

Growing up through McHenry public schools, home schooling, and then Christian Liberty Academy, Weiss met his wife, Beth, through the youth program, Awana.

Weiss leaves behind a wife and two children, Lucas and Susan, and extended family and friends. They remember him as brave from a young age, a shoulder to lean on in difficult times, and a caring, loving brother, husband, and father.

The family Christmas celebration will be muted this year, but we are forever grateful for Mose's service and sacrifice.

COACHELLA MOSQUE FIRE

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, on December 11, 2015, the Islamic Society of Coachella Valley mosque was firebombed, with four people praying inside, 9 days after the San Bernardino terrorist mass shooting. The perpetrator is being charged for a hate crime.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly condemn violence toward innocent people, whether they are victims of terrorism or victims of hate crimes, whether they are randomly chosen or targeted for being Muslim. I strongly condemn the hate speech from politicians who capitalize on the fear of the fearful and the hate of the hateful for political gain.

As Americans, we believe in justice, the rule of law, and freedom of religion. Destroying terrorists and protecting law-abiding Muslim Americans are not mutually exclusive, and we must do both because we believe in justice, sentencing the guilty, and protecting the innocent.

That is why I stand with my local priests, pastors, rabbis, imams, and law enforcement to denounce the violence, pursue justice, and strengthen our humanity.

MEALS ON WHEELS

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise during this Christmas season to speak about a public-private partnership that creates real impact in the communities I represent: Meals on Wheels.

Today, a national army of 2 million volunteers is preparing and delivering about 1 million meals to America's most vulnerable, hungry, and isolated seniors.

I am very proud of the Third District of South Carolina for many reasons, but I am especially proud of programs like Pickens County Meals on Wheels in Liberty, South Carolina. This is just one of thousands of Meals on Wheels programs across the country that provides more than just meals. Meals on

Wheels provides nutritious meals, safety checks, and friendly visits on a daily basis, which allow seniors to age in their own homes with the independence and dignity that they deserve.

The precious and powerful combination of nutrition and socialization has proven to improve health, reduce falls, avert unnecessary visits to the ER, and reduce hospital admissions and readmissions. This, in turn, saves billions of dollars in Medicaid and Medicare expenses. In fact, a Meals on Wheels program can provide a senior with meals for an entire year for less than the cost of 1 day in the hospital or a week in the nursing home.

I call on my colleagues to learn more about these vital programs, the seniors they serve, and the grave and growing and expensive problem of senior hunger, a problem that will undoubtedly worsen if left unaddressed.

Merry Christmas, America.

AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY TAX CREDIT

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the fact that the American opportunity tax credit is going to become a permanent law as part of the tax extenders package. I introduced, as the prime sponsor, this legislation many years ago as part of the economic recovery efforts.

It has provided well over \$20 billion to millions of families, a \$2,500 tax credit in which 40 percent is refundable. Over the next 10 years, the Congressional Research Service suggests that well over \$60 billion will be provided to families to help meet higher education costs.

So I want to just take a minute to pause and reflect on the fact that the work that we do here can, in fact, impact many, many lives. I want to thank my colleagues for their initial support of this program and for, today, our efforts that will be successful to make it permanent, along with the earned income tax credit and a number of other very important tax credits for American families.

□ 0915

HONORING VALOR CHRISTIAN HIGH SCHOOL'S VARSITY GIRLS SOFTBALL TEAM

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

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the girls varsity softball team at Valor Christian High School in Highlands Ranch, Colorado, on winning the 2015 Colorado 4A State championship game on October 25, 2015.

The students and staff who are part of the winning Eagles team deserve to

be honored for finishing what had already been a fantastic season by winning the State championship for the second time in 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the season, the girls of Valor Christian High School's softball team proved that hard work, dedication, and perseverance are the recipe for champions. The team was led to the championship title through the tireless leadership of their head coach, Dave Atencio, and his staff.

It is with great pride that I join with the families of Highlands Ranch, Colorado, in congratulating the Valor Christian Eagles on their second straight championship.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2029, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM DECEMBER 19, 2015, THROUGH JANUARY 4, 2016; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 566 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 566

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2029) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with each of the two amendments specified in section 3 of this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except as specified in section 2 of this resolution. Clause 5(b) of rule XXI shall not apply to the motion.

SEC. 2. (a) The question of adoption of the motion shall be divided between the two House amendments specified in section 3 of this resolution. The two portions of the divided question shall be considered in the order specified by the Chair. Either portion of the divided question may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

(b) The portion of the divided question comprising the amendment specified in section 3(a) of this resolution shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The portion of the divided question comprising the amendment specified in section 3(b) of this resolution shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

SEC. 3. The amendments referred to in the first and second sections of this resolution are as follows:

(a) An amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-39 modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution.

(b) An amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-40.

SEC. 4. If only the portion of the divided question comprising the amendment specified in section 3(b) of this resolution is adopted, that portion shall be engrossed as an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2029.

SEC. 5. The chair of the Committee on Appropriations may insert in the Congressional Record at any time during the remainder of the first session of the 114th Congress such material as he may deem explanatory of the Senate amendment and the motion specified in the first section of this resolution.

SEC. 6. On any legislative day of the first session of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress after December 18, 2015—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 7. On any legislative day of the second session of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress before January 5, 2016—

(a) the Speaker may dispense with organizational and legislative business;

(b) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved if applicable; and

(c) the Chair at any time may declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 8. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the periods addressed by sections 6 and 7 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 9. Each day during the periods addressed by sections 6 and 7 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 10. Each day during the periods addressed by sections 6 and 7 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XIII.

SEC. 11. It shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of December 18, 2015, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

SEC. 12. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of December 18, 2015.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5

legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for the consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2029. The resolution makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations that the House concur in the Senate amendment with two House amendments.

Amendment No. 1, consisting of the text of the omnibus appropriations bill, is provided 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. Amendment No. 2, consisting of the text of the tax extenders bill, is provided 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The rule provides for a separate vote on each amendment. In addition, the rule provides that, if one or both amendments are adopted, then the bill is sent to the Senate. Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides the standard recess authorities typically given at the end of the first session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be presenting to the House today the rule which will provide for the consideration of two critical pieces of legislation which are the product of long and hard negotiations between the House, the Senate, and the administration.

First, Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of the Protecting Americans from Tax Hikes Act of 2015, the PATH Act. This legislation makes over 20 different tax provisions permanent, like the Research and Development Tax Credit, section 179 expensing, and the State and local sales tax deduction.

Many of these provisions have existed as part of the Tax Code for many years. However, they were often extended retroactively or on a yearly basis, making it difficult for businesses and individuals to plan effectively. Making these provisions permanent will allow businesses and individuals to make more sensible decisions throughout the year, not just during the final 12 or 14 days at the end of the year after Congress passes a retroactive extension.

This bill also includes extensions of other tax provisions, like the New Markets Tax Credit, the bonus depreciation, and the Work Opportunity Tax Credit through 2019. Additionally, there are other provisions that are retroactively extended for 2015 and through 2016.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the PATH Act includes a number of program integrity measures designed to strengthen the integrity of the tax credit programs that have high rates of improper payments, fraud, and abuse.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill includes a series of reforms designed to

rein in the power of the Internal Revenue Service and better protect the American people, like firing IRS employees who take politically motivated actions against taxpayers and prohibiting IRS employees from using personal email accounts for official business.

In addition to these critical tax extenders, the rule also provides for the consideration of the omnibus spending bill for fiscal year 2016 at the funding levels agreed to in the Bipartisan Budget Act passed earlier this year.

There is much to be proud of in this 2,000-page bill and accompanying explanatory statement. But, as I have told many of my colleagues, if you can't find something you don't agree with in the bill, you must not be looking hard enough.

That being said, Mr. Speaker, this omnibus spending measure is a compromise and a reflection of divided government, but it also demonstrates a commitment by both sides to restoring regular order to this House.

While I could provide a long list of things I wish were included, this bill still maintains key Republican and conservative priorities. For example, the bill keeps the EPA staffing levels at the lowest level since 1989. In addition, it terminates dozens of duplicative, ineffective, or unauthorized programs.

Beyond the numerous cuts and restrictions on the executive branch, this bill also delays additional, onerous ObamaCare mandates. For example, it delays the Cadillac tax on healthcare insurance for an additional 2 years and imposes a moratorium on the health insurer excise tax in 2017.

In addition to these important changes, the omnibus also reveals some of the programs that Republicans value and that, frankly, Democrats value as well. Included in this legislation is a \$2 billion increase for the National Institutes of Health. Likewise, it increases funding by 9.8 percent at the VA while strengthening the restrictions and oversight to ensure that taxpayer dollars will be used more effectively.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, this legislation includes a repeal of the crude oil export ban. Repealing this ban, which has been in place for the past 40 years, has the potential to create more than a million new jobs across the United States, add \$170 billion annually to our gross domestic product, and lead to still lower gasoline prices. This provision is a victory for the American people.

I am sure many of my colleagues will speak about other portions of this legislation. However, in closing, I would like to recognize the hard work of Chairman ROGERS, Ranking Member LOWEY, and Speaker RYAN, who were able to lead us to this necessary compromise.

This is the second year in a row that we will have been able to complete a vast majority of the appropriations process before the end of the calendar

year, giving us the ability to begin the process anew when we return in January. It is a culmination of the hard work of the Members and of the staff over the past 10 months, and it should be worthy of all of the Members' support.

I urge the support of the rule and of the underlying legislation.

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), my friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, here we are again. It is the end of the year, and once more we have come to the brink of a government shutdown. It is sad to say, but this has become routine.

We need to return to regular order, where we pass appropriations bills one at a time and not end up with a 2,000-plus-page bill at the last minute that nobody has thoroughly read.

In all candor, the excuse that it is all the Senate's fault is a bit disingenuous. Of the 12 appropriations bills the government must pass each year, we only considered 6 in the House. We stopped considering appropriations bills because some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were more interested in protecting the Confederate flag than in getting the people's business done.

We have a deal before us that, if passed, would prevent us from heading toward a government shutdown and damaging our economy. Americans cannot afford another manufactured crisis, something that my friends on the other side of the aisle have become good at. The so-called deal that we will debate today and tomorrow reflects the imperfect process that produced it.

I am grateful to my colleagues who worked to get a product to us that, hopefully, can avoid a catastrophe. I am especially grateful to the staff who worked around the clock these last weeks to get us to this point. Truthfully, we should be apologizing to the staff for putting them through this ordeal. This is not the way to run Congress.

There are two parts to the underlying legislation: Amendment 1 to H.R. 2029, the omnibus Appropriations Act, and Amendment 2, known as the tax extenders bill.

The omnibus Appropriations Act is, by any measure, a mixed bag, but, importantly, it does begin to undo so-called sequestration, which has done great damage to our economy and great harm to our people.

□ 0930

In my view, sequestration represents an all-time high in recklessness and stupidity. We need to reverse it. This bill begins to do that.

In the omnibus there will be necessary increases in funding for NIH, NSF, Head Start, Pell grants, job training, State and local law enforcement, programs to prevent violence against women, energy efficiency programs, FEMA, our national parks, VA medical service accounts, the McGovern-Dole international school feeding program, a reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and a host of other programs. I am grateful for these increases.

This bill includes a 75-year extension to the Zadroga Act, which supports health care for the brave 9/11 first responders who risked their lives at Ground Zero to save others and became ill as a result. These are true American heroes, and I am pleased that Congress has finally done the right thing by ensuring that they will be able to get the care that they deserve.

One of the things, however, that concerns me about the omnibus appropriations bill is that it contains a controversial cybersecurity measure that many of us feel falls short of safeguarding Americans' private information. Quite frankly, a provision like this does not belong in an omnibus appropriations bill.

Last night in the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment to strike this cybersecurity provision. Every single Republican—every single one—voted against my provision.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a "Dear Colleague" that was sent to all of us from Representatives LOFGREN, AMASH, CONYERS, FARENTHOLD, and POLIS in opposition to the cybersecurity measure being part of this omnibus appropriations bill.

DECEMBER 16, 2015.

From: The Honorable Zoe Lofgren.

OMNIBUS INCLUDES PRIVACY VIOLATING PROVISIONS: JOIN REPS. LOFGREN, AMASH, CONYERS, FARENTHOLD, AND POLIS IN OPPOSITION

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We are writing to express our concerns with the inclusion of the Cybersecurity Act in the omnibus. What was intended to be a cybersecurity bill to facilitate the sharing of information between the private sector and government was instead drafted in such a way that it has effectively become a surveillance bill, and allows information shared by companies to be used by the government to prosecute unrelated crimes.

The bill intended to allow the private sector to share "cyber threat indicators" with government agencies. However, depending on the type of "indicator," it is highly likely that private information otherwise protected by the Fourth Amendment will also be disclosed to government surveillance agencies.

Unfortunately, as drafted, the bill falls short of providing safeguards to protect Americans' private information.

In particular:

1. This bill allows the use of shared information for more than just "cybersecurity purposes." It allows the government to investigate and prosecute specific threats to serious bodily injury or serious economic injury, computer fraud, and trade secrets violations, among other criminal violations.

WHY THIS IS OF CONCERN: Specific threats to serious bodily injury or economic

harm are extremely broad categories of crimes. So are identity theft, computer fraud, and trade secrets violations. By allowing the use of this information for non-cybersecurity purposes, the bill encourages intelligence agencies to collect and retain as much information as they can for as long as possible, in the unlikely event that one day it might be useful. An alternative bill, H.R. 1731, which received the largest House support, prohibited these uses and limited the use of cyber indicators to only cyber security purposes for this reason.

2. The bill fails to include an express prohibition on using this information for "surveillance" purposes.

WHY THIS IS OF CONCERN: Express prohibition of "surveillance" is vital because past experience demonstrates that intelligence agencies will broadly interpret the included non-cyber, criminal allowances to perform surveillance. For example, few thought the National Security Agency (NSA) would interpret "relevant" to allow collection of every phone record in America. Surveillance is merely an investigation method, so this bill contains no protections against the NSA (or any other agency) from conducting broad surveillance using this information in the name of stopping any enumerated offenses.

3. The private sector and government are only required to remove personal information they "know at the time of sharing" to be included in the information they share with DHS.

WHY THIS IS OF CONCERN: The information sharing legislation that passed the House with the strongest support, H.R. 1731, required both government and private sector to take "reasonable efforts" to scrub all personal information "reasonably believed" to be unrelated to a cybersecurity threat prior to sharing the information. Changing this to a "knowing" standard, as the Cybersecurity Act does, sets the bar too high. Developing automated systems to "know" that something is personal information is likely impossible. As such, the "knowing" standard encourages willful blindness. Why would the government or private sector expend time and effort to develop effective processes to determine when it "knows" something is personal information rather than just develop a cursory review process likely to permit the flow of private personal information. Furthermore, by limiting scrubbing only to "the time of sharing" there is no requirement that the government remove personal information it later discovers.

Finally, the bill leaves details on how to develop privacy protection procedures around the collection, storage, and retention of shared information to DHS and also to the Attorney General and Director of National Intelligence. The AG and DNI also determined these same standards for the bulk-collection of telephone metadata. These standards allowed for the largest abuse of American privacy in recent history and necessitated Congress passing the USA FREEDOM Act.

4. No express limitations on what or how DHS can share information with the DOD or NSA.

WHY THIS IS OF CONCERN: Earlier this year Congress passed major privacy reforms because past experience has shown that if the NSA acquires information, they will use it in ways unintended by legislators. Every cybersecurity bill passed by the House this year has prohibited automatic information sharing (and in some cases all sharing) with the NSA. Without this prohibition, designating DHS as the "sole information sharing portal" is essentially meaningless, since DOD and NSA automatically receive cyber threat indicators along with the rest of civilian agencies. As this bill is drafted, functionally—there is no difference between directly

giving this information to DHS and directly giving it to the NSA. There should be strong rules protecting personal information from being received, processed, and stored by intelligence agencies, which this bill lacks.

Sincerely,

REP. ZOE LOFGREN.
 REP. JUSTIN AMASH.
 REP. JOHN CONYERS.
 REP. BLAKE FARENTHOLD.
 REP. JARED POLIS.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one additional concern, for me and for many others, is an awful provision—and I stress the word “awful”—in this bill, which constitutes a big giveaway to Big Oil and could lead to an increase in gas prices. Big Oil gives big money to campaigns, and, sadly, Big Oil is getting a very big return on its investment with this bill. This provision could intensify climate change, have devastating environmental impacts, and does nothing to save consumers money on energy costs.

I will be asking my colleagues to defeat the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to strike this outrageous provision.

My colleagues will have to decide whether the good outweighs the bad before casting their vote on the omnibus bill. Compromise is never easy, but in a divided government it is essential if we are to move forward.

One of my biggest critiques of this Republican-controlled Congress has been the total disregard for Americans who struggle—those stuck in poverty. Time and time again in this Chamber, poor people have been demonized and disparaged while those who are well off and well connected get one tax break after another after another.

I am pleased that in the tax extenders package there are provisions to protect millions of struggling Americans from a tax increase and boost family incomes by permanently extending essential improvements to the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit for low-income working families, as well as the American opportunity tax credit to help low- and middle-income families pay for college.

All of these improvements to these tax credits were originally passed as part of the 2009 Recovery Act, and each has played a critical role in fueling America’s economic recovery after the financial crisis. Making these improvements permanent would be among the biggest steps Congress can take to reduce poverty, and without action these credits would expire at the end of 2017.

Every year, these improvements are expected to lift about 16 million people, including about 8 million children, out of poverty, or closer to rising above the poverty line. Simply put, making these improvements to the EITC and the CTC permanent will keep more children out of poverty than any other Federal program.

The real world impact cannot be overstated. For example, a single mother with two children who works full time at the Federal minimum wage

of \$7.25 an hour and makes \$14,500 a year would lose her entire \$1,725 child tax credit without congressional action. For a family on a fixed income, this would be a terrible setback. Additionally, making the American opportunity tax credit permanent would ensure this program continues to help millions of low- and middle-income families pay for college every year.

In addition to the millions of families these provisions would help, this legislation before us takes important steps to bolster investments in education, job training, advanced manufacturing, infrastructure, and research, while also strengthening national security.

I am especially pleased that this deal includes a provision that would make permanent tax parity for commuters who take mass transit—something that has long been a major priority of mine. For far too long, the Tax Code has allowed employers to offer their workers more in pretax parking benefits than in mass transit benefits. Parity between parking and mass transit benefits was first established in the Recovery Act and has been extended on a short-term basis since then.

The bill before us would establish permanent parity for mass transit commuters. It is an attractive fringe benefit that employers can offer their workers. It offers significant savings to employees who rely on mass transit. It is especially important to my constituents in central and western Massachusetts who take the train every day into downtown Boston.

Mr. Speaker, by averting a government shutdown and passing this deal, we will be able to bring certainty to small businesses, as well as companies investing in the United States, while extending important incentives that support hiring and investing in low-income communities.

Following the historic international climate agreement reached in Paris this past weekend, I am also pleased that this deal would extend tax incentives for investments in wind and solar energy, helping to drive significant reductions in carbon pollution and other dangerous air pollutants and provide certainty for investments in clean energy.

Investments like these would not be possible without the recent budget deal, which reversed about 90 percent of the cuts that sequestration would have made to nondefense discretionary programs in fiscal year 2016 with parity between defense and nondefense spending.

Mr. Speaker, while there are many positive provisions in this deal, one major concern is that the House Republican tax extender bill would provide hundreds of billions of dollars in special interest tax breaks that are permanent and unpaid for. Such massive giveaways to special interests like Big Oil are a step in the wrong direction.

As our economy continues to recover, we have a responsibility to the Amer-

ican people to pass legislation that helps to grow the paychecks of hard-working families and make the investments that will build the bright future that our children deserve.

I am especially troubled by the fact that the tax extenders bill continues the misguided double standard of financing tax cuts with budget deficits while insisting on offsets for any increases in domestic spending. Quite frankly, this is dishonest coming from my Republican colleagues who so often claim to be focused on reducing the deficit.

So many American families are working hard to get back on their feet and give their children opportunities that they deserve. Continuing this double standard of holding back on investments that we could be making now to help even more of our fellow citizens is inexcusable.

Extending hundreds of billions in tax breaks to the most powerful interests when our country needs much stronger investment in jobs and economic growth for all is a troubling and sober reminder that we must do more to put hardworking families first. Quite frankly, I think it highlights the difference between the two parties. Democrats have long championed the importance of investing in our infrastructure, investing in our people, and investing in our economy.

Mr. Speaker, the omnibus spending bill and the tax extenders package before us today is not perfect. Members on both sides of the aisle are going to have to decide for themselves whether the good outweighs the bad. Clearly, there are some good things and there are some bad things. Hopefully, in the future, we will return to regular order and do our business in a more thoughtful and effective way.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want to begin by agreeing with my friend from Massachusetts on a very important point, but perhaps adding a little bit of nuance.

I celebrate, probably as much as anybody in this Chamber, my friend’s and his side of the aisle’s newfound commitment to regular order. When they were in the majority here, they certainly didn’t practice it. As a matter of fact, in 2009, I think only one or two appropriations bills reached the floor. During that period, the right of having an open rule, where every Member with an amendment could come down and offer it in the House, was taken away by my friend. Again, I appreciate that.

My friend and I will disagree about what happened this year, because, indeed, we did begin down the path of regular order, we did bring six bills across the floor, we did bring all 12 bills through the committee. But, as my friend said, the Senate did not do that. Frankly, when regular order breaks down on one side of the rotunda in the Capitol building, it breaks down on the other as well. You can’t keep

bringing bills down when the other side simply won't bring bills at all. You are wasting a lot of time and you are casting a lot of votes that, frankly, become meaningless.

Let us put this behind us. I actually agree with my friend. I think because of the bipartisan budget agreement, which my friend supported, and I supported as well, we now know what our spending levels will be next year. We now have an opportunity to do exactly what I am sure he wants to do, and I think every Member, regardless of viewpoint of party, wants to do. That is to bring all 12 bills to the floor and give every Member an opportunity to participate. That would be a good thing.

The second point I would like to make in response to my friend deals with sequestration. I agree with him. To his credit, he has been a consistent opponent of sequestration. But we ought to remember this about that particular proposal. Sequestration was President Obama's idea—suggestion—in the 2011 budget agreement.

There are a lot of imperfections in that budget agreement. One of the things was that a supercommittee was set up that was supposed to work these things out and sequester was never supposed to happen. For whatever reason, that committee was unable to actually do that. Sequester did save a lot of money. Our deficit is considerably lower than it was.

Speaking of deficits—and my friend raised his concern about deficit spending—I share that concern too. I think it is worth pointing out that the last 4 years that my friends on the other side were in the majority, the deficit rose every single year, peaking at about \$1.4 trillion.

While we may disagree on particular provisions, the truth is for the 4 years—and now 5—that Republicans have been in power in the House, the deficit has gone down every single year. I think that tells you who is committed to deficit reduction and who is serious about cutting spending.

Indeed, we are spending less money in this omnibus spending bill in discretionary accounts than we were spending when George Bush was President of the United States in 2008, so that is a pretty serious reduction. I would invite my friends to work with this on the real driver of the deficit, and that is the entitlement programs, which desperately need reform—Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. That is something that can only be done in a bipartisan fashion, and, frankly, can only be done with Presidential leadership. In this case, sadly, the President of the United States has been AWOL in the effort to actually rein in entitlement spending.

My friend raised the lifting of the oil export ban in his remarks. On this we just simply have a different point of view. I come from a part of the world that has produced energy for this country for over 100 years and exported it.

We think this is the key to sustaining the growth in the industry.

Frankly, right now, \$38 a barrel for oil means actually thousands of layoffs in Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and other energy-producing States. The productivity of that sector, which has benefited every American with lower energy prices and lower gasoline prices, has also created a lot of difficulty for them.

We are the only country on the planet that does not allow for the export of petroleum—the only one. Frankly, I think this is a case where we ought to listen to other countries around the world, and we ought to recognize some basic principles. Willing producers, willing buyers, and free markets are good for everybody. That always gives you the best product at the lowest price and creates the most innovation.

I think this is an enormous step in the right direction. I am very proud that the two sides compromised and made this tough call—I know for some of my friends—but I think the right call long term for our country.

Finally, I would just like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by noting that in my friend's remarks, while he certainly made what I think were some excellent points about process, certainly had some points where we differed, and certainly made some fair and legitimate critiques in what is a very large bill—as I said earlier, you can always find something to be critical of in this legislation—my friend also pointed out a lot of the very many good things in this bill. Frankly, some of those things that he likes, Members on my side don't necessarily agree with.

That is the product of a real negotiation between the two sides, the two Chambers, and with the administration. There are wins and losses in here—if we even want to call them losses. But I think there is a victory here for the American people—stability, certainty, some really key national investments, no government shutdown, and I think this year the foundation, if we pass this legislation, for regular order, which I know my friend very much wants, next year.

□ 0945

We have moved a long way from where we were several years ago—frankly, under both parties—to where we are today. I actually give both sides considerable credit for this because I think there is a genuine yearning from Members of both sides to get to regular order, to make sure that, when we appropriate, everything is down here, transparent, every amendment has an opportunity.

So, in the spirit of the Christmas season, we can put aside maybe some of our differences here. I think we will pass, ultimately, a very good bipartisan bill. I think we can make a commitment, an early New Year's resolution, that next year we will go to exactly where my friend wants to go and where I want to go and, frankly, where

I know the Speaker wants to go, and that is regular order where each bill comes to the floor, receives due consideration, every Member has an opportunity to participate, things are more transparent and, frankly, things are more orderly. That will be possible because we came to a bipartisan budget agreement this year early that set the spending limits for next year. I think that is a very good thing.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my colleague from Oklahoma that I appreciate his commitment to regular order and reminding us that Speaker RYAN has committed to regular order as well. I am a little skeptical, so I am not going to hold my breath because I probably won't make it until next year if I do that. I will just remind him that the previous Speaker, Speaker Boehner, promised the same thing, and we never saw it. In fact, we have the most closed Congress in the history of United States Congresses.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, I urge that we defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule that would strike the provision in the omnibus that lifts the ban on exporting crude oil.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. To discuss the proposal, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

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

I urge Members to defeat the previous question because I am not sure that the majority has fully considered the permanent damage to jobs and to national security if this is not properly transitioned and implemented.

It was not too long ago that many of us in this room remember what we call the odd-even days where we were waiting in long lines, just hoping that we could get gasoline. Well, we have come a long way from there through technology and the ability to extract more oil.

We made a strategic investment in American energy. We have refineries on the West Coast. We have them on the East Coast. We have them in the Gulf. That is critical to our national security because oil, without refining, simply doesn't work.

So here we are today looking at lifting the 40-year-old oil ban. What this really means is jobs and, in particular, this means jobs and a strategic disadvantage to the East Coast where we will be losing many of our refineries.

When it comes to very difficult times in this country, we need that capacity.

We have the natural resource called oil, but if we don't have it in the refining sense on the East Coast, on the West Coast, and in the Gulf, we will be putting ourselves at a very strategic disadvantage. Those long lines remind us of how critical it is to have that capacity.

It is about jobs, those skilled craftsmen who work in the refineries day in and day out. So what this bill is doing is picking winners and losers. We are trading jobs. I absolutely believe in that. We are taking those East Coast jobs and shipping them overseas.

We only have one chance to get this right. This is like creating a dam that has been holding back the water, but instead of letting it out slowly and transitioning, we are just simply breaking that dam. We need to make sure that we implement a transition for our refineries. The 199 is a step in the right direction for those transportation costs, but we need more.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, this is refining capacity we cannot lose. This is about our Nation's security. This is about jobs.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of American jobs and independence for our strategic national security by defeating the previous questions.

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

I want to respond quickly to my friend from New Jersey on the refinery issue because I actually have two refineries in my district, so not all refineries are located on the East and West Coast or in the Gulf. There are quite a few of them in the historic middle part of the country as well.

I am always concerned about those jobs as well because, as my friend suggests, they are extremely important. He is precisely correct when he says that just producing oil is not enough. You want to be able to refine it.

I also will tell you that sitting in Cushing, Oklahoma, is over 250 million barrels of oil that can't be refined because there is not a sufficient capacity for that particular kind of oil in this country.

I would also suggest that it is not fair for people to say you can only sell the product you produce one place. Nobody else in the world does that. Nobody else says you can't sell your product to any place in the world in any market you want to. Only we do that.

Many people might want a captive audience, but that is just simply not fair to the people at the other end of the process. They ought to be able to sell their product, particularly when, in certain kinds of crude, there is just simply not sufficient capacity. I would suggest over time if we just have faith in the free market, those things will be worked out, and we will eventually have the appropriate balance and supply.

Again, I want to agree with my friend about the importance of the refining industry, but I also want to agree about the importance of free markets and the right and ability of people that produce products and make substantial investments to sell their product anyplace to any market that they care to do that. We are the only country in the world that denies that privilege to people that find and produce oil. I think if we remove that, frankly, we will have a more robust domestic industry.

Again, this is an industry that is to be commended because it has been their innovation that has created this abundance of production. We have increased production in the United States by 85 percent in the last 5 or 6 years. That wasn't done with any government program. That wasn't done by the government. That was actually done by hardworking entrepreneurs and workers in historic oil-producing areas and new areas that are being opened up, in States like Pennsylvania and Ohio. This is a good thing for the United States, and we ought to take full advantage.

Their productivity has also brought them record low prices, and they need the opportunity to market their product anyplace in the world that they think they can get a decent price. In the long-term, that will preserve the industry in the United States.

Again, to my friend's point, I care a lot about jobs. I would be happy to take you to my State and show you how many thousands of jobs we have lost in the last few months, in the last year and a half.

It is not just a question of oilfield work; it is also machinery, production, and that sort of thing. Frankly, those losses will reach into the manufacturing section of our country that produces much of the steel, the pipe, and the concrete that are important. Those jobs aren't just in our part of the country; they are all through the country.

Again, I want to work with my friend. I agree with his observation. There were efforts made in good faith by both sides to provide some tax relief to the refining industry. If that is not sufficient, I would be happy to work with my friend to try and do more in that regard.

Again, I think this is a balanced bill. It is a historic opportunity to do the right thing. At the end of the day, we are always better off when we trust free markets, free men and women producing and selling the products that they choose to make as widely as possible. That is what has made the country great. That has certainly been the key to the success in the energy industry. This is a step in the right direction to make sure that we not only maintain, but expand that principle.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a distin-

guished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this has been a difficult process creating this package. I commend Speaker RYAN and Leader PELOSI working with the White House and our friends in the Senate to put together a package that actually may secure support and passage from people on both sides.

Tomorrow, we are going to consider an omnibus bill that, on balance, I think is a very fair compromise, given the composition of this Congress and the challenges that we are facing.

I am particularly interested in the unprecedented support for neuroscience, something I have worked on for a long time, and the significant funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a priority of people on both sides of the aisle, but it has been bottled up. We will be talking more about that tomorrow.

As it relates to the bill that we are going to have before us in a few minutes, I wish that it had dealt more aggressively with the question of the revenue needs of this country, something I have consistently supported before I joined the Ways and Means Committee and what we are going to have to be addressing in the future.

It is important to focus on the elements, I think, in the bill that warrant my support for it. First and foremost, it provides certainty for provisions that are important to a wide variety of our constituents and interests that ultimately were going to be funded one way or another. It harkened back to the saga we had of the doc fix, the SGR, the sustainable growth rate that we forced people to jump through hoops year after year.

In this case, we are going to provide some important certainty for areas that invest in the future that I have spent a long time working on in terms of wind, solar, the new market tax credits, the short-line railroads. My friend from Massachusetts talked about a project we have worked on for years, transit parity; and being able to settle the books on that and move forward, I think, is very, very important.

It even is a little start on energy efficiency for commercial buildings that I hope we can do better. Emerging industries like American-produced cider get a tremendous benefit, incorporating the CIDER Act that I have been working on.

I would call special attention to something again my friend from Massachusetts referenced, and that is the provisions in this bill that relate to low-income working Americans. The earned income tax credit and the child tax credit were set to expire in 2017. This impacts 16 million people, raising them above poverty or at least getting to the poverty level, of which half of those are children, 8 million children. In my State, it is 164,000 families, some of Oregon's most vulnerable working poor.

Now, leaving this out until 2017 I think plays Russian roulette with it,

and it would be a mistake. No better deal is likely. I think it is important to move forward on it and protect it now.

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

Just very quickly, I want to thank my friend from Oregon for his hard, bipartisan work on Ways and Means and various elements in this package that came here. I want to thank him as well for the kind remarks he made about the omnibus and his interest in research. I know that is genuine, and he has been a champion of that. I look forward to continuing to work with that.

Finally—and I know my friend would think this, too—we are all concerned about the deficit. Some day, if we get serious about entitlement reform, we will sit down and do it. Now, I believe that can only be done in a bipartisan way. I would invite my friend sometime to look at a bill that Mr. DELANEY and I have to begin the process of perhaps reforming Social Security in a bipartisan way. So, again, I look forward to that. I appreciate my friend's good work.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, across the world, this is a special time of the year, and we have our traditions here in Washington. One of them is underway at this moment in the House. It is called the ceremony of the stuffing of the silk stockings. We do it each year, and we do it generously. This bill is even referred to as a "Christmas tree bill" because special interests get special presents, "ornaments" on this tree.

Much of the focus this year has been the fact that the direct spending bill and the tax spending bill are considered under this same rule. The press has focused most of its attention on the direct spending bill, the Omnibus. While there has been some debate over some of the policy provisions, it has really been the sideshow here.

What has driven the length of debate on this are Republicans—and some Democrats who have enabled them, unfortunately—determined to get as many permanent tax breaks as possible for those who have been waiting for this Christmas tree. They have added hundreds of billions of dollars of permanent tax breaks onto this bill.

□ 1000

I must say, like many shoppers out there, they have put it all on the credit card. It is just that it is your credit card. We are borrowing from the Chinese, from the Saudis, around the world, in order to pay for tax breaks for which not a penny has been paid. That is total fiscal irresponsibility.

To cover this wrong of borrowing and adding more and more to our national debt, they have reached out to put in a

few good provisions. I happen to be the author of the Refundability for the Higher Education Tax Credit. I am delighted to see it extended permanently, but it does not even expire this year, as is true of some of the other tax breaks that are boasted about this morning.

The real threat from adding hundreds of billions of dollars to the national debt has been clearly identified by my colleague from Oklahoma candidly, and that is that Social Security and Medicare are the next things up for consideration on the chopping block.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. DOGGETT. If you add this much debt unpaid for in a fiscally irresponsible way, you begin to jeopardize retirement security, Medicare, and Social Security because those so-called entitlements are next up on the chopping block. Reject this giveaway.

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

I want to join my friend from Texas in his concern about the national debt and the deficit. I think those are genuine and real.

I do point out to my friend that every year his side was in power the annual deficit got greater for 4 consecutive years, peaking at \$1.4 trillion. Every year the Republicans have been in power in the House, it has come down.

We can argue about the specifics of national debt, but who ran it up and who is trying to bring it down I think is pretty clear over the last several years.

Second, while my friend is critical of many of the provisions—and, frankly, I could list some provisions that I am critical of in this legislation as well—I remind him it was negotiated by the Democratic minority leader, the Speaker of the House, the leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the Senate, and the President of the United States.

Whatever is in this bill has been signed off by the leaders of both parties, but certainly the leaders of his party. It is not some Democrats that are involved. It is the top Democrats that were involved. I presume they think this was in the best interest of the country.

There are many items in here that we all like and agree on. There are going to be items that both sides do not like. I mean, that is just the nature of a compromise.

I could certainly tick off a list of things that I think either should have been in the bill and aren't or that are in the bill that I don't like. I look at the broader virtues here. I think it is good.

The final point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is this idea that we are making permanent tax cuts, the reality is they have been permanent anyway. We have been extending these things ad infinitum, forever.

The problem is, when you extend taxes instead of create certainty, people don't know whether to invest, what to invest, what to do. You actually don't get the productive value out of the tax cut.

I applaud my friend, Mr. BRADY, on Ways and Means and his colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are trying to make some things that are common sense and that we do every single year or every other year permanent so the American people can make an appropriate calculation.

I do invite my friend to come down next year and work seriously, as I know he will, on trying to come to some sort of agreement on entitlement spending, some sort of reforms. That is where 71 percent of the total spending of the budget is. If you want to balance, you can't rope it off and say these things we can never change over here.

I would invite my friend to look at Mr. DELANEY's bill and my bill, which is a process bill. It doesn't lay these things out. It doesn't cut anything. What it does do is actually force us to sit down and make some decisions. People on both sides of the aisle keep postponing this.

We ought to go back and honestly do what Ronald Reagan, Tip O'Neill, and Howard Baker did in 1983. They had a commission similar to what Mr. DELANEY and I have. Any recommendation to that commission would have to be bipartisan. Then the Congress would have to vote on it up or down. I can assure you that there will be things in a reform package that both sides don't like, but Congress has ignored these things.

On Medicare and Medicaid, two big drivers, I am proud that we have at least put proposals on the table in the Ryan and now the Price budgets, proposals I know my friends probably don't agree with, but I think are real efforts to actually reform those things.

What we don't have is a Democratic proposal on Medicare, a Democratic proposal on Medicaid. Frankly, neither side has been willing to really put something out on Social Security. I think that is something we ought to do. That is something Mr. DELANEY and I in a bipartisan way have tried to do. I hope other Members will work with us next year.

I know that the Speaker is committed to trying to reform these programs so we can save them so that the scenario that my friend laid out does not happen, that they do not go bankrupt, that the American people do not lose them. We are going to have to sit down and make some hard decisions and make them in a bipartisan way.

The fact that we did this on this bill, this omnibus spending bill and the tax extender portion, I think is a good start to sitting down and having that conversation more broadly next year. I hope we do that.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Small Business.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable that the legislation we are considering does nothing to address Puerto Rico's mounting debt crisis. Puerto Rico's crisis is decades in the making, and it stems from years of neglect from this very same body, the United States Congress.

The United States Congress brought us where we are today. Now it has a moral responsibility to act. Yet, my Republican colleagues are standing in the way. Giving Puerto Rico authority to restructure its debts will not cost taxpayers a dime, but it would help solve their fiscal crisis.

To those who say Puerto Rico needs to cut spending, I ask you: How much more? The island spends \$2,000 less per student than the average spent on the mainland. The government has already closed nearly 100 schools this year in addition to 60 closures last year. Sales taxes are the highest in the United States and would increase from 7 percent to 11.5 percent.

The government has laid off 21 percent of its employees since 2008, and the 2016 budget makes further cuts. Puerto Rico is doing its part to raise revenue and cut expenses. Stop playing Russian roulette with the well-being of the Puerto Rican people, American citizens.

Despite all the reforms that have been taken, Wall Street hedge funds want more. They bought this debt at cheap prices, and now they want it all. They are willing to inflate big suffering on 3.5 million American citizens in order to reap massive profits. Sadly, congressional Republicans decide.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds because I agree with her on this issue.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of Puerto Rico is here—he is sitting in the gallery—asking you to help those Americans who call the island home.

While we are all going home for the holidays, for the 56 percent of American children who live in poverty in Puerto Rico, this omnibus is their Christmas present.

Shame on us. It is wrong. It is morally wrong. It will not cost one dime to taxpayers. All we are asking is give Puerto Rico the ability to restructure its public debt like any other municipality in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to refer to occupants of the gallery.

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

I listen with a great deal of attention to my good friend from New York whenever she rises on this issue because, frankly, I know she is much

more knowledgeable about it than I am.

I do not pretend to be an expert in this area at all. It is not something we handle normally on the Committee on Appropriations. It would normally come through another committee.

I think, from what I have been told, that is actually what the great concern is. I don't think there is much doubt that there is a serious crisis here. Nobody debates that.

I think that the intent next year, as I understand it, is to try to work through regular order and resolve this, as we should, because it is a complex problem.

I think probably the decision at higher levels than mine was that this is not the appropriate vehicle. That does not take away from my friend's point that it is a serious problem. It needs the attention of Congress. I look forward to working with her in that regard.

I do not think this was the right vehicle. I do think, actually, there would have been many Members with many questions who would not have had a chance to study it.

It just makes more sense to work its way through the committee. I hope we do that. I think that is the right thing to do. I think my friend was certainly well within her rights and very appropriately raised an important issue that this House needs to turn its attention to next year.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and to express great disappointment with the underlying tax extenders bill.

While the tax extenders bill makes the expansion of the child tax credit permanent, along with the earned income tax credit and the American opportunity tax credit, it fails to index the value of the child tax credit to inflation. By the end of this decade, this will result in 750,000 children falling back into poverty.

In the last big tax deal, Congress made the estate tax cut both permanent and indexed to inflation. Who does this benefit? The children of the millionaires and billionaires.

Yet, this bill fails to provide the same benefit to working families. It means that 7,450 estates nationwide are the beneficiaries of the estate tax. Nineteen million families and many, many more millions of children would have benefited from indexing the child tax credit.

Congress has also provided for many more provisions of the Tax Code to be indexed: income tax rates, the adoption credit, the earned income tax credit, the low-income housing credit, the exemption amount for the alternative

minimum tax, the standard deduction, the overall limitation on itemized deductions, cafeteria plans, transportation fringe benefits, adoption assistance programs, the personal exemption, medical savings account, the maximum deduction for interest on education loans, foreign-earned income exclusion, estate tax exemption, gift tax exemption, and the list goes on and on.

No family in the United States should have to struggle to raise a child. By failing to index the value of the child tax credit, we allow the benefit of the child tax credit to slowly erode away.

Too many hardworking people are still not earning enough to make ends meet in this country. Middle class wages are stagnant or they are in decline. We need to do whatever we can to support working people. Working and middle class families cannot afford to continue to see the value of their child tax credit decline.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak in support of the 9/11 health provisions that are in the omnibus bill that we will be voting on tomorrow. This is a major bipartisan victory.

In our committee, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, we had the health portion of the bill, which basically provides specialized health care for those first responders and survivors of 9/11.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell how important this is. In my own State of New Jersey, we have a clinic where we help about 5,000 mostly first responders. They need specialized health care. Their problems get more severe as time goes on.

What we are doing with this legislation is making this 9/11 health program and victims compensation program permanent. It was authorized for 5 years. There was a cap on it. The cap has now been removed. We know that those first responders now will get the kind of specialized health care that they need. I cannot emphasize how important this is.

□ 1015

I want to thank my colleagues in the New Jersey delegation, the New York delegation, and the Connecticut delegation on both sides of the aisle in both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

I think a lot of people think this is just a health insurance program. That is not what this is about. This is a research program that looks into those specialized diseases that many of these first responders have been impacted by, and every day, we find more rare diseases, more problems that these first responders are coming down with. It is

a research program. It is also a treatment and diagnostic program for them.

Thankfully, we now are going to have this as a permanent program so that they will not have to worry about what kind of health care they get, and they will not have to worry about where they go.

I also want everyone to understand that it doesn't matter where you are in the country. There is a protocol that has been set up under this 9/11 health program so that somebody in Los Angeles, Florida, or wherever they are, can go to the local hospital and be attended to.

So, once again, this is a major victory, and I appreciate the fact that I have had the time to talk about it.

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

Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank my friend from New Jersey for coming down here and making that point and, frankly, for his hard work and continuous dedication on this important provision.

When this legislation was first offered a number of years ago, I was very proud to vote for it. I thought it was the right thing to do. I was happy to cosponsor its extension and being made permanent, and I look forward to having the opportunity to vote for it in this context again.

My friend is exactly right when he talks about the consequences of 9/11 to the men and women who heroically went to the site trying to save other Americans, risking their own lives and health, as we know, in the long term. I dealt with a similar situation when I was secretary of state in Oklahoma in the Oklahoma City bombing. I must say, we got tremendous help from our friends in New York and New Jersey and other parts of the country. We had rescue teams. We got wonderful help from the United States in the aftermath of the disaster and the recovery. Of course, the scale of 9/11 dwarfs anything that has ever happened in our country.

So I am glad on this note: The two parties have sat down and worked together and done the right thing. My friend from New Jersey has been a leader in that effort every step along the way. This is something in the bill that I think for even those who don't support the bill, frankly, had we run it individually, I believe it would have passed on this floor overwhelmingly in a bipartisan fashion, but it does come to us in the context of this bill, and I hope many of my friends can support the bill for a variety of reasons, and this would be one of the chief amongst them.

Frankly, if they cannot, I would recognize again that, had this come individually, I think even those who are opposed would have supported this, because this is a uniting experience in American history. It is something we are proud of. And we can't ever forget the sacrifices that men and women on the ground at the site in the moment

of enormous danger made for their fellow Americans and the example they set for us all. So the least we can do is to make sure that those who suffered on our behalf are taken care of appropriately in the aftermath of this great tragedy.

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

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

As I said at the very beginning, what we are presented with today, I think, can be fairly characterized as a mixed bag. There are some very good things that we can talk about in both these packages that we are going to debate and vote on today and tomorrow, and there are some very bad things. And I think Members are going to have to decide for themselves whether the good outweighs the bad or the bad outweighs the good.

But I think the one thing we should agree on is that we need to do better in terms of process. We ought to consider all of these appropriations bills individually. And even if the other body chooses not to take those bills up, we ought to at least do our work here. We only did half the job this year, and I regret that very, very much.

I will say on the good side of what is being presented today is the chipping away at sequestration, which was a horrible idea. It has done great damage to this country's economy, which has hurt a lot of struggling people in this country. This package before us today begins the process of chipping away at that.

I also believe that it is good that we are doing what we should have done a long time ago, and that is provide certainty for the 9/11 responders. I want to thank the New York delegation, in particular, for their steadfast insistence that we act on this. That is in this package as well.

In terms of the tax extenders, there is great concern on our side about the fact that a lot of this is all unpaid for. And yes, we do care about deficits. I wish my colleagues on the other side cared more about deficits.

Everybody is saying that they are committed to reducing or eliminating our deficit. I will remind you we had a Democratic President, Bill Clinton, in office when we actually eliminated the deficit. And when the Republican, George W. Bush, got elected and we had unpaid-for tax cuts—most for wealthy people—and unpaid-for wars, we saw the elimination of the deficit balloon into these huge deficits. And we are still trying to dig ourselves out of that mess to this very day.

I would say that in the tax extender bill I am grateful we have made permanent the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit. These are both important antipoverty initiatives. It will help a lot of people whom this body has consistently and deliberately ignored for too long.

I want to associate myself with the comments of my colleague from Con-

necticut (Ms. DELAURO), who said that the child tax credit should have been indexed for inflation. We could have done that. I think that would have been even a better gesture toward trying to help people get out of poverty. We didn't do that. That is a fight that we need to deal with in the future.

Finally, I ask my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we can have an up-or-down vote to eliminate what I think is an outrageous giveaway to Big Oil. It doesn't belong in this bill. We should have that debate, and Members ought to be able to vote up or down on it. The only way we are going to be able to do that, quite frankly, is by eliminating the previous question so we can bring this amendment to the floor.

Having said that, this is the final action of the Rules Committee—I hope it is the final time the Rules Committee will be presenting on the floor—and, again, I want to thank my colleagues for their work on this. I want to especially thank the staff. I want to wish everyone a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year, and I look forward to a more productive 2016.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank my friend. As always, it is a privilege to have a debate and a discussion with him. I think his characterization of this legislation as a mixed bag is a fair characterization, but that is what I would expect in anything that is a compromise—and particularly a compromise of this magnitude.

I take considerable pride, frankly, in all those involved in this. They did come to some major agreements. Again, I think each of the leaders of the House and of the Senate and certainly the President and his team could point to things they don't like in this bill or things they gave up or things they wanted that didn't make it. I know each of them has a long list of disappointments.

But the bottom line is they found a way to get the job done. They found a way to sit down, work across the institutional divide, the partisan divide, their philosophical differences, and produce a good bill.

I also want to agree with my friend on his concern about the process. He is precisely right; this is not the best way to operate. I am glad we got all these bills on the appropriations side through the full committee. I am proud that we got six of them across the floor. I am disappointed that our friends in the Senate, frankly, because of the minority's opposition, didn't get any onto the floor. They did get, though, in fairness, all 12 of theirs through committee. And that is progress for both bodies. We have moved in a broad direction. But my friend is right, we need to go further next year.

I am going to disagree with him a little bit about the deficit. He is not

going to be surprised. Again, I point out the reality that for the last 4 years my friends were in the majority, the deficit went up every single year; and since we have been in the majority, it has come down every single year. I don't think those are coincidences. I think they show who is committed.

I am also proud that we have put forward real reform proposals on entitlement spending, the real drivers of the debt. I invite my friends to actually offer proposals in that regard or to look at Mr. DELANEY's bill and my bill. I wish our side would do that, too, by the way, because I think it offers us a reasonable way to get to reforming the Social Security system, probably the most important single program that we have in the country.

I am also going to disagree with my good friend on the oil export ban, not surprisingly. In my part of the world, we are losing thousands of jobs. The idea that you would restrict where Americans, who have produced a product, can sell it to only one place, when no other country in the world does that. This is something that shouldn't have been in this bill. It should have never happened in the first place. It should have gone 40 years ago.

Now, my friend mentioned Mr. Clinton and balancing the budget. I think that is an appropriate thing to do. He somehow left out the part that it was a Republican Congress working with President Clinton. Frankly, President Clinton never ever submitted a balanced budget to the Congress. Congress reduced the spending, and eventually we got lucky. We had a growth spurt. We had a peace dividend. We had a lot of things going on in the nineties. We had the baby boomers at the top of their earning potential. They were not retiring at the rate of 10,000 a day, as we have now.

So I would argue our problem is tougher, but my friend is right when he makes the point that in a bipartisan fashion, we dealt with this problem in the 1990s. We need to be bipartisan and deal it with again, going forward.

Mr. Speaker, I think that as we conclude the legislative business of this Congress, it is critical for us to end in a way that honors the trust the American people have placed in us. Divided government is difficult; however, it is a position that we have been placed in.

The last few weeks have been filled with legislative activity: a long-term transportation bill, a fundamental overhaul of our elementary education programs, a Customs bill which makes it easier for Americans to trade overseas, and finally, both tax certainty for individuals and businesses and the completion of the fiscal year 2016 appropriations process.

None of these pieces of legislation have been perfect, from my perspective or I am sure from my friend's perspective, but they have all been better than the alternative we have faced. And they were, in my estimation, the best deals we could negotiate. That is a tes-

tament to the leadership of Speaker RYAN; Leader PELOSI; the committee chairman, Mr. ROGERS; Mr. BRADY on our side, of their counterparts, Mrs. LOWEY; Mr. SHUSTER; the ranking member of Ways and Means, Mr. LEVIN, one of my favorite Members.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I do want to end with one note. I want to join my friend, my valued colleague in the Rules Committee, in our joint hope that we do not meet again in that context. I want to wish him and his family a Merry Christmas, as well as to all those in this institution. And frankly, I want to congratulate all involved in this on a job well done. It was a hard deal, a long negotiation, but one where each side worked together.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 566 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

SEC. 13. Rules Committee Print 114-39 is modified by striking subsections (a) through (d) of section 101 of Division O concerning oil exports.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated,

control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 177, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 701]

YEAS—244

Abraham	Comstock	Goodlatte
Aderholt	Conaway	Gosar
Allen	Cook	Gowdy
Amash	Cooper	Granger
Amodei	Costa	Graves (GA)
Ashford	Costello (PA)	Graves (LA)
Babin	Cramer	Graves (MO)
Barletta	Crawford	Griffith
Barr	Crenshaw	Grothman
Barton	Culberson	Guinta
Benishek	Curbelo (FL)	Guthrie
Bilirakis	Davis, Rodney	Hanna
Bishop (MI)	Denham	Hardy
Bishop (UT)	Dent	Harper
Black	DesJarlais	Harris
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart	Hartzler
Blum	Dold	Heck (NV)
Bost	Donovan	Hensarling
Boustany	Duffy	Herrera Beutler
Brady (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Hice, Jody B.
Brat	Duncan (TN)	Hill
Bridenstine	Ellmers (NC)	Holding
Brooks (AL)	Emmer (MN)	Hudson
Brooks (IN)	Farenthold	Huelskamp
Buchanan	Fincher	Huizenga (MI)
Buck	Fitzpatrick	Hultgren
Bucshon	Fleischmann	Hunter
Burgess	Fleming	Hurd (TX)
Byrne	Flores	Hurt (VA)
Calvert	Forbes	Issa
Carter (GA)	Fortenberry	Jenkins (KS)
Carter (TX)	Fox	Jenkins (WV)
Chabot	Franks (AZ)	Johnson (OH)
Chaffetz	Frelinghuysen	Johnson, Sam
Clawson (FL)	Garrett	Jolly
Coffman	Gibbs	Jones
Cole	Gibson	Jordan
Collins (GA)	Gohmert	Katko

Kelly (MS) Newhouse
 Kelly (PA) Noem
 King (IA) Nugent
 King (NY) Nunes
 Kinzinger (IL) Olson
 Kline Palazzo
 Knight Palmer
 Labrador Paulsen
 LaHood Pearce
 LaMalfa Perry
 Lamborn Peterson
 Lance Pittenger
 Latta Pitts
 LoBiondo Poe (TX)
 Long Poliquin
 Loudermilk Pompeo
 Love Posey
 Lucas Price, Tom
 Luetkemeyer Ratcliffe
 Lummis Reed
 MacArthur Reichert
 Marchant Renacci
 Marino Ribble
 Massie Rice (SC)
 McCarthy Rigell
 McCaul Roby
 McClintock Roe (TN)
 McHenry Rogers (AL)
 McKinley Rohrabacher
 McMorris Rokita
 Rodgers Rooney (FL)
 McSally Ros-Lehtinen
 Meadows Roskam
 Meehan Ross
 Messer Rothfus
 Mica Rouzer
 Miller (FL) Royce
 Miller (MI) Salmon
 Moolenaar Sanford
 Mooney (WV) Scalise
 Mullin Schweikert
 Mulvaney Scott, Austin
 Murphy (PA) Sensenbrenner
 Neugebauer Sessions

NAYS—177

Adams Engel
 Aguilar Eshoo
 Bass Esty
 Beatty Farr
 Becerra Fattah
 Bera Foster
 Beyer Frankel (FL)
 Bishop (GA) Fudge
 Blumenauer Gabbard
 Bonamici Gallego
 Boyle, Brendan Garamendi
 F. Graham
 Brady (PA) Grayson
 Brown (FL) Green, Al
 Brownley (CA) Green, Gene
 Bustos Grijalva
 Butterfield Gutiérrez
 Capps Hahn
 Capuano Hastings
 Cárdenas Heck (WA)
 Carney Higgins
 Carson (IN) Himes
 Cartwright Hinojosa
 Castor (FL) Honda
 Castro (TX) Hoyer
 Chu, Judy Huffman
 Cicilline Israel
 Clark (MA) Jackson Lee
 Clarke (NY) Jeffries
 Clay Johnson (GA)
 Cleaver Johnson, E. B.
 Clyburn Kaptur
 Cohen Keating
 Connolly Kelly (IL)
 Conyers Kilmer
 Courtney Kind
 Crowley Kirkpatrick
 Cummings Kuster
 Davis (CA) Langevin
 Davis, Danny Larsen (WA)
 DeFazio Larson (CT)
 DeGette Lawrence
 Delaney Lee
 DeLauro Levin
 DelBene Lewis
 DeSaulnier Lieu, Ted
 Dingell Lipinski
 Doggett Loeb sack
 Doyle, Michael Lofgren
 F. Lowenthal
 Duckworth Lowey
 Edwards Lujan Grisham
 Ellison (NM)

Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Stefanik
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Trott
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Ross
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 Lynch
 Maloney, Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McNeerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter

Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takai
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tonko

Collins (NY)
 Cuellar
 DeSantis
 Deutch

NOT VOTING—12

Joyce
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Moore

□ 1057

Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. GRAYSON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois and Ms. GRANGER 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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 185, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 702]

AYES—240

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 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)
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Cook
 Costello (PA)
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Curbelo (FL)
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 Dent
 DesJarlais

Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

Nadler
 Payne
 Rogers (KY)
 Russell

Adams
 Aguilar
 Amash
 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
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 DeSaulnier
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Fattah
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)

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
 Roe (TN)

NOES—185

Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Graham
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hastings
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lynch
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McNeerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)
 Napolitano

Tiberi
 Tipton
 Trott
 Turner
 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

Neal
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sanchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 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—8

Collins (NY)	Deutch	Kildee
Cuellar	Joyce	Nadler
DeSantis	Kennedy	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1105

Mr. MASSIE changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 3831. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the annual comment period for payment rates under Medicare Advantage.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1616. An act to provide for the identification and prevention of improper payments and the identification of strategic sourcing opportunities by reviewing and analyzing the use of Federal agency charge cards.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 566, as the designee of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), I call up the bill (H.R. 2029) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Army as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Army Corps of Engineers and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation,

and for construction and operation of facilities in support of the functions of the Commander in Chief, \$663,245,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That, of this amount, not to exceed \$109,245,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, and host nation support, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of the Army determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, facilities, and real property for the Navy and Marine Corps as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$1,619,699,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That, of this amount, not to exceed \$91,649,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of the Navy determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Air Force as currently authorized by law, \$1,389,185,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That, of this amount, not to exceed \$89,164,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Air Force determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, installations, facilities, and real property for activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as currently authorized by law, \$2,290,767,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That such amounts of this appropriation as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to such appropriations of the Department of Defense available for military construction or family housing as the Secretary may designate, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: Provided further, That, of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$160,404,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$197,237,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That, of the

amount appropriated, not to exceed \$20,337,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Director of the Army National Guard determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$138,738,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That, of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$5,104,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Director of the Air National Guard determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$113,595,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That, of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$9,318,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Chief of the Army Reserve determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the reserve components of the Navy and Marine Corps as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$36,078,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That, of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$2,208,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of the Navy determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air Force Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$65,021,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That, of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$13,400,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Chief of the Air Force Reserve determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

For the United States share of the cost of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program for the acquisition and construction of military facilities and installations