an open process so that we do not have to consider large omnibus packages without the opportunity for amendment. I believe we will, and I believe we will end up with a better product because of it.

I am encouraged by the work of my friend, Chairman ROGERS, and Ranking Member NITA LOWEY, and I look forward to working with them and a new Senate next year to build upon the work we have done this year.

Madam Speaker, I urge support for the rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I want to take just a moment to say I know this will be the last time you will be presiding over the House, and I want to thank you for your friendship over all these years. Working together with you has been a pleasure.

I want to thank my friend from Oklahoma for yielding me the customary time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume. Let me say about him, he is someone I admire very greatly. But I don't admire this bill.

I have to rise to debate the rule for the final bill of the 113th Congress, which is the most closed Congress in history. The House majority has, over and over again, stifled debate, limited the ability of Members of this body to participate in the legislative process, and undermined the institution.

We have had 83 closed rules this term, the most in history, and this bill follows suit and has been, again, brought to us under a closed rule, which means that no Member will be able to offer an amendment; and the \$1.1 trillion spending bill to keep the Federal Government funded will be rushed through the legislative process because the deadline to keep the government open is 11:59 this evening.

By the same circumstance, I was doing a rule the night of the last time the government shut down, still on the

floor at midnight and made the announcement that the great Government of the United States of America was closed.

We don't, obviously, none of us, want to see that again, but we do see dysfunction mirrored in the Rules Committee, because all of our meetings are now only declared emergency. That means it has not gone to any committee, has no public input, no hearing, no markups, and no time to fully consider the legislation.

The bill has been brought to us under an onerous, blatantly political process, and its contents are troubling as well. It seems to me that with every passing hour, a new alarming provision comes to light. Perhaps if the House majority had spent less time voting to undermine the health care law, taking health care away from people, or investigating a nonexistent scandal in Benghazi, we might have been able to do a budget.

While this may have averted another dangerous government shutdown, what we are doing now, this bill, is another example of the preferred method of governance—manufactured crises. We are pushed and pulled from the brink for their political games, and America suffers.

At 1,603 pages, this spending bill is a behemoth. It was submitted in the dark of night at the last minute in hopes that we wouldn't find out what is in it and serves as further proof that the majority has reneged on their pledge of transparency.

□ 1045

Speaker BOEHNER, himself, said in December of 2010, as reported by the *New York Times*:

I do not believe that having 2,000-page bills on the House floor serves anyone's best interest—not the House, not the Members, and certainly not the American people.

He was referring, of course, to the fact that we would have 72 hours to examine such legislation.

Madam Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the *New York Times*' article from December 17, 2010, entitled: "Republicans Prepare for Looming Budget Battle"—even then.

[From the *New York Times*, Dec. 17, 2010]

REPUBLICANS PREPARE FOR LOOMING BUDGET BATTLE

(By Carl Hulse)

WASHINGTON.—The collapse of a government-wide spending package in the final days of this Congressional session sets up a politically charged fiscal showdown early next year, testing the determination of Republicans about to take over the House with promises to slash an array of domestic programs.

As Congress struggled to assemble a stopgap measure to finance the government at least into the first months of 2011, House and Senate Republicans on Friday hailed their ability to derail a \$1.2 trillion spending measure put forward by Senate Democrats, and promised to use their new Congressional muscle to respond to public demands to shrink government.

"Beginning in January, the House is going to become the outpost in Washington for the

American people and their desire for a smaller, less costly and more accountable government," said Representative John A. Boehner of Ohio, the incoming House speaker.

"I will tell you," he added, "we are going to cut spending."

With the lame-duck session entering its final days, there was an air of partisan chaos on Capitol Hill as both parties scored important legislative victories and events changed on an almost hour-to-hour basis as the end of Democratic control of the House approached.

Both President Obama and Congressional Republicans claimed credit for the package of tax cuts and unemployment pay the president signed into law Friday. Democrats also appeared poised to repeal the ban on gay and lesbian troops serving openly in the military, a long-sought goal of the party and its progressive constituency.

The House advanced a major Pentagon policy measure that had previously been tied up in the fight over the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy. At the same time, a major immigration measure championed by Democrats and the White House seemed headed toward defeat as early as Saturday.

Republicans celebrated their blockade of the spending package, which Senator Harry Reid of Nevada, the majority leader, had to abandon after Republicans denied him the handful of votes from their side of the aisle that he was counting on to break a filibuster.

Republicans said their determination to kill the omnibus spending package even when top party lawmakers had inserted pet spending projects demonstrated that they were heeding the fervor of voters who were fed up with giant spending measures slipping through Congress in the final hours.

"The defeat of the omnibus should reassure every American that their voice is making a difference in Washington," said Senator Tom Coburn, an Oklahoma Republican and an outspoken foe of increased federal spending.

But the collapse of the Senate measure, which like its House counterpart would have financed government agencies through the end of the fiscal year on Sept. 30, means Republicans could begin the new Congress with an immediate need to resolve the spending stalemate.

With the Senate making slow progress toward a stopgap measure, the House on Friday approved a plan to keep the government open through Tuesday and the Senate later followed suit to prevent a government shutdown after Saturday.

Aides said that behind closed doors, White House officials and some Democratic lawmakers were still trying to strike a deal to finance the government through September. But the officials said it was much more likely that government financing would be extended only into February or March.

Republicans say that timeline will allow them to quickly put their stamp on the budget for the current fiscal year, and Mr. Boehner and his leadership team have vowed to eliminate about \$100 billion in spending out of about \$400 billion in domestic programs.

Both sides say reaching that goal will mean very difficult choices and Democrats, promising to resist Republican efforts, say Republicans may find it easier to talk about cutting than actually doing it.

"They have been really good about talking about the need to cut this and cut that, but they are never specific," said Representative James P. McGovern, Democrat of Massachusetts. "I think it is going to be tough."

The 2011 spending fight could be complicated by the need to raise the federal debt limit to avoid a federal default—a vote that many new Republican lawmakers have indicated they would not make.

Republicans say the debt limit vote could also present an opportunity, allowing them to tie a package of spending reductions to the debt increase to make it more palatable.

Another complicating factor is that since Democrats retain control of the Senate, House Republicans must reconcile their spending proposals with those crafted by the Senate Appropriations Committee under the leadership of Senator Daniel K. Inouye, Democrat of Hawaii. Senator Inouye is unlikely to agree easily to Republican spending cuts, creating a climate for gridlock as the two parties face off.

On Friday, Mr. Inouye chastised Congress for jettisoning the spending package crafted by his committee, saying that simply extending current funding levels left the government on autopilot and could lead to disruptions. He said it also left too much discretion for determining spending priorities to the executive branch.

"And in two months we will find ourselves having to pass another 2,000-page bill that will cost more than \$1 trillion or once again abdicate our authority to the Obama administration to determine how our taxpayer funds should be spent," he said.

Mr. Boehner has made changing the culture of the Appropriations Committee a top interest of the new Republican majority, pressing new leaders of the panel to turn it into a center for budget cutting and stocking it with a few anti-spending advocates.

On Friday, he indicated that he would prefer that Republicans next year break up the enormous spending package that died in the Senate and pass a dozen spending bills individually to allow for better scrutiny—a process that could consume considerable time and subject the measures to multiple attacks on the floor.

"I do not believe that having 2,000-page bills on the House floor serves anyone's best interests, not the House, not for the members and certainly not for the American people," Mr. Boehner said.

Aides to Mr. Boehner later said the speaker-designate was referring to his desire to have an orderly appropriations process later in 2011 and was not referring to the spending package Republicans would have to quickly assemble in the opening weeks of the new Congress.

Lawmakers on both sides were running out of energy and patience as the session dragged on with no certain conclusion in sight. Even House Democrats who would be turning over control to Republicans seemed ready to call it quits.

"A lot of us just want to go home," said Representative John B. Larson of Connecticut, chairman of the House Democratic Caucus.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, this bill can cause grievous harm to the Department of Homeland Security by funding it until only February of next year, and it really does endanger the Nation's safety and security because they are the people who provide border security and the TSA. I have said this in the past—but it bears repeating—that funding the government in tranches weakens, destabilizes, and undermines our Nation.

The majority's insistence on punishing the President for his executive order on immigration by toying with the funding for the Department of Homeland Security, of all things, is troubling. This maneuver will hinder how we train new officers, how we guard the border, and it will endanger the Nation's airports; but the most

egregious provisions of this bill strike at the very soul of our democracy.

A last-minute, nongermane addition would fundamentally change our Republic. It gives away almost all power of the people to choose their leaders and to participate in their government by cementing the status of power donors. This provision changes campaign finance law to allow megadonors to give 10 times the amount currently allowed to political parties for housekeeping, and those of us in the political field know what it means to have the housekeeping accounts: that means it can go for absolutely anything. This change flies in the face of McCain-Feingold, and it completes the mission of the Supreme Court with their decision on Citizens United.

This tenet has been central to our democracy in that each person has equal power to influence their government by their voice and their vote. Not only has this Congress refused to reenact the Voting Rights Act, but this added provision will hasten the toxic influence of money and will further corrupt and unbalance our democracy.

Furthermore, the underlying bill includes a provision added only 2 days ago that would put our economy in danger and would roll back the gains made since the Great Recession. This most egregious provision would change the Dodd-Frank bill to give undue power back to the banks. The provision puts the taxpayers on the hook for risky behaviors by Wall Street banks, meaning, once again, that taxpayers will have to bail out the banks if they fail. It was a basic tenet of Dodd-Frank's that we would never do that again, and that will now be undone.

It has been only 5 years since the start of the Great Recession, and the economy has made great strides in adding 10.9 million private sector jobs in the last 57 months, but passing this bill would risk erasing those strides by steering us on a dangerous path toward another recession.

The former chair of the House Financial Services Committee, Barney Frank, released a statement this week, calling this inserted provision: "a substantive mistake, a terrible violation of the procedure that should be followed on this complex and important subject, and a frightening precedent that provides a roadmap for further attacks on our protection against financial instability."

He continues: "Ironically, it was a similar unrelated rider put without debate into a larger bill that played a major role in allowing irresponsible, unregulated derivative transactions to contribute to the crisis."

He is referring to the crisis of 2008.

He is warning us. He is imploring us: Don't make the same mistake twice. Our national economy cannot take this risk.

Madam Speaker, I would like to insert this article from The Wall Street Journal from December 10, 2014, entitled: "Barney Frank Criticizes Planned

Rollback of Namesake Financial Law," into the RECORD.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 10, 2014]

**BARNEY FRANK CRITICIZES PLANNED ROLLBACK OF NAMESAKE FINANCIAL LAW**  
(By Andrew Ackerman)

WASHINGTON.—Retired House Democrat Barney Frank urged his former colleagues to vote against a nearly \$1.1 trillion spending plan, saying it constitutes an attack on a Wall Street regulatory overhaul he co-authored in response to the financial crisis.

At issue is a provision included in the plan that would rollback a controversial part of the 2010 Dodd-Frank law requiring banks to "push out" some of their riskiest derivatives-trading activities into affiliates that aren't eligible for federal backstop programs. Mr. Frank is one of two namesakes of the law along with former Sen. Christopher Dodd (D., Conn.), who is also retired from Congress.

"The provision inserted into the appropriations bill is a substantive mistake, a terrible violation of the procedure that should be followed on this complex and important subject, and a frightening precedent that provides a road map for further attacks on our protection against financial instability," the Massachusetts Democrat said in a statement Wednesday.

The comments came hours after House and Senate lawmakers unveiled the plan, which would keep the federal government funded through September. The roll-back of the Dodd-Frank provision was included as part of an agreement to provide modest funding increases to the two agencies primarily responsible for implementing and policing Dodd-Frank—the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

Sen. Sherrod Brown (D., Ohio) and other congressional Democrats also warned against the move, saying it would "open the door to future bailouts funded by American taxpayers."

"This provision, originally written by lobbyists, has no place in a must-pass spending bill," he said in a statement.

Critics of the "push out" provision, including Federal Reserve officials as well as some Democrat and Republican lawmakers, say it doesn't strengthen the financial system and only moves potentially destabilizing activities to a different bank subsidiary. The provision could also increase costs for bank customers that use the derivatives.

Derivatives, which played a central role in the crisis, are used by firms to hedge or speculate on everything from moves in interest rates to the cost of fuel.

Mr. Frank said reasonable people can disagree on how to regulate derivatives. But he criticized the plan to change regulations through "a non-germane amendment inserted with no hearings, no chance for further modification and no chance for debate into a mammoth bill in the last days of a lame-duck Congress."

"Ironically it was a similar unrelated rider put without debate into a larger bill that played a major role in allowing irresponsible, unregulated derivative transactions to contribute to the crisis," Mr. Frank said, referring to 2000 Commodity Futures Modernization Act that essentially barred the regulation of derivatives and was signed into law as part of a larger appropriations bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, for these reasons and several others, Democrats should not support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" against the rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the State of Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER), my friend and distinguished colleague, for the purpose of a colloquy with the majority leader.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Madam Speaker, for over 100 years, the Federal Government has made a promise to our rural schools and counties to actively manage our forests. However, due to Federal regulations and litigation, forest management has been dramatically reduced, and our communities have suffered—thousands of people have lost jobs; counties lack the resources to pay for basic services whether it is school or fire or police; and our forest has become increasingly susceptible to forest fires, disease, and devastation. This situation is a crisis, and we in Congress must address it.

Mr. STEWART. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. STEWART. Madam Speaker, as my colleague from Washington has so ably noted, in areas where large tracts of land are part of the National Forest System, local school districts have relied in the past on timber harvesting receipts, shared with local governments, as an important source of revenue to support their school systems. This is a problem that was created by activists here in Washington, D.C.

When Federal policies dramatically reduced logging receipts from our national forests, those schools were hit very hard. That is why we created the Secure Rural Schools program. This is real. It affects real people. It affects real families. It has affected many people in my own State.

So I would like to ask my colleague: Are your local schools feeling the effects of a situation like mine?

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Oh, yes. I have heard from many of my local districts already, and layoff notices are being prepared because of the uncertainty and the status of the funding of Secure Rural Schools. Congress must make getting this legislation through both Houses and signed into law by the President a priority in the next year.

I would, actually, like to ask the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader, if he can give me any assurances that extending the Secure Rural Schools program will be one of his priorities early in the next Congress.

I yield to the leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank my colleagues for yielding, and I share their concern on this important matter. I want to ensure my colleagues that enacting an extension of the Secure Rural Schools program is going to be an early priority for next year.

Madam Speaker, as the gentlewoman knows, in September of last year, the House passed H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, which would have allowed us to better manage our Federal forests for the benefit of our rural schools and

counties. Unfortunately, the Senate was unable to act on this bill or to find a way forward on this important issue.

I believe, in the next Congress, we should find a path forward to get this important matter across the finish line, and I will work with our colleagues and with incoming Chairman BISHOP to make sure that this happens. We need to get this done, and we need to get it done early next year.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. I thank the leader for his comments and assurances.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a valued member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentlewoman.

Madam Speaker, I oppose this closed rule, and I oppose the underlying bill, which is the product of a closed and deeply flawed process.

It contains policy riders that will do great damage to this country and that have no business whatsoever being in an omnibus spending bill. It contains an airdropped earmark for politicians that would allow wealthy couples to give as much as \$3.1 million to political parties—three times as much as the current level. No hearings, no markup, no discussion—just snuck into the bill with the hope that no one would notice. We ought to be finding ways, Madam Speaker, to get money out of politics, not the reverse.

The bill would repeal, at the request of Wall Street special interests and lobbyists, important Dodd-Frank provisions. It would allow banks to engage in the same risky behavior that caused the financial crisis of 2008.

What in the world are my Republican colleagues thinking? I know they want to do a lot of favors for their pals on Wall Street, but, please, please, do not do it at the expense of our economy.

The bill contains a provision that the trucking industry wants to allow truck drivers to work up to 80 hours a week when we know that over-tired truck drivers put all of us at risk on the roads. Unbelievable.

Finally, the bill funds new wars that Congress has not authorized. We are dropping bombs every day in Iraq and Syria. We have 3,000 troops deployed in Iraq, and we hear more and more talk about having those troops engage in direct combat.

Yet, this Republican leadership has been content to do nothing. In fact, the majority has repeatedly and routinely denied Members the right to debate the issue of war on the floor of the House of Representatives. None of us will be asked to fight another pointless war, Madam Speaker—they are not our lives on the line—but we have a constitutional responsibility to debate and vote on whether to authorize it. But no. Instead, we are leaving town. Instead, we are ducking a vote. We are not doing our jobs. It is shameful and it is inexcusable, and it is a lousy way to end this session.

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

I just want to make a couple of points in response to my friend.

First of all, there is much of what my friend has to say that I agree with. This is not the preferred process of the Appropriations Committee on either side of the aisle in this Chamber. Indeed, we tried to bring—and did bring—bill after bill after bill to this floor to avoid this very end.

The responsibility here lies with the leadership of the United States Senate, which did not bring a single appropriations bill to the floor. When they won't pick up and pass a bill, we can't go to conference, and we are left to fund the government in the very final days.

Now, I don't think my friend meant to suggest this, but the idea that only Republicans were involved in drafting this is just simply not the case. This bill has to go through a Democratic Senate and go to a Democratic President. It cannot pass the Senate without Democratic support or even be taken up. It cannot go into law without the President's signing it into law.

The reality is that the Democratic Senate and the administration have been involved in these negotiations at every level, over and over. Indeed, my friends have been involved in this as well in their capacity as ranking members on the Appropriations Committee or in the leadership capacity. This bill, of which I do not particularly like the process, is, indeed, bicameral and bipartisan in its substance.

Again, I think my friend makes an excellent point in that this isn't the way to run the railroad, and we ought to work together; but I also will remind my friends that the last time they were in the majority they brought exactly two appropriations bills to the floor under closed rules. They never brought an appropriations bill here in their final year under an open process. We have done that seven times. We would have done it all 12 times, but we finally determined the United States Senate, under Democratic control, was never going to bring up an appropriations bill, at which point: Why waste the floor time, and why ask your Members to do the hard work and cast the votes?

That is something that shouldn't happen again. I pledge to work with my friend, who I know does not want to see that happen again, to make sure that we fulfill our part of the process on this side of the House; and I think the new Senate will very likely do the same thing. I am hoping our colleague who is leaving this Chamber and heading there will help us in that. She has been a wise and able Member here, and I am sure she will be equally distinguished in the United States Senate.

We look forward to improving the process—my friend is right about that—but the absence of passing this bill will shut down the government. I don't think that is something that either they or our friends in the Senate or in the administration want to do.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) will control the time.

There was no objection.

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

Just to respond to my colleague, I should remind my colleagues here that there were five appropriations bills that never saw the light of day here on the House floor. Of the ones that we did deal with, none of them included the rollback of Dodd-Frank provisions or the rollback of campaign finance reform. We can blame the United States Senate all we want, but they have nothing to do with whether or not we bring up a resolution to authorize another war in Iraq or not.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the distinguished ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I have come to the floor today to stop Republican efforts to give Wall Street banks a multibillion dollar gift this Christmas.

Under the cover of must-pass legislation, big bank lobbyists are hoping that Congress will allow Wall Street to once again gamble with taxpayer money by reversing a provision that prohibits banks from using taxpayer-insured funds—bank deposits—to engage in risky derivatives trading activity.

In fact, The New York Times reported that Citigroup, a bank that stands to directly benefit to the tune of billions of dollars, authored this provision. Big banks want to use their cheap funds provided by the taxpayer backstop to undercut their competition in a "heads I win, tails the taxpayer loses" scenario.

□ 1100

We know why Republicans want it. The spending bill also quietly allows individuals such as the big banks to contribute millions more to their own reelections. This provision must be stopped. Enough is enough.

This puts taxpayers at risk. This puts consumers at risk. This provision directly weakens a provision intended to prevent future bailouts of Wall Street. The Obama administration said this provision could be disruptive and harmful. Former FDIC Chairman Sheila Bair said the provision takes reform in the wrong direction.

It is also strongly opposed by consumer, labor, and civil rights groups, and former chairman Barney Frank, who puts the Frank in Dodd-Frank, called it a frightening precedent. So I agree, and I am urging a "no" vote.

I just heard the gentleman say this is bipartisan and this is bicameral. It is neither. As a matter of fact, Democrats are not going to join in putting this bill out.

We understand that our constituents, our workers, our people out there, our consumers know that we bailed out the big banks, and they know that we would be putting them at risk one more time to bail them out if we allowed them to do this risky derivatives trading.

Dodd-Frank said you need to push out your trading activities and put them in affiliates or subsidiaries. Don't try and use the people's backstop, FDIC protection, to do this risky trading with.

If you think the American public is going to stand for a bailout of the biggest banks in America one more time, you are wrong. This bill is going nowhere because we have enough people, I believe, that are going to stand up and fight on this issue and other issues in the bill.

As the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, I am just focusing on this one bad part of the bill because it is so outrageous.

I ask for a "no" vote on the rule, I ask for a "no" vote on the bill.

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

I am going to disagree with my friend from California. This bill is bipartisan and bicameral. It was negotiated with the Democratic Senate, and both sides approved it before it was ever submitted to the Rules Committee for consideration.

It has been alleged that the swaps push-out language contained in the omni was snuck into the bill, that it allows for risky trading and puts taxpayer funds at risk. None of this, in my view, is true. The language included in this omnibus is identical to H.R. 992, which passed the House with broad bipartisan support by a vote of 292-122.

The language was added to the Financial Services appropriations bill as a full committee amendment. After a public debate on the language, it was adopted by voice vote. When the Financial Services appropriations bill was considered by the full House for 3 days under an open rule, where 51 amendments were considered, there were no amendments offered on the swaps push-out language.

The omni provides a commonsense fix for section 716 of the Dodd-Frank. Risky swaps like those that brought down AIG are still required to be pushed out. The omni allows low-risk trades to continue to be conducted by depository institutions, which are regulated by banking supervisors. Without this fix, farmers and manufacturers will experience increased costs and regulatory burdens without making our financial system any more stable.

Former Fed Chairmen Ben Bernanke and Paul Volcker and former FDIC Chair Sheila Bair have all expressed a need to fix section 716 of Dodd-Frank. CBO has scored this language as having no impact on the taxpayers. So we obviously see this differently than our friends on the other side.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) will control the time.

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the time yielded by the gentlelady from New York.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to H.R. 83, the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act of 2015.

Just over a year ago I stood here urging the Republican majority to allow us to vote on the legislation to reopen the government during a 16-day shutdown. At that time the majority's gimmick was called a minibus, essentially cherry-picked programs within Federal agencies to be funded one by one.

Today I am troubled to have to rise yet again to oppose another gimmicky bill that provides piecemeal funding and undermines national security. Once again, the Republican House leadership has laid before us a package that, by design, seems to promote partisan division and appeal to a faction of its party that is blindly determined to punish the Department of Homeland Security for its grievances against the President.

When we returned from Thanksgiving last week, House appropriators were hopeful that we could consider and pass a full omnibus bill. Unfortunately, today we are forced to vote on legislation that provides full-year funding for all Federal agencies except the Department of Homeland Security. In previous Congresses, such an approach would be considered absurd.

It is important that we appreciate the consequences of a short-term continuing resolution for DHS. Contracting for the final national security cutter will be delayed, potentially driving up the cost. Border security technology upgrades along the Rio Grande Valley will not happen as scheduled. This approach not only punishes Secretary Johnson and DHS headquarters, it undermines homeland security.

Madam Speaker, clearly the insertion of the financing for political parties undermines McCain-Feingold, and for that and other reasons I oppose the rule and the underlying bill.

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

I just want to make this point again. I agree with some of the points my good friend from Mississippi makes, but this could be avoided if the United States Senate had simply picked up appropriations bills and passed them.

This could have been long done. We could have come to an agreement many months ago. We tried on seven different occasions and did bring bills across this floor. They were under open amendment, something my friends did

not do their last year in the majority, and we had multiple opportunities.

But at some point when the other body isn't moving and tells you it is not going to take up an appropriations bill, you just quit hitting your head against the wall and say, "Well, I guess we are going to have to deal with this with a big omnibus at the end of the year."

If my friends wanted a different process—and I am sure they did—they should have been talking to their colleagues in the United States Senate. That is why we are here, not because we wouldn't bring bills across but because the Senate wouldn't.

At some point, if one-half of the Congress won't work, the other half can't get its work done. That is just the process and the way it works. We are hoping the new Senate under new management will do something.

We all know in this Chamber the only reason why they did that was because they wanted to avoid tough votes. Quite frankly, that is the reason why my friends wouldn't allow an open amendment process the last time they were in the majority. It didn't work well for them in 2010; it didn't work well for their Democratic colleagues this time around in 2014.

I think the lesson both of us ought to draw from this is, let's do regular order. It actually is in the best interests of the country, the best interests of the institution. It is even in the best political interests of the two parties. Just let us go do our work.

But we can't now shut down the government because the Senate refused to do the process any other way but do it here. And, again, with all due respect to my friend's concerns on a variety of issues, some of which I share, quite frankly, there are even some parts of this bill that I like that I don't like to see passed this way. I don't think it is appropriate to be passed this way.

At the end of the day you have got to keep the government functioning. This is the last vehicle to do that.

To suggest, again, it wasn't bicameral or bipartisan—it has been. As my friends know, this has been negotiated at the top levels of leadership and on the Appropriations Committee between Democrats and Republicans in the House and the Senate.

There are some flaws in this process. There are certainly some things I don't like in this bill, but I recognize it is a gigantic compromise and one designed to allow government to continue to function, and it hasn't been the House of Representatives, either Democrat or Republican, that has gotten us to this point. This is the Democratic leadership in the Senate that has gotten us to this point.

But at the end of the day, everybody here will have a vote, both on the rule and on the bill, and the same thing will be true in the United States Senate. The President has a signature at his end of Pennsylvania Avenue, and if this process doesn't work or my friends



want to bring it down, that is up to them. We would prefer not to close the government, to continue to function.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from New York.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule that is providing for consideration of this so-called omnibus bill. Among the many troublesome eleventh-hour additions to the underlying 1,600-page spending bill is a provision that not only allows for another multi-billion dollar bank bailout and for taxpayers to be on the hook for that, but it gives the keys to the bank to the moneyed special interests by allowing up to \$800,000 to be contributed by one person to the Democratic and Republican Party committees.

Now, most Americans think there is already too much money in politics, but, oh, no, not House Republicans. They are just saying open up the spigots to the special interests.

Instead of passing a clean bill that funds the Federal Government and avoids another harmful shutdown, this Congress, these Republicans have chosen to bring the American people a bill that would allow for the negative opinions that they already hold of this Congress to go even further, to say the richer you are, the more access you have, the more influence that you have.

Madam Speaker, this provision has no business in a spending bill, no business in our democracy, and we can't allow the megaphones of moneyed special interests to take hold of our government.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule. There are a lot of reasons to oppose it, and I am just naming one. But let's not bail out the banks again, and let's not give them the keys to the bank in our pocket and let the special interests take control of this Congress.

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

Two quick points. As I think I pointed out earlier in the course of this debate, the language dealing with swaps was actually considered by this House in two separate pieces of language. One of those bills passed this House with a bipartisan majority. The other was the Financial Services bill, where there was no objection, no amendment, and no complaint.

Now we find at the very last minute concern and objections that were never raised earlier in the process when there were multiple opportunities to do that.

With respect to my friend's point about the political contribution issue, that is something I know a little bit about. I used to be chief of staff of the Republican National Committee. I was the executive director of the NRCC, our campaign committee, earlier in my life.

I have watched McCain-Feingold over the years, and I have seen that, frank-

ly, it has been a failed piece of legislation. I agree with my friend's point this is not the way to do it. I would have much preferred to debate in an open process, but the idea there is not big money in politics I think is an idea that is very much out of date. There is lots of big money in politics.

We have diminished the importance of individual candidate campaigns and the party organizations, while we have enhanced them partly through a Supreme Court ruling. So there is plenty of extra money out there, and it pours into races. To marginalize the political parties, which are actually the most accountable, most transparent, and most responsible participants in the process, is something that we ought to rethink.

Frankly, to put candidates individually at the mercy of megadonors on each side—by the way, my friends are as much at risk of this as my colleagues on this side of the aisle—is something we need to think about. Again, I suspect that is what happened here.

I wouldn't suggest this was a Republican idea. I don't know, frankly, if it was a Republican or Democratic idea. I know Democrats in the Senate consented to it and I suspect participated in it. So let's not have a lot of show that we don't like this or that and somehow this was a Republican measure. In many cases it wasn't, or it was a negotiated compromise.

In this case, again, there will be ample opportunity to deal with this both later when we vote on the final product and eventually when the Senate takes it up. But, again, if the Senate would just do its job, we wouldn't be here in this process. We wouldn't have these opportunities for people to short-circuit the normal legislative procedures that I know my friends agree with, and I certainly agree with.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1115

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democrat whip.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I thank her for her leadership on the Rules Committee. I thank Mr. COLE for his remarks.

Madam Speaker, I want to rise and support Mr. COLE. This is not the way to do it. It is what he said. The good news is we have time to not do it this way. We have time to return to the Rules Committee, pass out a rule which strikes these two provisions and pass the bill. In my opinion, if that is done, then an overwhelming number of Democrats will vote to support the bill. It will go to the Senate, and I predict without any doubt that the Senate will pass that bill.

It is clear that there is disagreement on both sides of the aisle about this bill, but it is also clear there could be

a significant bipartisan majority to do what is a basic responsibility of this Congress to do, and that is fund government.

Now, very frankly, neither side did its job. We did seven-twelfths of our job, and the Senate did zero-twelfths of their job, and we can point fingers at one another which would not be very useful. What would be useful is if we give to the American people and to our economy the confidence that we can act together in a bipartisan way to pass legislation. I tell my friend, Mr. COLE, for whom I have great respect, Madam Speaker, that we can do that.

The two provisions which he has heard discussed are of great concern to my side of the aisle, there are things of great concern to his side of the aisle, and in the next 2 years, we are going to have to work together to try to accommodate, in hopefully a bipartisan fashion, having the majority in this body do reasonable things.

The gentleman is a member of the Appropriations Committee. I had the honor of serving on the Appropriations Committee for 23 years before I became the leader. The fact is that that committee has a responsibility that must be accomplished, and that is fund government enterprises, fund the dollars that we, through programs that this Congress and previous Congresses have adopted, fund those objectives we think are important for this country.

I would urge my friend, Mr. COLE, who I think is a very responsible Member of this body, to urge his side because we have agreement we think on 99.9 percent of this. These two provisions are very small provisions, but I will tell my friend they put this bill at risk.

I would urge him, therefore, to urge his side to strike these two provisions, and I will tell him in return that I am confident that the overwhelming majority of my side of the aisle will join with I think the overwhelming majority of his side of the aisle and pass this legislation which is so important.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend for his very generous and kind words and remarks. There is nobody seriously I enjoy listening to more on this floor. I very much appreciate his generous offer which I know he has made to people far above my pay grade on my side of the aisle to work together and find common ground not only here in the closing days of the session, but next year as well.

I appreciate the fact that he is willing to accept over 99 percent of this bill, and I agree with his political assessment. I think we could muster strong bipartisan majorities to pass that.

The issues he raised I suspect are being considered and are a little above my pay grade to comment on, so I am not going to do that, but I do want to tell my friend how much I respect him and how much I appreciate his contribution each and every day to how

this House operates. I think we would have been in a much better place here as Democrats and Republicans had the Senate done a better job of doing its job.

Madam Speaker, I will disagree with my friend a little bit or maybe express a different opinion on saying we did seven-twelfths of our job. My friend has been a distinguished majority leader in this institution, and I think he is a master at the legislative process and knows probably better than most how difficult it is to function on one side of the rotunda of this Capitol Building when they are not functioning on the other.

You do reach a point after you have put seven bills on the floor and the other body has made it obvious that they are not going to put a single appropriations measure on the floor, your own side begins to wonder: Why are we doing this? Why are we going through this process?

Now, we did go ahead and move through full committee 11 of the 12 bills which were again done in a bipartisan fashion with consultation with our friends on the Democratic side. You do reach a point where you say: Why are we wasting the floor time? Why are we exposing our Members?

I am hopeful when our friend in the chair arrives at the other side that we are going to have partners that work with us on both sides of the aisle and engage in that normal process that I know my friend is not only a master at, but a defender and advocate for.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. Well, I have very little time and actually less time than my friend has, so I would prefer you to use your own time. If they are not willing to give you any time, then perhaps I will reconsider that.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 20 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I was simply going to observe to my friend from Oklahoma that that puts an awfully heavy burden on the presiding officer.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I share the concern expressed by my friend, Mr. COLE, that if we don't act today, government will be shut down, so I agree that we need to act. The question that we have to ask ourselves in this body is: At what price do we keep government open?

There is a lot of good in this legislation, no question about it, but for me—and I have supported bipartisan efforts to keep government open in the past, I have only been here 2 years, and I had to do it already—but the notion that a price has to be paid in order to keep

government open—and that price is to grant greater power to the wealthiest Americans to have more influence over our political process—is just too much for me to take.

Of all the problems that we could use this moment to try to solve, are we offering help to the unemployed who lost their benefits as a part of this package? No. Are we dealing with the massive problems we have with infrastructure? No. Are we trying to balance the playing field for people who happen to be born in a ZIP Code full of poverty? No.

But what we are doing as a condition of keeping government open is deciding that the one thing we have to do is to make sure that the wealthiest Americans can now spend 10 times more money on the political process than they did last year. Seriously? This is a problem that we have to solve in order to keep government open?

I just can't imagine that this is the price we have to pay.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Michigan because he is an exceptionally responsible Member in this body and an heir of a proud tradition in his family and somebody I enjoy working with and I think someone that makes a genuine contribution each and every day he has been here.

In terms of the bill itself, there is certainly nothing inappropriate about my friends on the other side of the aisle focusing on things they don't like, but there are some things we ought to think about that we do like. There are billions of dollars in here to fight Ebola, something that we sat down and worked with the administration and our friends on the other side and came to a common agreement.

We have disagreement sometimes and a difference of perspective. I am actually closer to Mr. MCGOVERN on this, at least in terms of process, than I am to the administration.

Look, ISIL is a clear and present danger to the United States of America. The President has asked for things in here; we have put the things he asked for in here and tried to work with him on that.

I don't think anybody in this Chamber thinks that the work done at the National Institutes of Health isn't exceptionally important. There is more money in here for that particular agency in a more difficult budgetary environment than we had last year.

I know how very much my friend and his family have always been concerned with Native Americans. Nobody did more than your uncle, our beloved colleague, Mr. KILDEE, Dale Kildee, in that area, and there is substantially more money in here than the administration requested for Indian health and for school construction on Indian reservations.

There are certainly some things in here that I share some of the concerns that my friends have, both from a process standpoint and an outcome stand-

point, but I think you have to make a balance. I think you have to look at the overall bill. I think you have to look at the consequences of not passing the bill and the rule.

I think you also have to remember that this is a negotiated agreement with a Democratic Senate. I don't think we should have gotten to this point, and had they done their job in the appropriations process, we would not be at this point; but whenever either body doesn't do their job, you always get down to the end, and this is exactly the sort of thing that you end up with.

I don't know how we can avoid that in the next 24 hours, but I do know this: I hope we all from both sides of the aisle recommit ourselves to avoid being here next year. I don't blame my friends on the Democratic side for getting us here. I don't think they had anything to do with it.

They worked with us in the appropriations process in very good faith with Mrs. LOWEY. That is why we brought bills to the floor. That didn't happen in the Senate, and that is what has gotten us here. I think we should reserve our fire for the other Chamber, one thing that tends to unite us instead of divide us because that is where the problem has been.

Madam Speaker, again, under new management next year, I hope we won't see this problem.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the underlying bill. There are two provisions in this bill that are deeply offensive to the American people and their sense of fairness.

Over here, you have a provision that would backstop with taxpayer money increased risky activity on the part of Wall Street. This would allow them to go out, make more money with less risk, and then if they run into a problem, the taxpayers of this country would be asked to come in and bail them out. So you have that provision for Wall Street.

Over here, you have a provision that would allow Wall Street, the wealthy, and the well-connected to pour 10 times more money into the political apparatus up here on Capitol Hill and buy influence. Over here, you have got a Wall Street giveaway, and over here, you have an opportunity for Wall Street to put more money into the political process.

These two provisions bumped into each other somewhere in the middle of the night in the corridors of Capitol Hill up here. They bumped into each other. Maybe they were introduced, and one said, "I will be the quid," and the other one said, "I will be the quo."

Madam Speaker, I don't know which is which, but I know this is a quid pro quo, and it is the kind of quid pro quo



that is corrupting the machinery of our government and is offensive to the American people. We need to get rid of the quid, we need to eliminate the quo from this bill, and we need to bring it back in a way that we can actually support it. That is what we need to do for the American people.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), my good friend, our distinguished parting Member and the chairman of the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee of our Appropriations Committee.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished incoming chair of the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee for the time.

Madam Speaker, I just want to say I do support this rule. I will revise and extend my remarks for the RECORD later on, but as someone who worked very long on appropriations bills, the problem has been historically that the Senate has blocked the passage of most of their bills.

This year, they did not pass a single one. This year, we passed seven before we had to shut down. None of us on appropriations want an omnibus bill. We all prefer individual, one-by-one bills, but in the absence of that, this is the aggregate of those bills added together, and I do support the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

□ 1130

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, and I rise in opposition to the rule and in opposition to the underlying legislation.

Last night in the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment to strike a measure from page 1,599 of this 1,603-page spending bill that would have this Congress march hand in hand with the Supreme Court's Citizens United and McCutchen to allow America's wealthiest donors to give \$5 million every election cycle to candidates, political parties, and their committees. We had no debate about this. The people's House did not vote to undermine campaign finances, and that this 1,600-page bill already cuts Pell grants and undermines Wall Street reform proves that wealthy donors hold enough sway in Washington.

A vote for this bill is a vote for the continued dismantlement of a broken campaign finance system. It is a vote to continue shutting out the voices of everyday Americans in our political process. Our constituents want us to fight money in politics. They do not want us to be complicit in putting our democracy up for sale.

Madam Speaker, in Washington for the special interests, they view every day as Christmas. Let's give the American people a present this holiday season: respect for our democracy and a place for them in it.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady for yielding and for her tremendous hard work and support.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and this bill for many reasons, even though the bill contains many provisions I support, such as Ebola funding; a critical \$5.67 billion for the President's emergency plan for AIDS relief; PEPFAR, which I helped write, and the Global Fund; programs I have worked on for many years and have supported.

But it also includes provisions I cannot support, such as an additional \$3.4 billion to fund an unauthorized war against ISIS in Iraq. More than 3 months after this war began, this is 3 months later, Congress has yet to have the constitutionally required mandated debate and vote on an Authorization for the Use of Military Force. We are now involved in another open-ended war in the Middle East without congressional authority.

This omnibus also includes \$73.7 billion for the overseas contingency operations fund which, quite frankly, is a slush fund.

Congress must get serious about transparency and oversight of our Nation's bloated Pentagon spending, and we can do that by auditing the Pentagon, an initiative that has bipartisan support. At the same time that this bill provides billions in war funding, my Republican colleagues included a section that will roll back key provisions of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street reform bill, putting taxpayers on the hook for Wall Street gambling.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule and a "no" vote on the bill.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend for all of her hard work on this bill.

District of Columbia voters passed the most restrictive marijuana legalization law in the country, Initiative 71, allowing possession of small amounts of marijuana for personal use only. Four States have legalized marijuana. The city was motivated by two independent studies revealing shameful racial disparities, disparities that are endemic, by the way, in the rest of the country as well in marijuana possession arrests. Ninety percent of marijuana arrests here are of African Americans, though Blacks and Whites use marijuana at the same rate in a city that is 50-50 Black and White.

Do not expect residents to tolerate unequal treatment of the District of

Columbia, a jurisdiction of Federal tax-paying Americans, and, on top of that, discrimination against African Americans who live here.

I am trying to find a way around the antidemocratic language in the bill that bullies the District of Columbia. Congress must find its way out of the local affairs of the residents of the District, who pay the highest Federal taxes per capita in the United States, while the Member who represents them must stand by and watch every Member of this House vote on a matter affecting her district, except the Member who represents the District of Columbia.

Mr. COLE. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady.

One of the big challenges that this institution faces is to restore its credibility with the American people. This process that we have gone through, where, at the end of the negotiations between our House and Senate negotiators, two provisions of great significance were inserted into the bill—one that would provide relief from Dodd-Frank provisions to Wall Street banks, the other which would allow individuals to increase donations to \$2.5 million per cycle—had no hearings. They had no debate. No one has had any input on what the implications are of these actions that are very significant when it comes to campaign finance and when it comes to the integrity of Dodd-Frank.

We must legislate in the light of day and not use a piece of legislation that is of vital concern to the American people to attach provisions that have nothing to do with that particular bill. It is why so many people—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents—think that the political process is not on the level.

So why put these provisions in? We could pass these bills without it. These provisions would then be allowed to have hearings in committee, and then we would be responsible to vote "yes" or "no" on the campaign finance provision, on the Dodd-Frank provision, where our constituents would be able to hold each and every one of us accountable as to what our view was.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, this bill spends \$1.1 trillion to fund the Federal Government. While we may yet avert another government shutdown, a lot of our trust in the legislative process has been destroyed. If a provision to allow the United States to be mined for uranium by a company with ties to Iran can be inserted into and passed with the National Defense Authorization

Act, taking away land sacred to an Indian tribe, what other deplorable and risk-laden bills are in this House majority bill? Heaven only knows what other egregious actions we will find.

The House majority continues to govern via manufactured crises. Regular appropriations bills have been replaced with temporary stopgap measures. Cliffs and brinks and fits and starts continue. The majority has another opportunity in the new Congress to do the good work of government and to provide stability to the American people with the American people put ahead of banking interests and political party interests—and I pray they do.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule and the bill underlying it.

And to end the 113th Congress, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

As I reflect back on the debate today—and it is always a good exchange with my friend from New York—I want to reflect on some areas of agreement and disagreement.

The agreement is we think, like our Democratic colleagues, this is not a good way to legislate. We do not like the process. We do not like to pass bills with multiple hundreds of pages and well over \$1 trillion in spending and lots of policy riders. We prefer to legislate as we began this Congress—that is with an individual appropriations bill.

I want to thank my chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), for the manner in which they got the process off and going this year, and I want to commend my friends on the other side of the aisle for participating.

This House was moving appropriations bills under open rules with multiple debates and passing them, usually with bipartisan votes, in the way that this system should operate. That was not true in the United States Senate.

That body, under Democratic leadership, never brought up a single appropriations bill. You simply can't operate the process if the other side of the Chamber, whose participation is constitutionally required, refuses to participate, refuses to bring bills to the floor. And that was done for political and, I would suggest, somewhat cynical calculations. It didn't work out very well in the end; it never does. Going through regular order, we all know, is the best way to operate. But we are here now because the Senate wouldn't do its job. The House did do its job and continued to do it until it was just painfully obvious that the Senate was never going to do anything at all.

I have also listened to my friends and their concerns about a multitude of issues that are dealt with in this bill. They know we can avoid this next year by following regular order and going through the process, but there are two

in particular that I want to address quickly.

The first issue is campaign finance. I probably have a different view than most of my speakers in terms of what ought to be done, but they are absolutely right in terms of the process by which this has been arrived at. Now, I will point out this idea that there is not unlimited money in politics now is just simply not true. The people who have been penalized are the candidates and the political parties. There are plenty of third-party groups on both sides that spend enormous amounts of money, people who write substantially larger checks, and that is both liberals, conservatives, Democrats, and Republicans. This is actually a measure, I would argue, to try to allow the parties who are more transparent and more accountable and, frankly, usually more professional to have the resources to compete with some of the outside groups. Be that as it may, the substance of my friend's process objections are real.

The other area is the Dodd-Frank area. Let me just say, that language was brought up under the separate legislation and considered; it was in Financial Services. So the idea it is being dropped in at the last minute is just not true.

Let me finish with two points. First, there is a great deal of good in this bill. There are a great many parts of this bill where we have worked together, worked well together, ranging from Ebola to the National Institutes of Health, the Native American issues. Those things ought to be enacted.

Madam Speaker, in closing, the continuing resolution we are currently operating under is due to expire at midnight tonight. I believe it is important to keep this government open and support this bipartisan, bicameral piece of legislation. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam 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, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 776 will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 5806, by the yeas and nays; and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 212, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 561]

YEAS—214

Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Pittenger
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Pitts
Bachus	Griffin (AR)	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Griffith (VA)	Pompeo
Barr	Grimm	Price (GA)
Barton	Guthrie	Reed
Benishek	Hanna	Reichert
Bentivolio	Harper	Renacci
Bilirakis	Harris	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Rice (SC)
Black	Hastings (WA)	Rigell
Blackburn	Heck (NV)	Roby
Boehner	Herrera Beutler	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Holding	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Bridenstine	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Hunter	Rokita
Bucshon	Hurt	Rooney
Burgess	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Byrne	Jenkins	Roskam
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Capito	Jolly	Royce
Carter	Joyce	Runyan
Cassidy	Kelly (PA)	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	King (NY)	Sanford
Chaffetz	Kingston	Scalise
Clawson (FL)	Kinzinger (IL)	Schock
Coble	Kline	Schweikert
Coffman	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Cole	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	Lance	Sessions
Collins (NY)	Lankford	Shimkus
Conaway	Latham	Shuster
Cook	Latta	Simpson
Cotton	LoBiondo	Smith (MO)
Cramer	Long	Smith (NE)
Crawford	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Culberson	Lummis	Southerland
Daines	Marchant	Stewart
Davis, Rodney	Marino	Stivers
Denham	McAllister	Stutzman
Dent	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
DeSantis	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
DesJarlais	McClintock	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart	McHenry	Tiberi
Duffy	McKeon	Tipton
Duncan (SC)	McKinley	Turner
Duncan (TN)	McMorris	Upton
Ellmers	Rodgers	Valadao
Farenthold	Meadows	Walorski
Fincher	Meehan	Weber (TX)
Fitzpatrick	Messer	Webster (FL)
Fleischmann	Mica	Wenstrup
Fleming	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
Flores	Miller (MI)	Whitfield
Forbes	Mullin	Williams
Fortenberry	Mulvaney	Wilson (SC)
Fox	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Noem	Womack
Gardner	Nugent	Woodall
Garrett	Nunes	Yoder
Gerlach	Nunnelee	Yoho
Gibbs	Olson	Young (AK)
Gibson	Palazzo	Young (IN)
Gingrey (GA)	Paulsen	
Goodlatte	Pearce	
Gowdy	Perry	
Granger	Petri	

NAYS—212

Adams	Capps	Cummings
Amash	Cárdenas	Davis (CA)
Bachmann	Carney	Davis, Danny
Barber	Carson (IN)	DeFazio
Barrow (GA)	Cartwright	DeGette
Bass	Castor (FL)	Delaney
Beatty	Castro (TX)	DeLauro
Becerra	Chu	DeBene
Bera (CA)	Cicilline	Deutch
Bishop (GA)	Clark (MA)	Dingell
Bishop (NY)	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Blumenauer	Clay	Doyle
Bonamici	Cleaver	Edwards
Brady (PA)	Clyburn	Ellison
Bralley (IA)	Cohen	Engel
Brat	Connolly	Enyart
Brooks (AL)	Conyers	Eshoo
Broun (GA)	Cooper	Esty
Brown (FL)	Costa	Farr
Brownley (CA)	Courtney	Fattah
Bustos	Crowley	Foster
Butterfield	Cuellar	Frankel (FL)

Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Gohmert  
Gosar  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Huelskamp  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Labrador  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack

Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe y  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lynch  
Maffei  
Maloney, Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Massie  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McColum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Michaud  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Rourke  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters (CA)  
Peters (MI)  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Pocan  
Polis  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel

Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Salmon  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sowell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Speier  
Stockman  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Camp  
Capito  
Capps  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coble  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costa  
Cotton  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Daines  
Davis, Rodney  
Delaney  
DeBene  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Enyart  
Esty  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Gardner  
Garrett

the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 275, nays 149, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 562]

YEAS—275

Aderholt  
Amash  
Amodei  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barber  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barrow (GA)  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bentivolio  
Bera (CA)  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Broun (GA)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jolly  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Keating  
Kelly (PA)  
Kilmer  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Kuster  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Lankford  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
Latta  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
Lummis  
Maffei  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McAllister  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Mullin

Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Neal  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nolan  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peters (CA)  
Peters (MI)  
Petri  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quigley  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Royce  
Ruiz  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schneider  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shea-Porter  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stockman  
Stutzman  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tipton  
Titus  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vela  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden

Walorski  
Walz  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westmoreland

Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack

NAYS—149

Adams  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Butterfield  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Grijalva

Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kind  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lynch  
Maloney, Carolyn  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McColum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
O'Rourke

Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Rybanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sowell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell  
Capuano  
Duckworth  
Gohmert

Hall  
Hensarling  
Matheson  
Miller, Gary

Negrete McLeod  
Smith (WA)

□ 1226

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell  
Capuano  
Duckworth

Hall  
Hensarling  
Matheson

Miller, Gary  
Negrete McLeod  
Smith (WA)

□ 1215

Messrs. VEASEY, DINGELL, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Messrs. GALLEGO, LARSEN of Washington, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SINEMA, Messrs. NORCROSS and CARNEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. CAMP, CASSIDY, McCLINTOCK, McALLISTER, STUTZMAN and BENTIVOLIO changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING AMERICA'S CHARITIES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5806) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and make permanent certain expiring provisions related to charitable contributions, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by