Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Nicholas Bennett for making his 1,000th half-court basketball shot on Saturday, January 24.

Let me say it is not the shot that is impressive, it is Nicholas. You see, Nicholas, a senior at North Hall High School who also has autism, has been manager of his school's varsity basketball team for 4 years. As a freshman, he made it his goal to sink 1,000 half-court shots by graduation. He has amazed his teammates by consistently making those on the way to fulfilling his promise.

Nicholas got his first-ever starting opportunity at the North Hall-Gainesville basketball game last month. He scored on the opening play and sunk his 1,000th half-court shot during halftime.

One of those people who impresses you the minute you meet him, Nicholas' kindness, determination, and dedication to his team are an inspiration. His motto is ''have faith,'' and it speaks to northeast Georgia's core values.

Today, I join with the Ninth District in recognizing Nicholas' outstanding character and wish him the best in his future endeavors. Sometimes it is not about the shots; it is about the person making the shots. And Nicholas, you remind us to have faith.

DHS SHUTDOWN

(Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call out my Republican colleagues for abandoning their duty to govern and protect our national security.

We are just hours away from asking 200,000 DHS employees who protect our country to go without pay because Republicans can't get their act together. A DHS shutdown doesn't protect us from national security threats, and it certainly doesn't solve our disagreements over immigration policy. This is nothing more than a tantrum, but even my 5-year-old son knows that tantrums are a waste of time.

It is time to grow up and govern. Will you listen to the extremists in your party who are focused on obstruction of progress, or will you listen to the majority of Americans who want us to fund DHS, want us to act on comprehensive immigration reform, and want us to govern like adults?

I urge my colleagues to pass a clean DHS funding bill.

□ 0915

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL ONE MINUTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not entertain that request at this time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POLIS. Point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, who objected to the motion?

I did not hear an objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announced that he would entertain five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side, and all those five requests have been entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Point of parliamentary inquiry. If I receive unanimous consent for a sixth request, am I not able to give that request under the rules of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is exercising his discretion not to recognize for more than five 1-minute speeches on each side.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 19 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 0925

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) at 9 o'clock and 25 minutes a.m.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2015

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 129 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 129

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 35) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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 Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to 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. COLLINS of Georgia. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a rule and the underlying bill that would provide for funding for the Department of Homeland Security for 3 weeks.

This short, six-line resolution, House Joint Resolution 35, would provide certainty by taking a shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security off the table.

So why are we here today? We are here because, last year, the President brought forward a plan to grant executive amnesty to over 4 million illegal immigrants. I believe that the administration's actions violate the rule of law, circumvent the role of the American people, and undermine the Constitution.

These actions have failed the American people. Over the last few years, the President's immigration policies have cost the Federal Government millions of dollars. They have cost our States, our communities, and our local schools and hospitals millions more.

I disagree with executive amnesty because I believe it is unwise, unlawful, and unconstitutional. That is why, 6 weeks ago, the House of Representatives did its job. We passed a bill that provided for the funding of the Department of Homeland Security and blocked the President's executive amnesty actions.

We had an expectation that the Senate would then do its work, stand up for the Constitution, while funding the Department of Homeland Security. Unfortunately, Senate Democrats, including numerous Senators who have argued repeatedly that no President can unilaterally change the law, have blocked that bill.

That is why we are here today: because Senate Democrats refuse to stand up and fight on behalf of the Constitution against the President's executive amnesty plan. We would not be here with a short-term solution if six—only six—Senate Democrats would stand up for the American people and stop the President's executive amnesty plan.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, the State of Texas and others, including my great home State of Georgia, stepped up to the plate and led a lawsuit with other States against the President and his unilateral actions. A judge in Texas ruled on that case 11 days ago and said that the President's November executive amnesty action was illegal.

As long as his injunction remains in place, no Federal dollars can be used to fund the President's executive action on immigration. That means that, for the time being, the President's plan has been stopped dead in its tracks.

In the meantime, I believe the House must do everything it can to fund the Department of Homeland Security at a critical time, which is why I stand in support of the rule that will fund the Department through March 19.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank the gentleman, my friend, Mr. COLLINS, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in this House, we use a manual of rules that was written by Thomas Jefferson. In 1801, when he began writing his manual of parliamentary procedures, he surely imagined a Chamber which followed the rules would be orderly, steadfast, and unwavering and that could govern our Nation in a respectable way; but under the current majority's rule, this House stands in deep contrast to that ideal.

Yet again, we stand on the brink, on the edge, on the precipice of a shutdown.

□ 0930

After 4 years of this kind of leadership of self-inflicted wounds and manufactured crises, one would think that the House majority would have learned their lesson. It is clear today that they have not.

First, Republicans promised when they took control of this Chamber that they would govern prudently and fairly and openly, with regular order. We haven't seen any of that.

Then last November, when Republicans took control of the Senate, we were promised that two Chambers under Republican rule would be better than one and that the games would be over. We surely haven't seen any of that either.

The House majority is not content to double down on their vendetta against the President; they want to undermine their own party in the process.

To the best of my knowledge, every President since Eisenhower—Republican and Democrat—has set some immigration enforcement and other priorities through executive order. But the majority's contempt for this President is so strong that they are engaging in an intraparty war, while Rome is burning around them, to see who can punish him the hardest.

Mr. Speaker, as we stand here debating this, the Senate is poised to send us a clean, bipartisan bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security until the end of the fiscal year. The Republican Senate, with help from Democratic Senators, is ready to do what is right for the country. But the House is so blinded by their need to discredit and disparage the President that they risk the very security of our Nation for political games.

House Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI offered Speaker BOEHNER all 188 Democratic votes on a clean bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security. He would have only needed to come up with 30. But the Speaker refused to take them. And if this dangerous continuing resolution were to pass, it will not be because of Democratic support. It will be pure Republican.

Democrats have been shut out of the process yet again. Today's closed rule brings the tally to 13 closed rules of the 18 rules passed in the 114th Congress.

The Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Jeh Johnson, sent a letter to congressional leaders yesterday which laid out what is at stake if his Department's funding is disrupted, either through shutdown or short-term continuing resolution. From maintaining airport security, to helping us recover from one of the hardest winters in generations, to guarding against cyber threats, to keeping the U.S. Coast Guard running and monitoring possible lone-wolf attacks on our homeland by ISIS, the House majority is threatening the safety and security of our Nation.

Secretary Johnson went on to say: ''As I have noted many times, mere extension of a continuing resolution has many of the same negative impacts.'' In other words, a short-term solution simply keeps us going on this cliffhanger. It ''exacerbates the uncertainty for my workforce and puts us back in the same position, on the brink of a shutdown just days from now.''

How in the world can we run the United States like this? What must the rest of the world think of us as we flounder around here trying to inflict all the pain we can on the President of the United States? And in any case, that is more important to too many Members of this House; the prime reason for being here is to tear down the government and the President.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the letter from Secretary Johnson to congressional leaders, dated 26 February 2015, for the RECORD.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, February 26, 2015.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, MINORITY LEADER REID, AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: Thank you for your leadership and efforts to pass a clean, full-year appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security. As you know, our funding expires tomorrow at midnight. I write to explain to Members of Congress the real and substantial consequences of a failure to pass a full-year appropriations bill by that deadline.

As an initial matter, it must be noted that a potential shutdown of the Department comes at a particularly challenging time for homeland security. It is stunning that we must even contemplate a shutdown of the Department in the current global context. The global terrorist threat has become more decentralized and complex. Terrorist organizations are now openly calling for attacks on Western targets. Yesterday's arrests in New York City highlight the threat of independent actors in the homeland who support overseas terrorist organizations and radical ideology. We are working hard to stay one step ahead of potential threats to aviation security. Last year at this time, the spike in migrant children began to appear at our border; we are deployed to prevent this situation from recurring, and to address it aggressively if it does. The Nation is in the midst of a very cold, harsh winter, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency is working with states impacted by record snowfalls.

Here are just some of the consequences for homeland security if the Departments funding lapses and we shut down:

First, about 170,000 employees will be required to work, but will not get paid for that work during the period of a shutdown. This includes our Coast Guard, Border Patrol agents, Secret Service agents, Transportation Security Administration officers, and others on the front lines of our homeland security. These working men and women depend on biweekly paychecks to make ends meet for themselves and their families. For them, personally, work without pay is disruptive and demoralizing. Even worse for our people are the public statements by some that make light of a shutdown, which disregards DHS employees' personal sacrifices and dedication to our Nation's security.

Second, approximately 30,000 men and women of the Department must be furloughed and sent home without pay. Our financial management, human resources, procurement and contracting, and information technology teams—the institutional backbone of the Department—will be reduced by 90 percent, from over 2,000 to just 208 people. My own immediate headquarters staff will be cut by about 87 percent. Our Science and Technology team, which is intensely focused on developing non-metallic explosive detection capabilities as well as other technologies to counter threats to aviation, will be cut 94 percent, from 448 to 26 people. Our Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, which is our Nation's primary research and development lead for development of advanced nuclear detection technologies and technical forensic capabilities, will also be cut 94 percent, from 121 to just 7 people.

Third, contracting services across the Department, including those for critical mission support activities, will be disrupted and/or interrupted altogether. Depending upon the length of a shutdown, contract awards and major acquisitions could be impacted. In the event of a shutdown, negotiations to construct the United States Coast Guard's 8th National Security Cutter will be delayed, potentially leading to an increase in costs.

Fourth, our $2.5 billion-a-year grant-making to state, local, tribal, and territorial governments, to assist them in preventing, responding to or recovering from terrorist attacks, major disasters and other emergencies, remains at a standstill (it has already stopped because the Department is currently funded by a Continuing Resolution). Of particular note, the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Emergency Management Performance Grants, which contribute 50 percent of the salaries of state and local emergency management personnel, cannot be funded.

Fifth, public assistance disaster recovery payments to communities affected by previous disasters will grind to a halt. Though these payments are funded with prior-year money, the Federal Emergency Management Agency's staff that processes them must be furloughed.

Sixth, depending upon the length of a shutdown, DHS will no longer be able to support state and local authorities with planning, safety, and security resources for special security events such as the Boston and Chicago Marathons.

Seventh, depending upon the length of a shutdown, work to complete construction of

the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility in Kansas, which will replace the aging 1950s-era Plum Island facility in New York, could be disrupted.

Eighth, new hires across the Department must be halted, disrupting critical missions to secure the border, protect millions of daily airline passengers, strengthen security at the White House, and deploy new ICE investigators. Routine attrition hiring would cease across the Department, seriously undermining our homeland security frontline staffing needs. Our plans to increase CBP staffing at our ports of entry by 2,000 officers, and to maintain the Transportation Security Administration's workforce of airport screeners and air marshals will be undermined. Our plans to hire additional Secret Service uniformed officers and special agents will also be disrupted.

Ninth, without funding, all training at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers will cease. Up to 2,000 local, state, and federal law enforcement trainees from across the country will be sent home.

Finally, as I have noted many times, mere extension of a continuing resolution has many of the same negative impacts. A short-term continuing resolution exacerbates the uncertainty for my workforce and puts us back in the same position, on the brink of a shutdown just days from now.

I urge Congress, as soon as possible, to pass a clean, full-year Fiscal Year 2015 appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

The American people are counting on us.

Sincerely.

JEH CHARLES JOHNSON,
Secretary.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. These are the consequences of the actions of this Chamber's majority, real and dangerous consequences: no certainty, no safety, no end in sight.

I say to my colleagues in the majority: The Senate is giving you a way out of this thorny, treacherous brush that you have built up around yourselves, and I urge you and I implore you to follow the path out of that brush. It is the right thing to do for the country, and it is certainly the right thing to do for this institution.

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

Mr. COLLINS OF GEORGIA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This, frankly, is an understanding. This is not being brought forward out of contempt, as has been said, Mr. Speaker, about this President. This has to do with institutional integrity, that each branch has a role, that each body within the Congress has a role. Do your job. That is all we are saying. Make compromises where need be. Work to progress where need be. But when you simply say, I will not do anything—and especially with this executive amnesty action, which we believe should not be funded—that is a valid point of view. We have got to come to the table. But when the administration refuses to negotiate, the American people see truly that we are not functioning, not because of this House, but because of what is happening through, frankly, a frustrating policy from this administration which wants to bypass Congress.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say, a negotiation took place, and that is why a bipartisan bill is passing the Senate at this very moment.

I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlelady from New York.

Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about here is simply kicking the can down the road for 3 weeks. The facts on the ground don't change in 3 weeks. Guess what, President Obama is still President of the United States in 3 weeks. Guess what, HARRY REID is still the minority leader with enough votes to prevent something from reaching the 60-vote threshold in the Senate.

All we are doing is giving the Republicans yet another chance 3 weeks from now to remind the American children of undocumented parents that they want to deport Mom and Dad and to remind DREAMers, aspiring Americans who grew up here and know no other country, that they should be deported to a country they don't even know, haven't been to, and might not even speak the language of. That is not the way to win friends and influence people.

Look, when you are going to people in an election cycle, it doesn't matter how great your agenda is. It might be great for their economics and their pocketbook; it might be great for their values. But you know what, if you are trying to deport Mom and Dad, you are not going to get past the front door.

Yet here we are, sending ourselves on a cycle where every 3 weeks, every 2 weeks, every 6 weeks, apparently, the Republicans want to remind American children that they want to deport Mom and Dad. Apparently the Republicans want to remind young people who grew up here, who know no other country, who might want to serve in our military, who might be a cheerleader or on the football team at high school with your kids, Mr. Speaker, that they, too, should be deported to a country that they don't know, where they speak a language that they might not even speak.

That is just simply not a winning electoral strategy, and it is contrary to our values as Americans. It is against family values. It is against the values of our Nation, as a nation of immigrants and a nation of laws.

Those two can be reconciled through sensible, comprehensive immigration reform that addresses our broken immigration system. And yes, it is broken; and yes, President Obama's first steps don't completely fix it; but together, we can make it work.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), my good friend, who is a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I come today, of course, to speak on the rule and to encourage passage of the rule and encourage passage of the underlying bill, funding the Department of Homeland Security for the next 21 days.

I would remind this body that the House, last month, funded the Department of Homeland Security until the end of the fiscal year, September 30. We have since awaited activity over in the Senate or over in the other body, and that activity, unfortunately, has not been forthcoming. So we are left, again, with a deadline situation; and the House leadership, responsibly, has stepped up to provide temporary funding for the next 21 days.

The problem, of course, goes back to November when the House did not want to fund the President's illegal, unlawful amnesty. It turns out a Federal judge in Texas agreed with us here in the House that it was an illegal amnesty.

But in reference to the comments just made here on the House floor, here is a pop quiz for everyone. What country is more welcoming than any other country on the face of the Earth? What country allows more people in legally than all other countries combined? Well, that country is the United States of America.

Last year, over 1 million individuals were welcomed into this country legally, and it has been so every year that I have been in the Congress for the last 12 years. That is 12 million people, just using simple math. All we ask is that you simply follow existing law.

For people who want to say our immigration system is broken, I would submit that what is broken is our enforcement system. You had only to look to the southern border last summer and see the flood of unaccompanied minors coming over—not sneaking across the border, simply walking across the border and turning themselves in—and this country was required to deal with that on an emergent basis. The State of Texas was required to deal with that on an emergent basis.

There was a lot of discussion as to why that surge happened. I think there is a link back to the President saying: I am going to suspend enforcement of some of our immigration laws. It sent a message. It sent a message to people: Y'all come. Y'all come. The doors are open. If you get here in time, guess what. You won't have to worry about our laws.

That was the wrong message because, as a consequence, States, like my State of Texas, were required to deal with the influx and were required to deal with the increase in social programs that were then called upon to provide those services that had never been budgeted before because they were, by definition, unexpected.

I agree that we do have a problem, and the problem is the porosity of the southern border, particularly in the Lower Rio Grande Valley sector in the State of Texas.

The former Governor of Texas, Rick Perry, met with the President in Dallas and invited him down to the border to come and see what we are dealing with, and the President refused. Well, many of us have been to the border. Bipartisan trips have been conducted to the border, to the Lower Rio Grande Valley sector.

Thank goodness for the men and women who show up there to work every day. Federal, State, and local sheriffs show up to work every day to keep our country safe. And right now, the lion's share of the enforcement on the border, of the protection on the border, is being done by the Texas Department of Safety, the highway patrol. The people who are supposed to be out catching speeders on the freeway are actually in boats on the Rio Grande to enforce our border security because it is national security.

Lieutenant Governor Patrick, when he was running for election, said over and over again: The security of the southern border is a Federal responsibility, but it is our problem, as State leaders.

So they have stepped up and they have spent money. They have committed money. They have committed people and equipment to that southern border, equipment that should have been pledged by the President of the United States and Department of Homeland Security.

Former Governor Perry offered President Obama an opportunity to come to the border to see what the problem was. The President refused. I think that was a mistake. I think the President should have traveled to the southern border.

The reality is that many of the Customs and Border Patrol individuals are not even on the border. They are one county in, dealing with the people who have now trekked across some of the most dangerous desert and difficult country around, who have been picked up by Customs and Border Patrol now 40, 50, 80 miles from the southern border.

The problem is not solved by the President's executive order. The problem is exacerbated. The President is throwing gasoline on the fire on our southern border, and that needs to stop. Thank goodness a Federal judge recognized that, and at least the process temporarily has been halted.

The answer, though, is to enforce existing law, protect and defend our border, as all of us were sworn to do when we took that oath of office. That is the type of reform that is needed.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New York, the ranking member, for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I come this morning with some good news that should make us all very comfortable. We have received an intelligence dispatch from ISIS and ISIL, and the good news is that they have decided to finance their terrorist attacks against the United States and the people of the United States based on a continuing resolution, based on short-term funding. They are going to finance the hijacking of airplanes, attacks on Americans, attacks on our Embassies on a 3-week spending resolution.

Sound preposterous? So is what the House Republicans are doing to our Department of Homeland Security.

□ 0945

It is a disservice to the American people, and it undermines our homeland security. This is not a game, Mr. Speaker. Three terrorists in Brooklyn were arrested yesterday. They were planning to do three things: one, they were planning to hijack airplanes; two, they were planning to kill cops; and three, they were planning to assassinate the President. There is one department in the Federal agencies that protects us from hijacking airplanes, assassinating the President, and helps protect us from killing cops. It is the Department of Homeland Security.

Those terrorists were not planning these terrorist attacks based on kicking the can in their budgets. They were planning those terrorist attacks based on doing whatever it took at whatever the cost to inflict harm on this country.

What are House Republicans doing in the face of that threat? They are kicking the can with 3-week spending resolutions because they disagree with the President on an executive order on immigration. They have the right to their disagreements, Mr. Speaker. If you don't like immigration, debate it. If you don't like an executive order, oppose it. But do not undermine the safety of the American people by weakening the Department of Homeland Security with short-term funding resolutions while our terrorist opponents and enemies are financing those attacks every single day for as long as it takes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at this point in time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I don't come to the well and speak on rules. I think the gentlewoman from New York will almost not recognize me on the House floor in this capacity. But I think this is an extremely important rule, and I think the last two minority Members made the point for me very well, and I would just like to maybe comment on it for just a moment.

Mr. POLIS is a dear friend of mine that I have cosponsored and I am cosponsoring legislation with. He and I agree on a great deal. He talked about the question of whether this was American to do what we are doing. Nothing could be more quintessentially American than to say when we have a real difference of opinion between two bodies—in this case the House and the Senate—that we want to provide an opportunity to reconcile those differences and to go to conference, to spend a week or two, as necessary, publicly, as the rules require, debating the differences between our visions.

Democrats in the Senate have been able to keep us from having any kind of a comment on the President's acts, which have been ruled by a Federal judge as unlawful and unconstitutional.

Now, I just got basically told ''shame on you'' by my other colleague, and I really can't understand that. He knows that there is a real difference of opinion in this body between what the President can do and what he is doing. He said, and I am paraphrasing: Please don't shut down the government because you disagree. Just disagree.

Mr. Speaker, the President has made it very clear time and time again that the wrong place to argue with him is on a debt limit, the wrong place to argue is on a budget, and now the wrong place to argue is on our one constitutional absolute, which is the power of the purse.

Mr. Speaker, there is no more important place to reconcile these differences than when we are debating the power of the purse. The President has said he has the authority. Fine. A Federal judge will decide that. But the House can decide whether or not to fund him. It is our obligation to decide whether or not his spending of the American people's hard-earned money is, in fact, consistent with the best interests of the American people.

Now, I want immigration reform. I want every aspect of it. I have hard-working farm families in my district who cannot live without an effective solution for an out-of-control farm labor base. Almost every farm laborer in California either is or was unlawfully in this country at one time. We have held up other immigration waiting to try to get an agreement with the Senate.

If we do not begin today by creating space in our democracy for the healthy debate between the two bodies over the next 3 weeks, then we have shirked our duty. If we simply shut down and give up, we have shirked our duty. If we simply capitulate and fund whatever the President wants—just a blank check—we might as well just say, Spend such funds as you may need to, and go home. That is not what the American people want us to do. They want us to reasonably provide the advice and consent when it comes to appropriation.

This bill was intended to do it. The 3-week extension gives the President a full 3 weeks to wage, if you will, his view with the American people, the Senate to do so, but I desperately want the healthy public debate between Members of the House, Members of the Senate, Democrats and Republicans, on what we will do going forward. I would hope my colleagues on the Rules Committee would vote with me, if not on the rule, then certainly on the passage of 3 weeks to give democracy a chance,

3 weeks for our Republic to do what is enshrined in the Constitution, what has been the policy of these two bodies for over 230 years. Provide the 3 weeks, go to conference, publicly debate the differences between the House, the Senate, Republicans and Democrats, the President and, quite frankly, a Federal judge, in front of the American people.

I have been here 14 years; we have been working on immigration problems. The President has been President for 6 years; we have been working on immigration problems. Three weeks of healthy debate, nothing could be more appropriate in our great Republic.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, anyone who says that we are going to let down the guard on national defense because we are having a healthy debate and we have continued full funding of the Department of Homeland Security simply is not being genuine in the discourse. The fact is, 3 weeks of full funding is exactly the right thing to do. Our enemies will know that we take homeland security seriously, but we also take immigration seriously.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. BURGESS from Texas, said one thing that should be repeated in this body every single time we use the word ''immigration'': America allows more people to come here through the front door not more than just any country in the world but more than all the countries of the world combined. Over 1.2 million people will immigrate to this country legally this year. We are generous beyond any other country in the world. So no one can say we are not pro-immigrant. We are. But there are 11 million people in this country who are unaccounted for, and getting it right and spending those dollars wisely is Mr. BURGESS' requirement, and it is my requirement. To all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, vote ''yes,'' make this happen, and we will have a healthy debate in our Republic.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I have to note we just heard my friend, Mr. ISSA, I think reveal what is really going on here. He said, and I think I am quoting him correctly, referencing the President, that we don't have to fund him. Well, with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, this is not about funding the President. This is about the decision of this body and the Senate, the Republicans in charge, to continue to kick the can down the road and not fund the most essential government function, and that is public safety and national security.

So let's be clear about what is going on here. This is a manufactured, deliberate political crisis intended to deflect attention from the fact that for 7 weeks—7 weeks in session—we have not seen any of the democratic deliberation that my friends on the other side have referred to. They could have brought a funding bill in the first week, in the second week, in the third week, in the fourth week, in the fifth week, in the sixth week, or the seventh week that we have been here on the floor of the House. But have they? No.

On the last day before the Department of Homeland Security shuts down, after 7 weeks in session, what do we get? Three weeks of funding. What changes in 3 weeks? What can you do in the next 3 weeks that you have been completely incapable of doing in the last 7 weeks? I don't see anything changing.

While the American people are at home worrying about how they work harder every day and can't seem to get ahead, that they can't seem to put the money aside to put their kids through college, and they can't seem to put the money aside to make sure that when they retire they are going to be able to enjoy the fruits of their labor, those are the questions that the American people have.

We have a Republican majority in the House and the Senate that can't even seem to act on the simplest question of providing for national security. If they are so concerned, Mr. Speaker, about immigration policy, bring an immigration bill to the floor of the House. Do your job. Legislate on the question of immigration and provide for national defense.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there is something I will agree with the previous speaker on. I agree this is not about the President. It is about the process. It is about what we have all gone through and said, this is how a bill becomes the law. If we need a reminder, then let's talk about that.

Mr. Speaker, one of the questions that was just said is why we would bring, why, when we have been here for the last 6 weeks bringing spending bills and sending them over—let's talk about what we did do. January 14, the House approves a full-year funding bill for DHS. February 3, Senate Democrats vote to block consideration. February 4, Senate Democrats vote again to block consideration. Uh oh, February 5, around Groundhog Day, somewhere in that neighborhood, Senate Democrats vote a third time to block consideration. February 23, in case they forgot, Senate Democrats vote for a fourth time to block consideration. Democrats even prevented themselves from offering amendments to strip the language that they found offensive.

Mr. Speaker, is there just not a problem being developed here? We find ourselves in a position today because Senate Democrats refuse to be part of the solution. Again, this goes back to basic civics. Let's work this out. Let's do what we need to do. This is about giving us time to let the process work. And as the gentleman had said earlier, what could be different? Maybe this will be different. Maybe the Senate Democrats will learn they are in the minority. The American people spoke in November, and it is time that we work together to find solutions.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from New York. We are here today to do a single job, and that should be to fund fully the Department of Homeland Security. Anything else is an abdication of our responsibility. Anything else is an act of legislative malpractice simply because of the inability of my friends on the other side of the aisle to satisfy the thirst of the extreme right-wing anti-immigration base of the party. So we are playing political games at a time when the safety and the security of the American people are being threatened.

I know that all too well, Mr. Speaker, because earlier this week the FBI uncovered a plot in Brooklyn in the communities that I represent where individuals sought to impart bombs to the Coney Island neighborhood that I represent. And yet we are here playing games, government by crisis. This, of course, is nothing new: fiscal cliff, sequestration, 16-day government shutdown in October of 2013, a flirtation with defaulting on our debt, and now we want to shut down the Department of Homeland Security because my friends on the other side of the aisle can't get their act together.

We need all hands on deck right now, Mr. Speaker. That means the FBI, the CIA, the NSA, and the Department of Homeland Security working together. Why would we want to either shut the Department down or create a level of uncertainty where people within the Department of Homeland Security are distracted when we know that the terrorists only have to be right once and where we have to be correct 100 percent of the time in order to protect the American people?

You claim to be strict constructionists as it relates to the Constitution. We have an article I legislative branch, an article II executive branch, and an article III judicial branch. The Founders said if there is a conflict, if you have got concerns, if you have got constitutional issues, then let the judicial branch work it out. That is what is going on right now.

□ 1000

We should be doing our job instead of taking the American people on another reckless legislative joyride that is simply going to crash and burn, this time affecting the safety and security of the American people.

They want us to focus on good-paying jobs. They want us to focus on retirement security, higher education affordability, better childcare, strengthening the middle class and all those

who aspire to be part of it. They want us to further the American Dream. But we are here playing games with their safety and security. It is a shame.

Let's get back to doing the business of the American people. Vote down this rule, and vote down the underlying 3-week reckless extension.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, again, I greatly respect my friends across the aisle, but we do have to understand exactly what we are bringing forward is not a bill we are bringing forward to shut down the government. We are bringing something forward to fund it for the next 3 weeks while we continue to work on a process of getting stuff done.

Again, I agree with my colleagues. We are trying to fight. We had to work on the 529 plan that, frankly, the administration had some issues with. We fixed that here in the House this week. We are working on the problems that matter to kitchen tables around this country. Republicans are doing that, but they are also standing up for what we learned in civics lessons, is that this is the way the legislative process works.

If I just need to repeat it one more time, let's go through it once more. January 14, the House did its job. It approved a full-year spending bill. February 3, Senate Democrats voted to block consideration. February 4, Senate Democrats vote again to block consideration. February 5, Senate Democrats vote a third time to block consideration again—as we will go along, as you know, February 23, same story, three times, fourth time removed.

Democrats even prevented themselves from offering amendments to strip language they found offensive. I guess, after so many years of not being able to offer amendments, they forgot how. They are preventing their own selves from doing this in the Senate. It is time we act. This is the issue that we are dealing with today and will continue to do so.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from New York for the time; and my good friend, as well, on the Rules Committee, let me thank you for the time. We share time on the Judiciary Committee. He is a good friend.

In this instance, I vigorously disagree and say that it is about the President. It is about the President on every term, from the Affordable Care Act to his reasoned, constitutionally premised response to the tragedy of undocumented individuals in this country over and over again. It is about the President. It is about the President when there is not one item that the President has put forward that you are agreeing to.

Right now, let me change my story because I am here today—though I wanted to honor a dear person who is in my district today, and I am not able to be there, I was leaving last night—but because of this immediate crisis and the foolery that is going on, the ignoring of the words of the experts, such as the Secretary of Homeland Security, that says as an initial matter in a letter he sent to all of us, it must be noted that a potential shutdown of the Department comes at a particularly challenging time for Homeland Security.

It is stunning that we must even contemplate a shutdown of the Department in the current global context. The global terrorist threat has become more decentralized and complex. The FBI Director said that there is an ISIS-ISIL cell in every State.

Mr. Speaker, the tomfoolery of Republicans is absurd, that they are willing to play with the lives of Americans, that they are willing to throw under the bus the thousands upon thousands of important, essential, and crucial workers in the Department of Homeland Security. The FBI said, under this new fusion of work together, that the Department of Homeland Security is crucial.

In my district, people are coming up to my staff and asking, What is going to happen in Houston—a place where, when we were in the midst of 9/11, there were rumors about planes going to the energy sector.

This is a foolish position that we are in. I demand that we vote for a clean DHS bill that is coming from the Senate. This is foolish. This is outrageous. I cannot understand what is going on with Republicans that they are, in essence, killing us here in this House. This is absurd.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think it is sort of interesting—and I appreciate my colleague from Texas—but I think the well-reasoned response of the administration to the issue that is going on, I think there just happens to be a contrary opinion found in a Federal judge in Texas, so maybe so much for the well-reasoned opinion.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, the House went through regular order to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security, but in keeping with our constitutional right, we elected to not fund the President's executive amnesty.

We have a policy difference with the President, that is clear. He supports amnesty; we support the rule of law. Let's debate that. HARRY REID and the President want to play games and, in doing so, are jeopardizing America's security to win political points. It is sad.

Republicans funded the Department of Homeland Security. We have not funded the President's illegal actions. Now, Democrats are playing politics with it. This is not the time or place. This is about funding the Department of Homeland Security, which we have done. Now, Senate Democrats are playing political gamesmanship to defend his executive amnesty.

Democrats are the ones putting the Department of Homeland Security in peril to defend an illegal action taken by this President. We have passed a bill that funds every aspect of the Department of Homeland Security, except for the President's illegal actions. That is a reasonable stand to make.

President Obama did what he said he couldn't do more than 20 times. He said he couldn't do what he did. He went outside the bounds of the Constitution to make law that was politically expedient, in his point of view. He didn't work with the legislative branch. He went outside of it. We disagree with that action. We have the power of the purse. It is our responsibility to appropriate money and to make law.

The House has funded the Department of Homeland Security, and we have responsibility to go through regular order to do so. We did that. HARRY REID and the President are the ones throwing a temper tantrum right now.

This rule for this bill is necessary. Let's pass this rule. Let's pass this bill. Let's fund the Department of Homeland Security. Let's stop playing political brinksmanship.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair asks Members to refrain from making improper references to the President.

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

The Department of Homeland Security will run out of money and shut down tonight. House Democrats, Senate Democrats, the White House, and Senate Republicans all agree on what to do to pass the bipartisan bill to fully fund the Department for the rest of the fiscal year.

The Republican majority in the House of Representatives is the only one standing in the way. Our next vote on ordering the previous question will be a vote on whether to continue down that dangerous path or to govern responsibly and to put our national security ahead of partisan politics.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member on Appropriations, to discuss how essential it is that we pass a clean full-year appropriations bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge this House to immediately take up and pass a clean funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

By defeating the previous question on the pending rule, we can immediately make in order a clean Homeland Security bill and stop the theatrics over the President's use of executive orders. My colleague Ms. ROYBAL-

ALLARD and I made several similar attempts, which were unfortunately defeated on party-line votes.

It is my sincere hope that my friends on the other side of the aisle are now prepared to end this standoff with only hours left before the Department of Homeland Security shuts down. Republicans are playing a dangerous game with our security.

As the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, I was involved in the bipartisan, bicameral negotiations on the omnibus spending bill that passed the House and Senate and was signed by the President last December.

That package could have contained all 12 annual spending bills because all 12 were negotiated in conference—bipartisan, Democrats and Republicans—and every one of them was ready to go; but an unfortunate decision was made by the leadership of this body to omit the Homeland Security bill, not because there were outstanding issues or continued disputes.

That bill was stripped from the omnibus because some in this body were upset by the President's executive order on immigration. They even admitted the President's actions had little to do with the Homeland Security Appropriations bill, yet that was the choice that was made on how to proceed.

The Homeland Security Appropriations bill was forced to operate under a continuing resolution instead of having a full-year bill. Ironically, it meant that the Customs and Border Protection and Immigration and Customs Enforcement, two of the agencies tasked with defending our borders and enforcing our immigration laws, had to do without the nearly $1 billion increase they would have gotten under the full-year bill.

Delaying the full-year bill limits the Department's ability to advance the Secretary's unity of effort initiative, designed to improve coordination in our security missions; limits the ability of the Secretary to move ahead with the Southern Border and Approaches Campaign; creates uncertainty regarding ICE's capacity to detain and deport dangerous criminals; complicates the Department's ability to deal with another influx of unaccompanied children at our border stations; delays implementation of the new security upgrades at the White House and hiring increases of the U.S. Secret Service; and delays terrorism preparedness and response grants for State and local public safety personnel.

I do understand that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle feel quite strongly about the President's use of executive orders on immigration policy; but do they have the courage of their convictions to look the first responders they represent in the eye and tell them that they are holding up critical assistance to firefighters, law enforcement, EMTs, and emergency managers because of an ideological fight over immigration?

My friends, this is disgraceful. This is irresponsible. The Homeland Security bill should never have been held hostage.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. LOWEY. With only hours left until the Republican shutdown, hasn't this gone on long enough? Isn't it time to abandon this failed strategy and pass a clean full-year bill?

To that end, I urge this whole House to join me today in defeating the previous question so that my colleague, Ms. SLAUGHTER, can offer an amendment to provide a clean full-year appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think the question that was just asked, Mr. Speaker, on the floor is: Do we have the courage to tell first responders and others that we will fund and put forward a bill to keep funding going for 3 years? The answer is a resounding ''yes.''

The question would be to my friends across the aisle: Do you have the courage to tell them that, this afternoon, you are going to vote ''no?'' That is the better question.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, what we ought to have the courage to do is to tell all our Homeland Security personnel, We are going to fund you through the end of this year, as we have told every other employee in the Federal Government that is protecting us and serving us on a day-to-day basis.

Mr. Speaker, the majority party said to the American people in a pledge to America:

> We will end the practice of packaging unpopular bills with ''must-pass'' legislation.

The funding of the Department of Homeland Security is a must-pass piece of legislation, legislation to circumvent the will of the American people.

> Instead, we will advance major legislation one issue at a time.

Mr. Speaker, they are breaking that pledge today.

□ 1015

PETER KING, the former Republican chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, said this: ''If a clean bill comes here, as we expect to happen in just a few hours, we have to accept and vote on it.'' He then said, in reference to this cul-de-sac strategy that the majority party is following of continuing to go into a dead end, he said this, PETER KING: ''I think up to this point, we've engaged in an exercise of tactical malpractice. Self-delusion is self-destructive.''

There is not a Republican in this House who believes this strategy will do anything but run them back into that cul-de-sac that they went into in December, at the expense of the confidence of Americans that their Department of Homeland Security, tasked to make them safe, tasked to provide for the security of this Nation, will, in fact, be operating on a full basis.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter dated yesterday from Secretary Jeh Johnson and read this key excerpt from it. Secretary Johnson said: ''Finally, as I have noted many times, mere extension of a continuing resolution has many of the same negative impacts''—outlined in this letter. ''A short-term continuing resolution exacerbates the uncertainty for my workforce and puts us back in the same position, on the brink of a shutdown.''

For those Republicans who believe that we ought to do the responsible thing, as PETER KING has said, vote against the previous question. Vote for a rule that provides for the consideration of the Senate-passed bill, which they, 98–2, decided to put on the floor because they thought it was good policy.

> KEY EXCERPT: ''Finally, as I have noted many times, mere extension of a continuing resolution has many of the same negative impacts. A short-term continuing resolution exacerbates the uncertainty for my workforce and puts us back in the same position, on the brink of a shutdown just days from now.''

FEBRUARY 26, 2015.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, MINORITY LEADER REID, AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI:

Thank you for your leadership and efforts to pass a clean, full-year appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security. As you know, our funding expires tomorrow at midnight. I write to explain to Members of Congress the real and substantial consequences of a failure to pass a full-year appropriations bill by that deadline.

As an initial matter, it must be noted that a potential shutdown of the Department comes at a particularly challenging time for homeland security. It is stunning that we must even contemplate a shutdown of the Department in the current global context. The global terrorist threat has become more decentralized and complex. Terrorist organizations are now openly calling for attacks on Western targets. Yesterday's arrests in New York City highlight the threat of independent actors in the homeland who support overseas terrorist organizations and radical ideology. We are working hard to stay one step ahead of potential threats to aviation security. Last year at this time, the spike in migrant children began to appear at our border; we are deployed to prevent this situation from recurring, and to address it aggressively if it does. The Nation is in the midst of a very cold, harsh winter, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency is working with states impacted by record snowfalls.

Here are just some of the consequences for homeland security if the Department's funding lapses and we shut down:

First, about 170,000 employees will be required to work, but will not get paid for that work during the period of a shutdown. This includes our Coast Guard, Border Patrol agents, Secret Service agents, Transportation Security Administration officers, and

others on the front lines of our homeland security. These working men and women depend on biweekly paychecks to make ends meet for themselves and their families. For them, personally, work without pay is disruptive and demoralizing. Even worse for our people are the public statements by some that make light of a shutdown, which disregards DHS employees' personal sacrifices and dedication to our Nation's security.

Second, approximately 30,000 men and women of the Department must be furloughed and sent home without pay. Our financial management, human resources, procurement and contracting, and information technology teams—the institutional backbone of the Department—will be reduced by 90 percent, from over 2,000 to just 208 people. My own immediate headquarters staff will be cut by about 87 percent. Our Science and Technology team, which is intensely focused on developing non-metallic explosive detection capabilities as well as other technologies to counter threats to aviation, will be cut 94 percent, from 448 to 26 people. Our Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, which is our Nation's primary research and development lead for development of advanced nuclear detection technologies and technical forensic capabilities, will also be cut 94 percent, from 121 to just 7 people.

Third, contracting services across the Department, including those for critical mission support activities, will be disrupted and/or interrupted altogether. Depending upon the length of a shutdown, contract awards and major acquisitions could be impacted. In the event of a shutdown, negotiations to construct the United States Coast Guard's 8th National Security Cutter will be delayed, potentially leading to an increase in costs.

Fourth, our $2.5 billion-a-year grant-making to state, local, tribal, and territorial governments, to assist them in preventing, responding to or recovering from terrorist attacks, major disasters and other emergencies, remains at a standstill (it has already stopped because the Department is currently funded by a Continuing Resolution). Of particular note, the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Emergency Management Performance Grants, which contribute 50 percent of the salaries of state and local emergency management personnel, cannot be funded.

Fifth, public assistance disaster recovery payments to communities affected by previous disasters will grind to a halt. Though these payments are funded with prior-year money, the Federal Emergency Management Agency's staff that processes them must be furloughed.

Sixth, depending upon the length of a shutdown, DHS will no longer be able to support state and local authorities with planning, safety, and security resources for special security events such as the Boston and Chicago Marathons.

Seventh, depending upon the length of a shutdown, work to complete construction of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility in Kansas, which will replace the aging 1950s-era Plum Island facility in New York, could be disrupted.

Eighth, new hires across the Department must be halted, disrupting critical missions to secure the border, protect millions of daily airline passengers, strengthen security at the White House, and deploy new ICE investigators. Routine attrition hiring would cease across the Department, seriously undermining our homeland security frontline staffing needs. Our plans to increase CBP staffing at our ports of entry by 2,000 officers, and to maintain the Transportation Security Administration's workforce of airport screeners and air marshals will be undermined. Our plans to hire additional Secret Service uniformed officers and special agents will also be disrupted.

Ninth, without funding, all training at the Federal Law ''Enforcement Training Centers'' will cease. Up to 2,000 local, state, and federal law enforcement trainees from across the country will be sent home.

Finally, as I have noted many times, mere extension of a continuing resolution has many of the same negative impacts. A short-term continuing resolution exacerbates the uncertainty for my workforce and puts us back in the same position, on the brink of a shutdown just days from now.

I urge Congress, as soon as possible, to pass a clean, full-year Fiscal Year 2015 appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

The American people are counting on us.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if the gentleman from Georgia has any further speakers? I am ready to close if he does not.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. We have no more speakers at this time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman. Then I shall close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this intraparty dysfunction, governing from crisis to crisis and self-inflicted wounds, must come to an end. Our Nation's very security is at stake, and the American people are crying out for stability, for certainty, and for responsible government. Let's give them that.

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 gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' to defeat the previous question. Vote ''no'' on the underlying rule and the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It has been really an interesting morning discussing what we could do, what we not do, and what we have done, and, actually, the fact and the process of the House doing its job again and the Senate Democrats not doing theirs. It is just very frustrating.

You talk about the American people. I tell you, from a Republican standpoint, this is about administration. This is about a time in which we are confronting, in which there is honest debate on both sides, but when it comes down to the bottom line, it has been very true over the course of these first 7, 8 weeks here that one party is putting forward an agenda that says that moms and dads and kids matter, that the rule of law matters, that things are to operate in a certain way, and they are operating in the way that we grew up knowing civics from our Founders that had a Constitution that laid out the path.

What is interesting right now is that really, right now, the House Republicans, for the second time, are providing a path to keep the Department of Homeland Security open for business while the judge, Federal judge, has said the administration cannot go forward on their executive amnesty memo, which means it is not happening right now. So the question really becomes—and I don't think this can be stated enough, because when people are out there looking to Washington, they are wanting to know: Are you thinking about me? Are you thinking about what is going on? Are you thinking about what we need to fund in the days that people get up and they know that their country is fighting for them?

So I just want to make it very clear. We said, ''for the second time.'' This is the second time because the first time happened on January 14. The House approved a full-year funding package for DHS, and yes, said this is what we do not like and will not fund, but this is a part of the process.

Then, February 3, Senate Democrats vote to block consideration.

February 4, Senate Democrats again vote to block consideration.

February 5, guess what. Senate Democrats vote for a third time to block consideration.

February 23, let's at least make it a home run. We will touch all the bases. Senate Democrats refuse, for the fourth time, to block consideration.

But then, the most amazing part, Democrats even prevented themselves from offering amendments to strip language they found offensive. We are here today because the Senate Democrats refused to be part of the solution.

So as I go forward and as I look at this, there has to be an understanding of this today—and it was said earlier and I made the point, but I am going to make it one more time today—a solution is being put forward. There is no one putting forward a bill to shut anything down. The bill that is being put forward is to fund for 3 more weeks.

So I will encourage my friends on the other side of the aisle, any Democrat who wants to vote ''no'' on this funding bill, you are voting to shut down the Department of Homeland Security. Is that what you want to tell the American people?

With that, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 129 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

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. 861) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled

by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. 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. 861.

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. COLLINS of Georgia. 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.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 183, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—240

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

NAYS—183

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine

Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Farr
Garamendi
Graves (MO)
Hinojosa
Lee
Long
Roe (TN)
Speier
Turner

□ 1049

Mr. NADLER changed his vote from ''yea'' to nay.''

Messrs. MICA, LAMBORN, and Mrs. HARTZLER changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 183, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

YEAS—240

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

NAYS—183

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Boyle, Brendan F.
Garamendi
Graves (MO)
Hinojosa
Lee
Long
Roe (TN)
Speier
Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1056

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.

Stated against:

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 101, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote yesterday and this morning because of a serious illness in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted: rollcall No. 95—"nay," rollcall No. 96—"nay," rollcall No. 97—"nay," rollcall No. 98—"nay," rollcall No. 99—"nay," rollcall No. 100—"yea," rollcall No. 101—"yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 27, I missed a series of rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on No. 100 and No. 101.

□ 1100

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 129, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 35) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). Pursuant to House Resolution 129, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 35

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015 (Public Law 113–164) is further amended by striking the date specified in section 106(3) and inserting ''March 19, 2015''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 35.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present H.J. Res. 35, a short-term continuing resolution to keep the Department of Homeland Security open and operating until March 19, 2015.

This type of bandaid, stopgap funding fix is not the way we should be running things around here. It is the constitutional duty of this body to provide

funding for the Federal Government, all of the Federal Government, and this should be done through regular order, without the threat of shutdowns or the lurching uncertainty of continuing resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, we face an immediate deadline that makes this continuing resolution a necessity. Without it, the Department of Homeland Security will shutter its doors at the stroke of midnight tonight.

This would put thousands of Federal employees on furlough, waste taxpayer dollars, and create instability at the Department tasked with one of the most important functions of government, potentially risking our national security.

The House must pass this bill in short order to keep the lights on at the Department of Homeland Security in the near term. Hopefully, this will buy us the additional time necessary.

I would prefer and I hope that we pass the full-year, regular DHS funding bill that we negotiated on a bipartisan, bicameral basis last fall. Until both Chambers of Congress agree on how to do that, we must continue to fund the essential daily operations of our homeland security.

At the same time, Congress must continue to fight the President's executive actions on immigration, a massive overreach of his constitutional authority and a substantial shift in our immigration policy that I do not support and the American people do not support.

I believe we can and should continue the fight on the President's intrusion into our Constitution, but we must also maintain the functions of government that protect the rights and safety given to us by this hallowed document.

We have no time to waste, Mr. Speaker. I ask that my colleagues in the House today keep in mind that, as elected Members of the House of Representatives, it is our constitutional duty to fund the government, to protect the people who elected us, and to defend this great Nation.

I urge an ''aye'' on the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

We learned late last night that the House Republican leadership has stepped in to thwart the agreement reached in the Senate to fund the Homeland Security Department. As we all know, funding for these critical activities runs out tonight at midnight.

We learned that, instead of taking the clean bill that would fund the Department for the remainder of this fiscal year, the House has come up with a new plan, a plan to string this mess out even further—the new plan, to pass yet another continuing resolution, 150 days into this fiscal year. This is really discouraging.

Additionally, we learned that the House leadership has decided now would be a good time to formally request a conference committee be convened on the controversial immigration riders passed by the House bill and the Senate's clean bill.

As hard as it is to believe, they really think requesting a conference with the Senate, on the very day funding expires, is reasonable. I could not disagree more.

I understand that many of my colleagues disagree vehemently with the President's executive actions on immigration policy. I understand that many of those same Members believe strongly that they should fight the President through the power of the purse, the appropriations process.

What I don't understand is how a decision could be made to wreak havoc on one of the most important agencies in the Federal Government, the agency tasked with protecting our Nation's homeland, over policies related to an agency that isn't even directly funded in this appropriations bill.

Under a continuing resolution, the agencies that are funded through the Department of Homeland Security are hamstrung, forced to live at last year's levels and under last year's terms.

Ironically, this means that Customs and Border Protection and Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the agencies tasked with defending our borders and enforcing our immigration laws, have to do without the nearly $1 billion increase they would get under the full-year bill.

Instead of pursuing the bipartisan path—and I want to remind my friends that this Homeland Security bill was negotiated right here between Democrats and Republicans, a bipartisan bill; but, right now, instead of pursuing the bipartisan path the Senate has chosen, the House leadership has chosen yet another punt.

By not passing the clean, full-year bill, the House plan would delay terrorism preparedness and response grants for State and local public safety personnel, potentially leaving FEMA with insufficient time to get those grants out before funding expires.

It would limit the Department's ability to advance the Secretary's unity of effort initiative, designed to improve coordination in our security missions; limit the ability of the Secretary to move ahead with the Southern Border and Approaches Campaign; create uncertainty regarding ICE's capability to detain and deport dangerous criminals; complicate the Department's ability to deal with another influx of unaccompanied children at our border; and delay implementation of new security upgrades at the White House and necessary hiring at the U.S. Secret Service.

My colleagues, I am simply at a loss. I am mystified. I can't understand the wisdom of this strategy.

I know some of my colleagues are upset with the President. I understand how much easier it is to take out your frustrations on the appropriations process, instead of through debate on an immigration policy bill, and we know we must have a serious debate on immigration policy.

I support comprehensive immigration reform; but why should we would do this in such an inappropriate way through the appropriations process? Don't take out your frustrations on the appropriations process instead of a thorough debate on the immigration policy bill.

I think the majority of my colleagues agree with me that this has gone on long enough. It is not rational to punish firefighters, EMTs, police officers, emergency managers you represent because of immigration policy. It is not rational to hamstring U.S. Customs and Border Protection or Immigration and Customs Enforcement because you are mad at the President.

We are adults. I left my eight grandchildren home. We are adults, I hope, in this body. It is not rational to fund an important government department week by week.

I really hope, Mr. Speaker, that the House gets serious by immediately taking up and passing the clean bipartisan bill, as the Senate has done.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlelady from New York is a good friend, and I respect her so much. She asks some important questions that the House has to answer. She has been here a good while. I have been here a good while.

Why would we be proceeding in this fashion? First of all, the House, we are trying to get to regular order. The Congress has not passed a budget, hasn't passed most appropriations. We live from CR to CR. There has been such instability in this institution.

Here, for the first time, we have the opportunity, and I believe it is within the hour that the other body may act—or have they acted? They have had this question before them for a long time; but, here, we have the possibility of going to a conference.

This is an important issue. This is an issue in which the President himself has said, I think, 22 times, that he doesn't have the authority to do what he did. The courts have upheld the position that we have or at least put a stay on the President's action. This is a very important issue because it affects the entire Nation.

If we could get to regular order, we want to keep the government open. We want national security and homeland security to move forward. We are offering that and also the opportunity for a little bit of time to go to regular order to make the process work.

Why shouldn't the House of Representatives have the opportunity to sit down with the Senate and work out the differences and honor the law that we passed and the President is abusing?

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I think we need to do this in regular order, and there is good reason to act in the fashion that Republicans are advocating.

□ 1115

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all Members to refrain from inappropriate references to the President.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, just for clarification, because my friend asked some fair questions, but maybe the gentleman is not aware that the appropriations process concluded 12 bills in a bipartisan way. Democrats and Republicans worked together.

However, back in December, on probably one of the key bills at this time, when we are threatened, when terrorists worry my constituents—they worry about whether they should go to the mall; they worry about their daily activities. So when my good friend, the gentleman from Florida, just spoke about regular order, check the appropriations process.

We passed the Homeland Security bill through the subcommittee, but it was held up. The gentleman will have to ask his colleagues on his side of the aisle why the Homeland Security bill was not part of the entire omnibus, why we had to invent this CR/Omnibus so we could leave out Homeland Security.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), the ranking member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, in December of 2014, as leverage against the President's immigration executive action, the Republican leadership irresponsibly decided to hold hostage the 2015 funding for the Department of Homeland Security.

Now, 150 days into fiscal year 2015, this House is no closer to addressing the Homeland Security funding needs of this country than it was last December. Instead, the Republican leadership is proposing to, once again, kick the can down the road, this time for another 3 weeks.

The serious consequences of the Republican majority's inability to responsibly lead on behalf of the American people will, once again, leave the Department without the 2015 funding levels it needs to effectively fulfill its mission of protecting our homeland.

I ask my colleagues: What is gained by continuing to delay resolving this crisis, a crisis of the House Republicans' own making? Does anyone really think circumstances will be any different 3 weeks from now? The judicial review of the President's executive actions will not be resolved in 3 weeks. The only circumstances that will be different in 3 weeks is that much will be lost. Republicans cannot continue to block the Department of Homeland Security funding for 2015 without undermining the national security of this country.

We should not fool ourselves into believing that the Department of Homeland Security has been doing just fine under the continuing resolution or that there would be no further consequences if we forced the Department to keep living with the uncertainty of a continuing resolution for even another day, much less 3 more weeks.

Secretary Johnson and agency heads have warned that passing another CR will not address the uncertainty of being able to meet our long-term national security needs.

Yesterday, Secretary Johnson sent a letter to the bipartisan leadership of the House and Senate, warning of the dangers of either a funding lapse or another short-term continuing resolution. To quote the Secretary, a ''mere extension of a continuing resolution has many of the same negative impacts'' of a shutdown. It ''exacerbates the uncertainty for my workforce and puts us back in the same position, on the brink of a shutdown just days from now.'' The Secretary ends his letter by saying, ''the American people are counting on us.''

The American people are, indeed, counting on us; and so far, the Republican majority in the House has let them down.

The Constitution provides a path for the Congress to work its will on policy issues without resorting to funding lapses or continuing resolutions, which represent the complete and utter abdication of Congress' obligation to effectively govern.

The Senate will soon send back to us a bill that was agreed upon by both Democrats and Republicans, and that will enable the Department to move forward on the critical planning that is needed to protect our country now and in the future. Let us do the responsible thing and bring that bill to a vote so that our country can truly be protected, by funding the Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, let's review something. Let's just review briefly where we are and why we are here.

The House passed a funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security maybe 3 weeks ago in order to give the Senate enough time to consider it and take appropriate action. So the House acted 3 weeks ago and sent the bill to the Senate.

The Democrats in the Senate have refused to allow that bill to be brought before the Senate four different times over 3 weeks. Now who is to blame for not funding the Department of Homeland Security? The House has tried. The Senate refused to act, until finally this morning, the Senate took up a clean funding bill for Homeland and passed it.

So here is where we are. The House has passed a bill. The Senate now has passed a bill, finally. So what do you normally do? What is the procedure of the Congress when both bodies pass a bill that is different from each other? You go to conference. We have done that from time immemorial. That is the recommended way. That is what is in the Constitution.

The conference is necessary, but that is going to take some time. So we need some time to allow the conference to go to work and conclude this problem and work out the differences. Thus, we need this temporary funding bill for the Department, to keep the security of the Nation intact through the Department of Homeland Security while we work out the permanent funding for the Department for the balance of the year.

That is where we are. It is fairly simple. I don't know any other way to do it. Perhaps our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have a better idea about how to reconcile the differences between the House and Senate, other than a regular conference committee.

A lot of Members of this body are so new to the process that they have never seen or know what a conference with the Senate is. And I think there is some confusion in that regard because people in this body, new to the process over the last 4 or 5 years, have never seen one, and that is sad.

So I hope Members will quickly pass this temporary funding bill for the Department and allow the conference committee to go to work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), my good friend, the former chair of the Homeland Security Subcommittee who was a key person in negotiating the bipartisan Homeland Security bill, which could have been part of the omnibus in December, and we wouldn't have been involved in these kinds of dangerous games.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank our ranking member for yielding.

As the gentlewoman from New York suggests, the account of the history of this bill that Chairman ROGERS has just given needs to go back a bit further. The original failure in this case was in December. Today we are voting on a 3-week continuing resolution. I rise in opposition to that.

But this is only the latest manifestation of the majority's failure to govern this institution and to get the funding in place for the Homeland Security Department for the full fiscal year. The initial failure was in December. That is what we need to look back to and understand that it was a profound mistake to leave Homeland Security out of the omnibus appropriations bill.

This Department, and this Department alone, was put on a 3-month continuing resolution, rather than including the bicameral, bipartisan, negotiated Homeland Security bill that is the equivalent of a conference report.

People are talking about the need for a conference report. We already have our conference report. It is an agreed upon bill that the majority deliberately left out of the omnibus bill in December.

And why did they do that? They did it for political purposes, because they didn't like what the President was doing on immigration. They wanted to poke him in the eye. They wanted to add these riders enacting a radical anti-immigration policy, and they were willing to sacrifice regular funding for the Homeland Security Department in order to pursue their political objective.

Ironically, in passing a CR rather than the regular negotiated bill, they sacrificed increased funding for things they profess to care about. They are supposedly all about border security. They are all about immigration enforcement. And those very things were reduced by virtue of their failure to accept the negotiated bill, going down the road with a continuing resolution.

Now the clock has run out. The 3-month clock has run out, and here we are again. And today, we are about to compound December's failure by passing a 3-week CR, which doesn't solve the Department's basic problems but, in fact, just postpones the day of reckoning by a few weeks.

The Republican-controlled Senate has shown the way here. They have resisted the Tea Party siren, this desire to make the Homeland Security bill a vehicle for radical anti-immigration policy. The Senate will soon be passing the negotiated Homeland Security bill, the same bicameral, bipartisan, negotiated bill which we should have approved in December.

The Secretary of Homeland Security has made very, very clear that a continuing resolution is not an acceptable way to run this Department. State and local terrorism prevention and response grants will be held up, for example. For my State of North Carolina, that means $9 million in emergency management preparedness grants. It means $5.5 million in state grants. That is true of every State in this Union. The security upgrades at the White House are also on hold. The acquisition of the Coast Guard's eighth National Security Cutter is on hold. Construction of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility out in Kansas is on hold.

A continuing resolution is just what it says: It is a continued resolution which does not permit us to make the upgrades, to undertake the innovations, or to make the grants that our homeland security requires.

The House majority is still unwilling to follow the lead of the Senate and put that negotiated, bipartisan Homeland Security bill on the floor. So here we are, stuck with an inferior proposal, a 3-week continuing resolution which doesn't do the job. We should reject this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Where do we go from here? Where does this end? Some kind of conference? We already have a conference report. It is the bipartisan Homeland Security bill.

□ 1130

That can pass today. We can put that on the floor, and it would pass in a heartbeat. That is what the majority needs to do, not this 3-week holding action. We need to pass that negotiated bill and keep the Homeland Security Department functioning at full strength.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), the chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Madam Speaker, history is something we ought to try to get right. So we have heard some versions of history here. But let's talk about exactly why we are here today. We are here today because, yes, the Appropriations Committee in a bipartisan effort put together a whole series of bills to fund this government, one of which is the Homeland Security bill. It is a good bill. I agree with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. It is a good bill. I am proud to have had a part in that.

But there is a piece of history that is missing in this discussion. Right after the last election, the President—well, we don't want to talk about the President—the administration stepped forward and said, well, the legislature hasn't changed the immigration laws, so the administration is going to change the immigration laws.

Without any action of the legislature, they are going to ignore laws that are on the books and in some cases have been on the books for generations, and they are going to do what they want to do for immigration reform, which includes the proposal that somewhere between 4 and 6 million people who are in this country illegally would be allowed to be in this country, with other benefits added to those. So that intervening cause is why all of a sudden the people of the United States said: Wait a minute, this is not following the Constitution. This is not the way our government is supposed to run.

Madam Speaker, we fought a war with a guy named King George to not have a king in this country who would just do it without legislative process. We fought a war to make sure that we follow the legislative process. The people who are in charge of enforcing the law, the executive branch, should be enforcing the law.

Madam Speaker, there became quite a tidal wave of people who were very concerned about the action. So in an effort to try to engage that fight, we came up with what has been referenced here as the CR/Omnibus, and we withheld the Homeland Security bill as the instrument to go fight forward on.

Now, once again, I say it is a great bill. But the decision was made, and here we are. Now, we passed this bill with amendments that take on the actions of the executive and sent it to the Senate 3 weeks ago. Someone said once that is the greatest deliberative body on Earth. Well, it may be, but this spring here, this early spring, they haven't deliberated. In fact, they haven't taken action at all, because each time the Republican leadership in the Senate said, let's go have a discussion, let's go on the floor and have a debate, and we will accept amendments, let's go have a debate, the Democrat minority said, no, we won't have a debate. Four times they said no; under their rule, we won't have a debate.

Madam Speaker, the Republicans didn't do what the Democrats did when they ran the Senate and just waive the rules that Thomas Jefferson wrote a couple hundred years ago. No, they followed the rules. So there was no discussion in the greatest deliberative body on Earth of this particular problem.

Now, are we funded now in our Department? Yes, we are. We have heard cries from the other side, you are leaving this country in jeopardy because you are not—if we close the Department—which I do not want to do—if we close down the Department, you put us at risk from terrorists.

Well, here we are. We are saying, you are right. Let's don't close down the Department. Three weeks ago we sent it to them. We are getting in a few minutes the results of their work product over there. Quite honestly, we have a dispute with them.

What is the process? Now, I know there are many in this body who have never even seen a conference committee because since 2006, this has not been something we have done very regularly in this body. But, quite honestly, the way we do this, to resolve differences, is go to a conference committee.

So what we are saying here, Madam Speaker, is help us keep the government open for 3 weeks—kind of the same 3 weeks they had to hang around and never go to work in the Senate—let us have 3 weeks and go to conference like we are supposed to and see if we cannot work out the differences we have between the two bodies. Now, how unreasonable is this?

By the way, Madam Speaker, if you are worried about those terrorists attacks which are looming over the horizon, which very, very may well be, then you had better vote to continue this

government today or otherwise a ''no'' vote on this particular resolution keeping the government open will shut the government, and when the government closes, all those terrible things are going to happen. So you don't want to have the responsibility of voting ''no'' to keep the government open and let the government close and then face the fact that the terrorists may be looming in the wings.

Let's pass the CR. Do it like we are supposed to, go to conference, work it out in the 3 weeks that the Senate had, and see if we can't resolve this issue—an issue that was started by the executive branch in their November surprise.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am so privileged to serve on the Appropriations Committee with the gentleman from Texas, who did an excellent job working in a bipartisan way completing a Homeland Security bill that we thought would be part of the omnibus bill so the Homeland Security Department would be funded for a year.

This event was a manufactured event today, and I do hope we can get past it and pass a Homeland Security bill for the next year immediately so that we don't have even a small potential of shutting down the government.

Madam Speaker, could you tell me how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 13 minutes remaining.

Mrs. LOWEY. I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished leader.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I join her in thanking Mr. CARTER and Mr. ROGERS for bringing to the floor in December a Homeland Security bill that was appropriate and that funded at the levels that were agreed upon by both parties. All we are asking is that we pass Mr. CARTER's and Mr. ROGERS' bill.

The Republicans pledged to not mingle controversial issues and allow each issue to stand on its own merits or demerits. That was their pledge to America in 2010. This action is inconsistent with that pledge.

The Senate has just voted, Madam Speaker, 68–31 to pass the Rogers-Lowey-Mikulski-Shelby bill. This is not a partisan bill that we are arguing about. This is the bill that we have agreed upon, Republicans and Democrats—and we can't even pass that—with the knowledge that if we do not, the future funding of America's homeland security will still be in question.

Yes, we can do it for 3 weeks. I call it our cul-de-sac strategy, going into a cul-de-sac over and over and over again and feeling somehow a pathway is going to open. The Senate is now voting on the Collins amendment. Now, as I understand the strategy of the Republican Party in the House, Madam Speaker, it is to add the bill that has been rejected four times on the floor of the United States Senate. They went in the cul-de-sac once, it didn't open up. They went in the cul-de-sac twice, it didn't open up. They went in the cul-de-sac a third, fourth time, it didn't open up. And now the proposal is to go into that cul-de-sac a fifth time while we focus on whether or not we are going to fund Homeland Security, not on the objectives of homeland security.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I urge Republicans and Democrats who have all said not funding the Homeland Security Department now for the balance of the year is—Mr. ROGERS didn't quote this, he was talking about sequester—is ill-conceived and wrong. I therefore, Madam Speaker, urge my colleagues to vote against this short-term CR and to vote for the Senate bill that will be sent to us in just a short period of time, today, which passed the United States Senate with over a two-thirds vote. Democrats only have 46 Members, so almost a majority of the Republicans are voting for it as well.

Madam Speaker, that is the responsible thing to do. That is the right thing to do. That is the regular order to do. Let's do it. Let's put aside our partisan differences and our partisan strategies and vote as Americans to fund the Department of Homeland Security for the balance of the year.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. FARR. Thank you for yielding, Madam Ranking Member.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to give apologies to all of the employees of the Homeland Security Department. In watching this, I hope that they understand what is really going on. This is not a battle about the process, the gamesmanship that we need time to work out at conference. We don't go to conference on a brink of a disaster. We have had a year to deal with this. In fact, we passed this bill.

What this is about is a bigger game going on in town. It is about whack-a-mole with the President. They sue him; they say they don't want to support any of his proposals; they cut, squeeze, and trim his appropriations; and they hold up his government appointments. But now the real story shifts when we see that the Republicans in this House even more than disliking the President dislike the Senate.

The Senate passed a comprehensive immigration bill which we could have passed. There were enough votes if we had brought that to the floor to pass it. If we had passed that comprehensive immigration bill, we wouldn't even be here today. This wouldn't even be a discussion.

The irony for all you Homeland Security employees is that the House is taking care of itself. The leadership, with their details and all of the wonderful Capitol Police we have around here, they are all taken care of because we don't pay for them out of our Homeland Security bill; we pay for them out of our own legislative branch bill, and that was passed. So our security is fine. But the security of the rest of the Nation is in jeopardy.

What does it take? The Senate has just passed a bill, we bring that to the floor, it takes the votes, 218. We have got at least all but 30 on this side, 30 Republicans. Mr. Speaker, let your Republicans go. Let them come to the floor and vote on a clean bill. We could pass it before this afternoon. That bill would be in the White House tonight, and we could go home and sleep knowing that this Nation's security is in good hands. Stop playing games.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Madam Speaker, it is really important that the American people understand what is happening here. It is pretty clear here. The Republican majority in the House and perhaps in the Senate disagree with the President on immigration policy. So they have two really clear choices. One would be to do what they somehow have been unable to do despite promises of a prolific period of legislation in the first couple of months here in Congress. Despite that, 7 weeks later we haven't seen anything that looks like an immigration bill.

So rather than using this magnificent process of democracy that the Framers designed for us to determine policy, the Republicans in Congress—really the Republicans in the House—have decided to threaten the shutdown of an essential government function—national security and public safety—in order to extract concessions on policy that they are unwilling to submit to the legislative process.

□ 1145

Why not bring an immigration bill that determines for this country what our immigration policy ought to be and, in the meantime, fund the essential functions of government? To not do so, there are consequences. This is not an academic exercise. There are consequences.

Three weeks of funding? Seriously, 3 weeks? After 7 weeks of coming to the floor of the House in session, why couldn't we come up with this compromise with the Senate, with whom you share partisan majority? Why can't we have a real debate on immigration policy on the floor of the House of Representatives without having to threaten to close down the essential function of government?

My friends on the other side have said, That is not what we are doing—except that that is what you are doing. Words are cheap, Madam Speaker.

You won't pass a clean bill to fund this Department, like your colleagues in the Senate have done, and you continue to hold out.

Madam Speaker, I just think it is time for us to get back to the serious business of the American people and pass a clean bill to fund this essential function.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

There it is. That is the bill the Senate finally passed. It has been 6 weeks—I said 3 weeks, earlier. I am corrected.

It is 6 weeks that the House passed a funding bill for the Homeland Security Department, 6 weeks ago, sent it to the Senate, purposefully early, to give them plenty of time to consider and bring forward a funding bill of their own.

I have to say the majority over there tried. The Democrats in the Senate stopped consideration of that spending bill four different times over 6 weeks. In the meantime, the House had to sit here waiting for the Senate, and we have been waiting 6 weeks, until just now.

Finally, this morning, the Senate has passed a bill funding the Department for the balance of the year, which differs from the House-passed version of that bill, so we have got to go to conference.

That is the way the framers set things up. When the House does something and the Senate does something different on the same subject, you have got to bring them together into a conference to work out the differences and come up with a bill for the President to sign. That is where we are.

Finally, now, we can go to conference. We could not have earlier because the Senate had not passed the bill. Now, we can go to conference, and we will be asking the Speaker for that designation today.

In the meantime, we can't let the Department stop working. Consequently, we are putting before you a bill to temporarily finance them while we go to conference on the main year-end financing of the Department. That is what this is all about.

Now, I am glad that the Senate brought the Senate bill and laid it on our desk. Now, it is finally up to us to give the Department a chance to survive and for us to stop the President's amnesty program.

By the way, Madam Speaker, there is not one penny in the bill before us, the temporary bill, the CR, there is not a penny in there to fund Obama's amnesty program. We are opposed to it, and there is no money in this bill for that purpose.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to state for the record, as my good friend from Kentucky is aware, on December 12, the Senate and the House conference committees agreed on a bipartisan, bicameral Homeland Security bill—in December. It could have been implemented with all the other 11 bills.

I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman very much, and I thank her for her commonsense explanation.

Might I say, as a member of the authorizing Committee on Homeland Security, I believe, as we have just heard, that the Senate has passed a clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill that came out of these appropriators who did excellent work.

In the name of the security of this Nation, I ask the Speaker to bring this bill to the floor of the House right now. I do so with headlines like: ''Three Denver girls played hooky from school and tried to join ISIS.''

I do it in the name of the headlines of three arrested in Brooklyn who had intentions to do the Commander in Chief harm and many others harm. I do it also in recognition as one of the Members who was there, if you will, in the aftermath of 9/11, who watched the forging of the Department of Homeland Security that put forward Border Patrol agents and TSO agents and ICE agents working with the FBI. All of those individuals will not be funded.

Let me say to the hardworking men and women of the Department of Homeland Security: We will not leave you abandoned, but we will vote for a full funding of the Department of Homeland Security.

We ask the Republicans why they refuse to address the national security of this Nation, putting political security over national security.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the ranking member of the Homeland Security authorizing committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for the time.

It is quite clear that a short-term CR is not in the best interest of the country. It is quite clear that the politics of Homeland Security puts us at risk as a Nation.

All of the things that have gone on over the last few weeks say that we have to have a fully funded Department—our men and women in the Coast Guard, Customs and Border Protection, and Transportation Security Administration, all those entities on the front line keeping us safe. A 3-week CR that kicks the can down the road does not keep us safe. It only says that it is ''politics as usual.''

What I am saying, in the interest of the over 200,000 men and women who work every day and do a wonderful job, they should not be played as pawns in this game of Homeland Security chess.

Let's fully fund the Department, like we funded every other Department, and get on with the business of securing America.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our distinguished leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and congratulate her on her exceptional leadership as the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

I also commend our colleague, Congresswoman ROYBAL-ALLARD, as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security, for her great leadership to protect the American people, to keep American security strong and certain.

I also thank the chairman of the committee, Mr. ROGERS, for the important work that was done leading up to December to have bipartisan legislation, to have an omnibus bill that funded all of the departments of government except, unfortunately, Homeland Security for the full time, and that is really a disappointment because the first thing we do as Members of Congress is to take the oath of office to protect and defend the American people.

That we would have this be the last bill that we would fund fully is really shameful. The fact is that the Senate has acted in a strong bipartisan way.

I always like to talk about time. It is about time, it is about the time that has been lost from December until March 19, in terms of what the intentions are of our Republican colleagues here. It is about the time lost, the uncertainty placed on our security. It is so sad.

At the same time, this morning, the Senate, in a very strong bipartisan way, passed a clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill. The papers are here. We could take it up immediately, send the bill to the President, and the crisis would be over—long overdue, mind you, but, nonetheless, bipartisan and with great certainty.

Instead of that certainty, while the Senate Republicans have joined the Senate Democrats for sending this bill over here, House Republicans instead have continued to manufacture a crisis that does not exist but exacerbates the insecurity of our country by their inaction.

The fact is this bill that the Senate has sent over has the support of every Democrat in the House. The Roybal-Allard-Lowey legislation is cosponsored by every Democrat in the House: full funding for the full term for the Department of Homeland Security.

All of our Members—Democratic and Republican—will have a chance to vote

on that in terms of the previous question, in terms of a motion to recommit, and in terms of motions to instruct conferees.

What we are missing is the ability of the Speaker to give us a vote on the Senate bill. Give us a vote, Madam Speaker, give us a vote—instead, drip, drip, drip, drip. The Republican leadership is putting forth legislation drip, drip, drip for the resources.

Now, I want to read the words of the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, who has been a great leader in the position he holds. In his remarks, he goes through all the reasons why a shutdown would be harmful. To those who want a shutdown, read his letter, please.

He does go on to say:

As I have so noted many times, mere extension of a continuing resolution has many of the same negative impacts. A short-term continuing resolution exacerbates the uncertainty for my workforce and puts us back in the same position, on the brink of a shutdown just days from now.

Can our Republican colleagues say that we won't be on the brink of another shutdown in the next few weeks in terms of the legislation they are putting forth? What is the purpose of it?

If the purpose is to oppose the President's immigration policy, the court has given you a face-saving way out. If the purpose is to have a better idea about immigration, bring up a bill, but if the purpose is to inject uncertainty into the security of the American people, shame, shame, shame, because it undermines our ability to the American people, it undermines the oath that we all take, and it is really a very sad day.

I would urge my colleagues, as they weigh the equities, we all want to make sure that the workforce of DHS is fully engaged, employed, and paid.

I would just like to ask my colleagues who have been advocating for a shutdown or take us to the brink of a shutdown over and over again if they would like to live without being paid as Members of Congress.

Most of our workforce makes much less than Members of Congress. They live paycheck to paycheck. Why are we saying to them, Come to work, 160,000 some of you, don't get paid, but get paid later?

They don't have trust funds. That may come as a surprise to you—perhaps you do, and maybe that is why you don't think not getting a paycheck is a big deal.

Then to the other, say, 30,000: Stay home, don't come anywhere near here and not get paid.

Some say: Oh, they will get paid later.

Well, that is not the way it works. They have mortgages, rent, car payments, and all the rest.

What could you possibly be thinking? What equity could you weigh against security, respect for our workforce, and morale of the people who are on the front lines to protect our homeland security?

□ 1200

There was quite a lively debate a number of years ago, and I was part of it as a member of the leadership to establish the Department of Homeland Security and the Committee on Homeland Security in the House, and hence the Subcommittee on Homeland Security on the Committee on Appropriations. The words were chosen very carefully, ''Homeland Security''—home—''Homeland Security.''

The American people should know what this means to their home security. The list is a long one, but I will just do a few things to say that without a full funding bill, without the full-year funding bill, DHS cannot award $2.5 billion in grant funding. That means that if you are in an Urban Area Security Initiative area, a place that would be targeted, maybe 40 of the urban areas in our country, $600 million in grants would be withheld.

FEMA, $350 million in emergency management preparedness grants. $350 million in SAFER. SAFER is Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Responses. That is an acronym, SAFER. That means a lot in your neighborhood. $340 million in firefighter assistance grants, $120 million for emergency food and shelter grants, and $100 million in flood-related grants. All of this hit home, and they hit Homeland Security.

So these numbers have an impact, ramifications in the lives of the American people beyond the workers; beyond the workers, but the people that they work for.

So I would urge my colleagues to think another time about this. We have the paper. The bill is here. It has passed in a strong bipartisan way in the Senate. Every House Democrat has endorsed the bill. We will vote for it with the parliamentary options that are available to us. How much better if we all came together, as the Senate Republicans and Democrats did, come together to support certainty in our security? Otherwise, the question is: Why not? Why are you not taking advantage of this great opportunity? The courts saved you face. What happened in Paris added to the urgency. The examples of people being picked up in our own country make matters worse.

Stop the drip, drip, drip of funds week to week. Let's get the job done for the American people by doing it right, following the lead of the Senate Republicans and the Senate Democrats. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this legislation. I appreciate the concerns we all have about a shutdown of government. We can't let that happen, but this is not the way to go.

With that, again, I commend Congresswoman LOWEY, Congresswoman ROYBAL-ALLARD, Congressman BENNIE THOMPSON, the authorizing committee for their great leadership on our side. The chairman of the committee, Mr. ROGERS, knows I have a tremendous amount of respect for him. I feel sad for him that he is in this situation. I hope that we can get out of it soon.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close. Does the gentlelady have further speakers?

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I will be brief. There is no money in this bill to fund the President's amnesty program. There is money in this bill to keep the Department of Homeland Security's doors open and in protection of the American people. This will give us time for the bill the Senate just has sent over to us funding the Department; this will give us time to reconcile the differences between the House version and the Senate version, and we will be prepared then to send a bill to that conference committee and, hopefully, then a bill to the President to sign.

Madam Speaker, I urge an ''aye'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, congressional dysfunction is now impacting our nation's security.

The Senate has acted rationally by passing a clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill.

The House should do the same. The House majority should take up the Senate bill and rise above political security and make national security the priority.

As a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security and one who was present in this body on September 11, 2001, it is sobering to think that so many of this body's members now think terrorism is a political football.

Over 3,000 Americans died that day—and if not for the bravery of those who gave their lives in a field in Pennsylvania many more would have died.

Those who were killed or risked their lives to save others included undocumented persons.

The 9/11 Commission Report stated that had United Flight 93 not crashed in Shanksville, Pennsylvania, located 125 miles from Washington, DC, that flight would have reached Washington, DC, between 10:13 and 10:23 on September 11, 2001.

I went to ground zero in New York while it still was burning and workers were trying to recover the remains of victims.

This sobering experience has seared into my mind—never again.

I am forever grateful to those who risk their lives every day to protect this nation—they should be valued and honored.

The fact that the leadership of the House chose to bring to the floor a rule for another Continuing Resolution that would extend funding to the Department of Homeland Security for three weeks is without a doubt one of the worst ideas in our nation's history.

Our enemies have not stood-down; nor have they given up—they are adapting, evolving and improving their ability to inflict harm upon America and Americans.

Meanwhile the House is sending a message to terrorists that we are disorganized and ineffective in our resolve to protect our nation and its people.

In his letter to Members of Congress, DHS Secretary Johnson states in clear terms what is at stake.

The global terrorist threat has become more decentralized and complex. Terrorist organizations are now openly calling on attacks on Western targets.

A new video, reportedly from Al Shabaab, shows the terror group calling for an attack on Mall of America in Bloomington, Minnesota.

Al Shabaab is the same terrorist group that attacked the Westgate Mall in Nairobi, Kenya resulting in 60 deaths.

The arrest this week in New York City highlight the threats posed by independent actors in the homeland who support overseas terrorist organizations and radical ideology.

Last October—three teenage girls who lived in a Denver suburb attempted to depart the country for Syria to join violent extremists, but thanks to the work of our domestic and international security professionals they were intercepted and returned home to the custody of their parents.

Keeping American families safe is the first responsibility of the Congress—but Republicans have decided that appeasing anti-immigrant Tea Party extremists is more important than the protecting our homeland.

The Department of Homeland Security needs support for important federal cybersecurity initiatives, disaster relief and recovery programs, and essential law enforcement activities that are critical for ensuring that DHS can help keep our nation safe from harm.

The recent terrorist attacks in Paris and by Boko Haram in Nigeria give heightened urgency to the words of Appropriations Committee Chairman ROGERS that we need to get a clean Homeland Security spending bill "to the president's desk so we can get a signature funding Homeland Security at a very tedious time in the world."

If the day ends without Congress taking action, the men and women charged with protecting the homeland will be sent a message that the House does not value 170,000 employees who will be required to work without pay.

These employees include members of the Coast Guard, Border Patrol, Secret Service, Transportation Security Administration and others on the front lines of Homeland Security.

An additional 30,000 employees of the Department of Homeland Security will be furloughed and sent home without pay.

Contracting services across the Department, including those for critical mission support activities, will be disrupted or interrupted.

A shutdown will prevent DHS from awarding $2.5 billion in grants to state, local, and tribal governments for response capabilities to recover from terrorist attacks, major disasters and other emergencies.

A DHS shutdown would hit Texas especially hard.

The local and state negative impact of House inaction is the forgoing of fiscal year 2015 grants that go to first responders.

In 2014, DHS grants awarded to the city of Houston included $24,000,000 from Urban Area Security Initiative grants and $299,995 from the nonprofit program.

In 2014, port security grants included: $1,810,826 for Harris County; $845,250 for the City of Houston.

Programs intended to aid our fire fighters such as the one at the University of Texas Health Science Center in Houston, which received a $1,493,340 DHS research grant last year are being hurt by House inaction on fiscal year 2015 funding for the agency.

The majority must stop putting political security before national security and take up a clean bill to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to register my disbelief that Republicans are continuing to use funding for the Department of Homeland Security as a political football. Every single member of the Democratic Caucus is a cosponsor of a clean, full-year funding bill, a bill that would be sure to pass if House leaders were to allow it to come to the floor. Across the Capitol, the Senate has already passed a clean bill. And yet House Republicans continue to insist that their political priorities take precedence over the operations of an agency vital to our national security.

I am a member of the Committee on Homeland Security. Over the past few weeks, I have heard testimony highlighting the threat that we face from violent extremists, particularly those radicalized in the U.S. I have heard testimony about the pervasiveness of the cyber threat to our nation, particularly to our critical infrastructure. And I have heard how DHS plays a vital role in ensuring we can protect against and respond to these threats.

Trying to implement strategies to protect our homeland security on a three-week time frame is simply absurd. Republicans created this funding crisis by refusing to approve a bipartisan agreement in December, and Republican action today is prolonging it. I hope that the majority will cease their political gamesmanship well before their new deadline and join with Democrats in passing a clean bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 129, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of House Joint Resolution 35 is postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 240. An act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 125 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5.

Will the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1207

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes, with Mr. YODER of Kansas (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, February 26, 2015, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 41 printed in part B of House Report 114–29 by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) had been postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 42 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF MISSISSIPPI

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. BLACK). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 43 printed in part B of House Report 114–29.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 620, after line 8, insert the following:

SEC. 802. DELAY OF EFFECTIVE DATE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or the amendments made by this Act, this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall not take effect until the Secretary of Education—

(1) determines that the enactment of this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, will not decrease the college and career readiness of students who are racial or ethnic minority, students with disabilities, English learners, and low-income students; and

(2) provides written notification to Congress on such determination.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 125, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Chair, the Thompson amendment to the Student Success Act is a commonsense amendment that ensures millions of poor, minority, and disadvantaged students will not be overlooked in the chaos that emanates from this rewrite of our educational policy.

Madam Chair, education is a civil right. Rather than develop quality standards that improve and enhance our system of education, this body has overlooked the harmful effects of H.R. 5 on funding and equal opportunity for millions of our students.

H.R. 5 removes strong accountability provisions required to make sure that children who need the most help will