for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2867, the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom Reform and Reauthorization Act, as amended by the Senate.

Religious freedom—the right to worship and practice one's faith according to the dictates of one's own conscience—is a foundational human right. Many have called religious freedom the first freedom. Not only is it the first amendment of the U.S. Constitution, it is intrinsic to the human dignity of every man and woman on this earth.

However, it is a right denied or curtailed for many—and according to some estimates, most—people in the world.

For Copts in Egypt, Uighurs in China, Montagnards in Central Vietnam, Jews and Baha'i in Iran, many Buddhist monks in Burma, and countless millions elsewhere, the ability to live their faith without threat of persecution is a distant and unrealized promise.

Dr. Brian Grim, a witness at a recent hearing I held on religious freedom, has done significant research in this area. In a study he conducted in 2009, he found that nearly 70 percent of the world's 6.8 billion people live in countries with high or very high restrictions on religion. His study specifically cited Iran, Pakistan, China, and Egypt as among the most repressive of religious expression. This is significant not only because it highlights the number of people denied this most fundamental of human rights, but also because religious freedom is comprised of a ''bundle of rights.'' Religious freedom implies freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, freedom of association and assembly, and even freedom of the press. Absent freedom of religion, all these other rights are in jeopardy.

In fact, Dr. Grim's research shows that countries that respect these rights reap a host of socio-economic benefits, including better education, better health care, greater equity of pay between men and women, and higher GDP, and these benefits arguably lead to greater social stability. On the other hand, countries without respect for religious freedom do worse on these socio-economic indicators, have greater societal tension, and are more prone to instability. The importance of promoting all components of religious freedom therefore cannot be overstated. Not only is it a moral imperative, but religious freedom keeps extremism and tyranny at bay.

For these reasons, U.S. leadership on religious freedom is desperately needed in many countries around the world, together with a more vigorous utilization of the means provided in the IRF Act for promoting religious human rights.

I was pleased to work with my good friend from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and to chair the Committee hearings and markup fourteen years ago that led to the enactment of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998, which established the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom. The Act provided our Administration with the tools necessary to make international religious freedom an integral component of the highest priority in U.S. foreign policy.

Contrary to assertions that singling out religious freedom would somehow make it seem more important or separated from other fundamental human rights—the Clinton Administration asserted that its strong opposition to the Act was based on its belief that the Act would result in a ''hierarchy of rights''—those of us who championed the bill argued that it was necessary to ensure that religious freedom is given its rightful place within the framework of human rights promotion.

The law provided a new and bipartisan focus, which has begun to grant religious freedom its rightful stature in the diplomatic and foreign policy of the United States, under both Democratic and Republican administrations.

The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom was and is an important part of that effort. It was created as an independent body of experts to review the facts and make policy recommendations from a vantage point outside of our diplomatic corps, where bilateral and other concerns had sometimes resulted in the soft-pedaling of severe, ongoing violations of religious freedom around the world.

Even today, when the quality of State Department reporting on religious freedom issues has improved, the Commission continues to serve a critical role as a sounding board and a catalyst.

One indicator is the fact that the Commission's list of recommended ''Countries of Particular Concern'' for severe violations of religious remains larger than the number designated by the State Department.

In September, Secretary Clinton rightfully designated Burma, China, Eritrea, Iran, North Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sudan and Uzbekistan as CPCs.

But the State Department's list does not add any new countries from last year, and glaringly omits Vietnam, whose policies have more than earned that badge of shame.

Secretary Clinton also did not designate Egypt, Iraq, Nigeria, Turkmenistan, and Pakistan as recommended by the Commission.

We need the Commission more than ever. Already in the Congress, we have had six comprehensive hearings on religious freedom: Two in the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission regarding the religious freedom of minorities in the Middle East, especially Egypt; two on the Committee I chair regarding the prioritization of religious freedom in U.S. foreign policy, and two in the Helsinki Commission on the particular plight of Coptic Christians in Egypt.

The Commission has been an invaluable resource to Congress as we monitor the protection and promotion of religious freedom around the world—and the response of the Administration on this very important issue.

They have also been a resource to governments seeking how to remedy religious freedom abuses within their own borders. For instance, in Indonesia, the Commission worked with members of the Indonesian House of Representatives and civil society groups who introduced measures to strengthen provisions in the criminal code regarding attacks on religious gatherings and amend the law governing the building of religious venues.

The Commission also continues to help network human rights and legal advocates in Indonesia working to defend individuals accused of ''blasphemy'' and religious minorities facing intimidation and violence from extremist groups. The Commission's work in Indonesia will have practical impact on the exercise of human rights—and preservation of peace—in Indonesia.

Other governments have looked to the Commission as a model for their own religious freedom Commissions.

The bill before us includes a number of bipartisan reforms to Commission authorities and operations to make their work even more effective.

I want to thank Chairman ROS-LEHTINEN and Ranking Member BERMAN for working to bring to the floor this important bill, which deserves unanimous support. And I would like to extend a special thanks to Representative WOLF, whose tireless efforts on this legislation have brought hope to persecuted people across the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 2867.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2055, CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3672, DISASTER RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 94, CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 3672; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 500 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 500

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2055) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to its adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate; and (2) one motion to recommit if applicable.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3672) making appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to consider in the House the

concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 94) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 3672. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to its adoption without intervening motion except: (1) 20 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

SEC. 4. The Clerk shall not transmit to the Senate a message that the House has passed H.R. 3672 until notified by the Speaker or by message from the Senate that the Senate has taken the question on adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 94 as adopted by the House.

SEC. 5. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of December 16, 2011, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1(c) of rule XV, relating to a measure continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012.

SEC. 6. 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 31, 2011, providing for consideration or disposition of any of the following measures:

(1) A measure relating to expiring provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) A measure relating to the Medicare payment system for physicians.

(3) A measure relating to appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good friend from Rochester, New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 500 provides for the consideration of three measures that will ensure that the government is funded through the end of the fiscal year; and this rule, as was outlined by the reading Clerk, provides very important tools to deal with important issues that have yet to be resolved.

□ 1000

Now, Mr. Speaker, we all know that, as we sit here at 3 minutes of 10 o'clock this morning, we are faced at midnight tonight with the prospect of a government shutdown. There is a bipartisan consensus on the need to ensure that we don't face a government shutdown; and it's very important that we take action to prevent that from taking place, and that's exactly what our opportunity is here today.

At the same time, it's important for us to realize that it is absolutely imperative, if we are going to get our economy growing and create jobs, for us to reduce the size and scope and reach of the Federal Government. That's the message the American people have sent to us overwhelmingly, and that's why I have to say that I believe this bipartisan compromise, which has been worked out with Members of the House and the Senate and the White House, moves us in the direction of doing just that.

Why? Because we are actually bringing about in this conference report a $95 billion reduction in discretionary spending, merely a drop in the bucket. We all recognize that it's not enough. We all recognize that much, much more remains to be done, but, Mr. Speaker, this is an important first step. And the fact that it's been done in a bipartisan, bicameral way, working not only with the first but the second branch of government as well, is, I believe, a positive indicator for us.

As I think about the challenges that we have—and I said this during the management of our jobs bill that we had, the so-called extenders measure that deals with the question of extending unemployment insurance, doing everything we possibly can to keep taxes low by extending for a year the payroll tax holiday, ensuring that people have access to Medicare dollars, and, of course, focusing on job creation by proceeding with the Keystone XL pipeline. As I pointed out during that debate, right now, our job is jobs. The American people want us to focus on job creation and economic growth, and I believe that this bipartisan, bicameral compromise will help us in that quest.

It hasn't been pretty getting here. We all know the famous Otto von Bismarck line, that you don't want to watch sausage or laws being made. This has been ugly.

And, actually, I was not going to say what I'm about to say right now, Mr. Speaker, but I am going to proceed and I will explain to you why.

It's been a painful and difficult and ugly and messy process which, frankly, is exactly what James Madison wanted. He is looking down at us saying, The process is working just as I envisaged it, because he wanted there to be this clash of ideas and a struggle. But, at the end of the day, he wanted there to be a compromise; and he wanted there to be an agreement at the end of the day, recognizing that that needed to be done.

We know that the chairs of the Committee on Appropriations, Messrs. ROGERS and INOUYE, shook hands on Monday and had an agreement. Again, I was not going to say this; but the Rules Committee completed its work early this morning, and I got a few hours of sleep, and I woke up to National Public Radio, which I do. That's what wakes me up in the morning, Mr. Speaker. And I know that there are some of my Republican friends who are not fans of National Public Radio. I like to watch MSNBC TV and listen to National Public Radio. It keeps my blood circulating very well, Mr. Speaker.

But I woke up this morning to listen to a report on this conference agreement. I am very happy to see my good friend from Seattle, the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, arrive on the floor. And I wasn't going to say this, but because of this report on NPR, I'm going to share it.

Tamara Keith, who is the congressional correspondent for NPR on Morning Edition, characterized why it is that we are here on Friday rather than having met the 3-day layover requirement and all these things that we wanted to do when the agreement was struck on Monday, and what she said was that Senate Democrats held this bill hostage. Those are not my words, again, Mr. Speaker. Those are the words of Tamara Keith who reported on National Public Radio this morning that this measure was held hostage by Senate Democrats. And she went on a second time, using the word ''hostage.'' She said, Well, finally the hostages have been released. Again, those are not my words. Those are the words of National Public Radio.

So some people wanted me to say it, but I decided not to say it myself. But when I heard it early this morning, I couldn't help but say it. So that's the reason I'm looking across the Chamber right now at 3,000 pages stacked this high right next to the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, right across the aisle from the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. Speaker, we've had to waive the 3-day layover requirement because, again, according to NPR, we had this conference report held hostage, but we've finally gotten here. Now that we're here, I'm happy to say that, while I'm not ecstatic with every measure in it—just as I know that Mr. DICKS is not ecstatic with every measure in it; I know that Ms. SLAUGHTER is not ecstatic with every measure in it; I'm not ecstatic with the process that has gotten us here because of the challenges and ugliness and messiness we've gone through this week. We are here because it is absolutely essential that we not see the government shut down in several hours at midnight tonight.

So I believe that we need to realize—and I know Mr. DICKS and I have had this conversation repeatedly, along with our friend Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations—that we want a clean slate as we head into next year so that Mr. DICKS and Mr. ROGERS will be able to go through regular order, bring the appropriations bills to the floor and, we hope and pray, get each bill done ad seriatim, the way they're supposed to be done, rather than dealing with what has been characterized as an

omnibus, a mini-bus, a megabus. But the term that I like that was given by the distinguished chair of the Committee on Appropriations last night is this is ''the rest of the bus.'' And that's really where we are.

But it's essential for the American people, for those who are representing us so diligently around the world in conflicts in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other spots, for people who rely and need to have support from government programs that do exist, it's essential that we get this measure passed, and pass it with what I hope will be strong bipartisan support.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to say that I am happy that we are doing the things that will be outlined, I know, very thoughtfully by the distinguished former chair and current ranking member of the Committee on Rules. I will say that we have got 3,000 pages.

By the way, I should say, before my friend begins this, that on Monday, virtually all of that was available, and it was put online at 12:30 Wednesday night. Right after midnight Wednesday, it was made available online. And so while we have not actually met the exact 3-day layover requirement, I should point to the fact that we always said—and I'm so proud of the fact that we have been able to do it. But when we faced what is really a very, very important deadline, that being the closure of the government that would take place 14 hours from now, I think it is very important that we take this action and do it as quickly and as well as we possibly can.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Good morning, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague is absolutely right. This is ''the rest of the bus.'' But it's going to be a little while before we realize whether we are on that bus or whether we've been thrown under it. Obviously, as Mr. DREIER called attention to it, this is the bill that we have today. None of us will make any pretense at all of having read it.

Now, I have been around long enough to know that things happen this way. The country is about to shut down tonight; the agencies are all prepared to close, and we can't have that. So we find ourselves confronted here today with this completed and going through this conference.

□ 1010

A lot of people are breathing a sigh of relief this morning, frankly, particularly the Federal workers and the rest of the country, that they are not going to be faced with a shutdown of Federal agencies.

But although we were able to avert that crisis today, this 2,000-page legislative package is not a cause for celebration—and I don't believe Mr. DREIER thinks it is either—but it is a demonstration of failure. As I have said, I have known cases and have been a participant in cases where things like this have happened before. But for a Congress that had promised at the beginning part of the campaign and what we were promised at the beginning of this term was that this would not happen anymore. Instead, it has happened over and over again. Over the past 12 months, we have witnessed the utter failure to responsibly legislate—a failure that has led to this massive bill that we are considering today.

You've heard all of this before, but in the fall of 2010 when the majority took over, Speaker BOEHNER said: We'll do away with the concept of comprehensive spending bills.

He's been around awhile too, and he knows that there are times when things happen that really don't fall in line with what we want. But nonetheless, he made that promise. Despite this call for a deliberate appropriations process, the House was recently asked to consider a $180 billion minibus, totaling 354 pages of legislation.

And today, less than 24 hours—we're about halfway, I think—we are offered a $1 trillion megabus appropriations bill. It was given to the Members of the House today, and we're asked to vote on that. We will, of course, do that because, as I've said, the looming layoff and shutdown of the Federal Government is something that we cannot stand at this juncture, or any other time.

So despite the earlier promises by the GOP to separate the controversial legislation from the must-pass bill, the megabus was delayed by a battle over controversial riders. We know this could have been done much sooner, but there were five riders that had to be resolved—everything from the reproductive rights of the citizens of the District of Columbia to energy-saving lightbulbs.

Mr. Speaker, this House has spent more time debating lightbulbs than we have putting American people to work. It has really been an outrage—we have talked about this so many times before. But nonetheless, in all the contemplations, all the conference work, lightbulbs have survived. I know that's a sigh of relief to everybody in America who had no idea we were spending so much time micromanaging their lightbulbs.

But this is a sign, I think, of a larger failure, a failure of their vision of governing. It is a vision that we've gone through all this year that was based on brinksmanship and threats—an all-or-nothing game of chicken with their colleagues and the American people. And everybody is exhausted from, will we do it? Won't we do it? Can we do it? Must we do it? Part of that has resulted in a lessening of the credit rating of the United States of America for the very first time.

So instead of spending the year finding common ground with their Democrat colleagues, the majority spent the year advancing legislation to dismantle the EPA and to talk about lightbulbs and to open federally protected lands to foreign mining companies. I find in my constituency the idea that we were going to give land to Russia around the Grand Canyon to mine for uranium mind-boggling to people. We really ought to be worried about that. This is a very serious problem.

Instead of spending the year finding common ground, we have done nothing about that. So throwing bipartisanship to the side, the majority pushed forward with its ideological battles at the expense of the Nation's welfare. And what we see this morning is the result of their divisive efforts.

What we know is that a process that began with brinksmanship and threats, and ends with this 2,000-page, $1 trillion megabus crammed through the House as the clock hits zero is all we have. This is our chance to keep the government from shutting down.

With proper priorities and a serious effort to engage legislators from both sides of the aisle, we could truly have a process and a product that would make the American people proud. But that's not what we have here today, and it is not what has been done this year.

I hope sincerely, and I know that many people on both sides of the aisle hope sincerely, that as the calendar turns to 2012, we can put an end to the zero-sum leadership that has been provided and finally give the American people the responsible, bipartisan leadership that they want and deserve.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as my good friends from the Appropriations Committee, Mr. ROGERS and Mr. DICKS, congratulate each other in the well, I will ask them to move out of the well so that I am able to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Grandfather Community, who left the Rules Committee at 1 o'clock this morning and went down to her office to work before going down to the White House at 7:30 for a tour for her constituents.

So I underscore the fact that VIRGINIA FOXX is extraordinarily dedicated, and for that reason and many others, I am happy to yield her 3 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from California, the chairman of the Rules Committee, to whom we all look for wisdom, especially at times like this. I think he has been extraordinarily generous in his comments this morning in talking about the bipartisan approach. We all praised the chairman and the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee early this morning when the Rules Committee was meeting. It is important that we celebrate the bipartisan nature of this bill.

As everybody will say I'm sure today, it's not a perfect bill that's coming up. It's not pleasing everybody. It's pleasing very few people. But it is sausage-making and rulemaking at its finest.

And I appreciate the fact that it is the Christmas season and we want to be a little friendly to each during this time, as we are when we're in our home districts. We are here in Congress, too; and, so, I'm mindful of the season and I'm mindful of the fact that we have reached a bipartisan agreement. But I do want to say to my colleagues across the aisle, there's an old saying that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones.

Again, as my colleague from California said, we're not happy that we have a rather large bill and a somewhat short perspective in time to deal with it. But this bill was out there on Monday, as he pointed out. And were it not for the dilatory tactics of the Senate, we could have had this bill on the floor earlier this week, and it has certainly been out there for everybody to read.

I want to say to my colleague from across the aisle from New York who said there was a lot of wasted time on lightbulbs. Mr. Speaker, lightbulbs are a symptom of the problem with this executive administration and our friends across the aisle. Talk about wanting to micromanage—they want to control what kind of lightbulbs we have. It was a debate between the Senate Democrats and the President of the United States on whether we're going to continue to control the kind of lightbulbs we have that delayed this process yesterday for many, many hours.

But we need to talk about some positive things that the Republicans in this House have done this year. We've stopped spending money we don't have. We've cut discretionary spending for the second year in a row for the first time since World War II. Thanks to the changes in the way this Congress works, that Republicans brought here under the leadership of our Speaker, instead of shoveling ever-larger piles of money into the Federal government black hole, this bill represents another step towards reducing the size, scope, and cost of the Federal government.

We've been working hard to cut spending, grow the economy, and create jobs. We've protected hardworking taxpayers from Washington's waste by eliminating 42 government programs.

And thanks to Republicans' efforts to stop wasteful pork-barrel spending, while the Democrats included 18,000 earmarks in their final 2 years of spending——

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield my colleague an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

House Republicans fulfilled our pledge to Americans by including no earmarks—no earmarks—in the 2011 and 2012 spending bills. This is a huge success. After years of status quo pork-barrel spending, Republicans have changed the culture of spending in America.

There's much work to do, but this bill takes us in the right direction. That's why I'm urging my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

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

□ 1020

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me thank Congresswoman SLAUGHTER, the gentlelady from New York, for her leadership and for yielding.

This is not the open and transparent process the Republicans have promised the American people. Instead, we have had a closed-door process that has stacked this critical spending bill, a bill that is necessary to make our government and our Nation function, with a bunch of special-interest riders. For example:

Gutting the budget of the IRS, that will not reduce deficits caused by the Bush tax cuts for the 1 percent, and that's in this bill.

Helping to spread HIV and hepatitis C through dirty needles will not help our economic recovery. Yes, that will happen in this bill.

Denying the women of Washington, DC, the right which other women have throughout the country, the right to health services, the right to have an abortion with the city's own money—not Federal funds, mind you, not Federal funds but other funds. We are denying, again, low-income, mostly African American minority women that right in this bill. Why in the world would we want to include this type of a rider in a bill to fund our government? It makes no sense. It's mean-spirited and it's wrong.

Also, why would we want to continue to have provisions to pollute the air that we breathe and the water that we drink? That's in this bill, with some of these riders. That will not raise the failing median income of American workers. Unfortunately, again, this bill does that.

Funding abstinence-only sex education, we know that fails. That won't create the millions of jobs necessary to grow the American middle class and to help more people from falling deeper into poverty.

This recession—and for many, it's still a depression—is hurting millions. Half of all Americans are either in poverty, near poor, or low income. We should be focused on lifting these families up and reigniting the American Dream.

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

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

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you.

In this bill, we should have focused on creating these ladders of opportunity, removing barriers and helping to reignite the American Dream for all Americans. Instead, we're scoring, I believe, political points on the backs of Washington, DC, women and millions of poor and struggling individuals and families in this country.

The process that this bill underwent as we brought it forward to this floor was not a good process. I think had we had regular order, due process, we would have been able to figure some of these issues out.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to simply make a couple of very important points, and that is we are here faced with this situation because of the inability of our colleagues in the other body, the United States Senate, to act.

I am just looking at the list of the conferees, and I listened to my friends criticize the bill—and I actually don't know whether my friend from Rochester is going to end up supporting the conference report or not. I didn't get a conclusion on that—but I will say that every single House Member, Democrat and Republican, every subcommittee chairman, every ranking member of a subcommittee, the so-called cardinals, the chairs of the subcommittees, signed this conference report. It is bipartisan.

Unfortunately, in the Senate, we have a number of Members of the Senate who didn't sign the conference report. But I believe that we need to realize that we went for 963 days—nearly 1,000 days, Mr. Speaker—without a budget having passed from the United States Senate. We know, Mr. Speaker, that we didn't have any appropriations bills done last year. We're trying to clean this process up.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to a very thoughtful, diligent new member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Lawrenceville, Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my chairman for yielding the time, and I want to thank my chairman for his work on opening this process up in the House. He's teamed up with our new Speaker to say that regular order is the better way to do things.

I want to say, and it needs to be said, it's too easy when all you do is read the headlines in this town to start pointing the finger of blame. Here is National Journal, one of our dailies: Dems Sign Conference Report. The White House and Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID had blocked passage of the measure.

It's not about where the blame is; it's about where the successes are.

When you look behind me, Mr. Speaker, at this stack of pages that represents this bill, what that represents is the work that didn't get done last year but that NORM DICKS and that HAL ROGERS have come together to get done this year. When we talk about regular order and the regular order that hasn't happened this year, what we need to talk about is the fact that we had no regular order on appropriations bills last year. We got six of them passed through appropriations, the regular order process, this year. That's half. That's 50 percent of the way

there, and I know we have a commitment from the Appropriations Committee to get the rest of them there next year.

This is a success story. This is not a failure. Is this the way that I wanted to legislate, 2,300 pages? No, it's not. And it's not the way that the Appropriations Committee wants to legislate, and it's not the way any Member of this House wants to legislate, and it's 50 percent better than what we did last year. We're going to get back to regular order. We're going to get back to regular order by clearing out the work from 2012—I'm sorry, 2011 was this year. We are now finishing 2012 today. We're going to be able to start 2013.

I sit on the Budget Committee. My commitment to my friends on the Appropriations Committee is we're going to move that budget. We're going to move it early. We're going to move it on time, and we're going to be done by the end of March so that you all can begin your important work. It's not just about the spending of the money. It's about the oversight of how the money is spent. And that's why regular order is so important.

Do you know that there is only one committee in this House that comes to the Rules Committee day in and day out and says this: I want an open rule on my bill so that all Members can be heard. I do not want waivers to go along with it, and I want the House to operate under regular order? There's only one, and it's the Appropriations Committee.

When you see what's going on today and what we're doing in the name of completing our business for the year, understand that this is the one committee in the House that wants to give everybody a say. This is the one committee in the House that tries to make every Member's opinion count. And if we can successfully deal with this in the same bipartisan way that we have been throughout the year, we can move this business today and begin anew, as we all want to, on January 1 of next year.

I thank my chairman, and I thank the appropriators for their very hard work.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the Committee on Rules, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member DICKS for their tireless work on this bill, and I'm pleased that we're finally going to finish the appropriations process for this year.

I especially want to thank the White House, Senator REID, and other key Senate and House negotiators for removing the House Cuba provision from the final conference report. Not only was it a direct attack on the prerogatives of the Executive, but it was cruel and inhumane. It would have ripped apart Cuban American families from their relatives on the island.

Family communication, connection, and reunification have always been a cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy. It has promoted great good in the case of Cuba, and it deserves the support of this Congress. And hopefully, some day soon, we can scrap our whole Cuba policy and lift the travel restrictions so every American can go visit that country.

But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this opportunity go without commenting a little bit on the process. My friend from Georgia talked about regular order. Regular order my foot. I mean, all points of order were waived against this bill. Half of the bills that are in this—this is pretty heavy—no one had an opportunity to offer a single amendment on. ''Read the bill.'' That's what my Republican friends shouted last year, ''Read the bill.'' They used this rallying cry to promote their Pledge to America where they promised to read the bill. No one read that bill at all. Where are the Tea Party people when you want them?

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. When I'm finished, I'll yield.

Mr. DREIER. I look forward to it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Let me read a quote:

''We will ensure that bills are debated and discussed in the public square by publishing the text online for at least 3 days before coming up for a vote in the House of Representatives.''

That's directly from their pledge. Yet here we are today considering a 2,300-page bill that was introduced at 11:45 p.m.—last night. That's not 3 days. That's not even 12 hours. Twenty-three hundred pages were presented to this House in the dead of night. The Rules Committee didn't finish until close to 1 a.m. this morning, and here we are.

Who knows for sure what's in this bill? Who in this body has had the time to read this bill as it is currently drafted? This is not the way my friends promised to run this House.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I said to the gentleman I won't yield until I'm finished, and I would appreciate not being interrupted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts controls the time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. This is not the way you promised to run the House. This is not how you said you would do the people's business. You said you would bring up every appropriations bill under an open rule, but you barely manage to bring up half of them. Half of the appropriations bills were never brought up before Members of this House.

□ 1030

What happened to the Labor-HHS bill? What happened to the Transportation bill? The Financial Services bill? The Interior bill? The State and Foreign Ops bill? The CJS bill? That's not the Senate's fault; that's not Barack Obama's fault. You're in control of this House of Representatives; you have the power to bring bills up to the floor. You couldn't be bothered to bring them up.

Sure, you found time to bring up bills to defund Planned Parenthood and National Public Radio. You had time to bring up bills that would allow unsafe people to carry concealed weapons from one State to another. Oh, and my favorite, you found time to reaffirm our national motto. That's what all the American people are worried about, whether we're going to reaffirm our national motto.

But you couldn't find time to debate bills funding our Nation's roads, bridges, national parks, and community health centers. You couldn't find to time to do your job.

Now, I'm glad the appropriators reached an agreement, but it's sad that this Republican Congress has once again broken the promise they made to the American people. A 2,300-page bill—something this important and detailed—can't be read and examined in a few hours. That's why you promised 3 days to read the bill, but you couldn't even keep that promise. I remember when they were in charge at an earlier time when immunity for prescription drug companies was inserted into an appropriations bill without anyone knowing about it.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts 1 additional minute.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I have the utmost respect for the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. And I take him at his word when he says there are no earmarks in this bill, that there are no special provisions, that there is nothing snuck in here at the last minute. I'm a trusting guy; but I also believe in verifying things, because in the past, things have been snuck into these bills without us knowing about it.

But look at this bill. Look at this bill. It's 2,300 pages. It was just introduced in the dead of night. It was reported out of the Rules Committee almost at 1 a.m. in the morning. And this is different than what was posted a few days ago. Read the bill, Mr. Speaker. The new Republican Congress promised that we could read the bill. Too bad they're breaking their Pledge to America.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that next year we will go back to regular order, where all the appropriations bills will come to the floor and they will all be debated individually, under an open process. I hope we get to that point.

But I want to say, finally, that the fact that these bills were not all brought up has nothing to do with the Senate, it has nothing to do with the President. It has everything to do with

the leadership of this House that chose not to do it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I say to my friend from Rochester, would you yield time to the gentleman so I can engage in a discussion with him?

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

Who seeks time?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 13½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from New York has 16½ minutes remaining.

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

I'd like to yield to my friend from Worcester to engage in a discussion. I'm sorry, would the gentlewoman like me to yield? I'm happy to yield to my friend from Rochester if she would like me to yield. Would the gentlewoman like me to yield to her? I've just been recognized.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I would like to address the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. DREIER. Would the gentlewoman from New York like me to yield to her, Mr. Speaker?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I do not. If I could be allowed to say something here.

Mr. DREIER. Then I will reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York is not recognized. The gentleman from California controls the time.

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to my friend from Rochester if she would like to ask me a question or ask the Chair a question. I am more than happy to yield to her, I would say, Mr. Speaker.

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

In the spirit of bipartisanship, in the spirit of recognizing that we need to ensure that the government doesn't shut down at midnight, I'd like to engage in a discussion with my friend from Worcester, as I was trying to when he was in the well, to say a few things.

First of all, as we all know, last year no appropriations bills were passed. Nothing was completed in the last Congress—nothing at all. And we have spent, with Mr. ROGERS and Mr. DICKS, virtually this entire year cleaning up the work of the last Congress. And the gentleman will recognize that, I'm sure. I mean, the gentleman acknowledges that, Mr. Speaker, that we have spent this year working to clean up the fact that no appropriations work was done last year.

I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I think we're talking about this year, aren't we?

Mr. DREIER. Yes, absolutely. If I could reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker, I would say absolutely, we're talking about this year. And the responsibility that was thrust on us this year was so overwhelming because last year nothing was done, nothing was accomplished. And so what's happened, Mr. Speaker, is we are in a position where the appropriators have been shouldering this responsibility. And, unfortunately, our colleagues in the other body, the majority leadership there, Senator REID and others, according to the National Public Radio report, as I discussed this morning, as others have acknowledged, it was pointed out in the publications out this morning, this was held hostage, and that's why we are where we are.

Now, my friends are enjoying holding up the 2,300-page conference report and the additional 700 pages of the joint managers' report that is included in there. But guess what, Mr. Speaker, all of that was available on Monday, 5 days ago. And the only exception in this measure is one item has been pulled out. That one item pulled out happens to be the Cuba language that was there, and there was obviously a lot of concern about that. That was pulled out. Then one item was added, and that has to do with the Commodity Futures Trading Corporation. And so, as our colleagues hold up these thousands of pages, we need to realize it's been available since Monday. This is Friday, Mr. Speaker. That's more than the 3-day layover requirement. And we've pointed to these minor modifications.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished chair of the Committee on Appropriations, my very good friend from Somerset, Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding.

And I want to thank the members of the Rules Committee. Chairman DREIER and all of the members of that committee are required to work at all hours of the day and night. In fact, we were testifying before the committee last night at 12:30 seeking the rule on this bill; but that's par for the course for the Rules Committee, who work long, laborious hours with very little thanks. But I want to thank them.

And I want to say to Chairman DREIER and the gentlelady, the ranking member, there has got to be a special place reserved in heaven for those who labor in this vineyard. So thank you for the hard work that you do.

I want to say thanks to my colleague, my ranking member on the full committee, Mr. DICKS, who is with us in the Chamber. He and I have worked hand in hand in this process all year long. It's a very productive relationship. I value his advice and his help and he has been free to give that advice and help all year long. And this is the product of our work, a bipartisan, comprehensive effort to fund the government. And we want to get us back to regular order.

For the last several years, before we took over this body, appropriations was a mess. We didn't do any appropriations. We lurched from one continuing resolution to another, leaving the public bewildered. And so Mr. DICKS and I have determined, along with Senator INOUYE and our colleagues in the Senate, to restore regular order, bringing one bill at a time to this floor and letting it be amended and debated at length, and then into a conference with our colleagues across the way. That's what we want to get back to.

Now, this bill that's before us today is a huge bill. I do not like omnibus bills; neither one of us does. We're not going to have them. But in order to clean up the mess that was left us, we had no choice.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield my friend an additional 30 seconds. And I would ask my friend to yield to me, if he would.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

I would like to just say that I misspoke. The agreement was reached between Mr. ROGERS and Mr. INOUYE on Monday, and the pages were not made available until it was filed at 12:27, at just after midnight on Wednesday.

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

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield my friend an additional 30 seconds.

So I just want to say that I did misspeak when I said the agreement was struck on Monday. It was made available after midnight on Wednesday.

I would like to yield an additional 30 seconds to my friend from Somerset.

□ 1040

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. We're here because this bill is the product of our committee, but most importantly, it's a product of our subcommittees, Republicans and Democrats. They're the ones who put this bill together. Collectively all of those nine subcommittees are represented in this package here. It's been vetted by Republicans and Democrats, House and Senate, all the way through, there are no earmarks here, there are no airdropped provisions in this bill, it is a good bill. It's not perfect. I don't like omnibus bills.

But in cleaning up the mess left us, this bill is a good-faith effort to get '012 out of the way so that in '013, this January, we will be able to go to work on getting the 2013 bills done in the regular way.

I want to thank the staff for all the hard work they have done all year long, and I thank our colleagues.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Let me say all I was trying to do after last month was to say that if Mr. DREIER's 16 minutes were not adequate for him, I would be pleased to yield him one of my 13. That was my aim there.

I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington, the ranking member of Appropriations, Mr. DICKS, who has worked so hard.

Mr. DICKS. I thank the ranking member of the Rules Committee for yielding.

I just want to say that this has been a bipartisan collaborative, bipartisan effort to put this bill here, and Mr. MCGOVERN and others have explained some of the concerns about the process, and they're legitimate, and we hope to do better next year. I am committed to working together with the chairman to bring all 12 appropriations bills to the floor separately next year so that we can exercise regular order.

We did have to do H.R. 1 in the spring, which was all 12 bills from '11, and we spent a week on it, and we also had over 500 amendments. And it just showed that the Members want to have a chance to amend these bills. And if you don't bring them to the floor under regular order, you don't have an opportunity to do that.

So we're going to try to improve on our record. We got six to the floor this year. I think we can do better next year if we get started early, so we make a pledge to work from that.

I want to compliment our chairman, Mr. ROGERS, for his openness, his willingness to consider all points of view. He could not have done a better job, and to have the patience of Job to listen to everybody, and still debating the last few items in this bill this week.

Now, my good friend, Mr. DREIER, whom I have enormous respect for, we work together on trade issues all the time. The only thing I would say about the other body is that they weren't doing something that was evil. They were trying to get an unemployment compensation bill enacted; they're trying to get an extension of the payroll tax bill and some other important provisions that are crucial to the American people.

And so what they did by slowing us down a little bit was to give an opportunity to get that work done.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. As much as I would have preferred to go forward, we had to acknowledge that this was important work that needed to be accomplished.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I've heard a rumor around here that today is sort of a special day for the gentleman. Is it true that a few years ago you were born on this date?

Mr. DICKS. It was not just a few years ago, Mr. Chairman. Well, this is my birthday. We didn't plan it this way. I want to make sure that the chairman of the Rules Committee—

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Happy birthday.

Mr. DICKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I say to my friend, first of all, happy birthday.

Mr. DICKS. Thank you.

Mr. DREIER. And the great birthday present is that we will not shut the government down, and we obviously will see this measure passed today.

I also want to say to my friend that I believe we've made history here. To have any Member of the House stand up, especially on his birthday, Mr. Speaker, and speak in complimentary ways of the other body is, in fact, historic in and of itself.

Mr. DICKS. I just wanted to make sure everybody got the full picture.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 7¼ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from New York has 13½ minutes remaining.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentlelady.

This is the end of the year, and so the Republicans need a few presents for the oil industry, for the coal industry, and that's what this final weekend is all about: How do we get those presents? And so they tried and tried in this bill to roll back many, many environmental laws, but they have been unable to do so. But what they have said is just give us one thing, give us one trinket, perhaps, a symbol of our success in rolling back the laws of energy efficiency in our country.

And so within this bill, the Republicans have now successfully inserted a provision which rolls back the lightbulb efficiency laws, which the companies of our country and the rest of the world must comply with.

Now, what does that mean? Well, for consumers in our country, it will be $6 billion per year that they will have to pay in higher electricity bills every year that they are alive.

What else does it mean? Well, it means that the coal industry is happy because they generate half the electricity in our country, so they'll burn more coal in order to generate that electricity in order for the American people to use less efficient lightbulbs. And that greenhouse gas will go up into the atmosphere, and since the Republicans don't believe the planet is warming, what do they care? Just roll back the lightbulb efficiency standards.

What's the next bill that's up? Oh that one, can we give a payroll tax break to the ordinary Americans? Can we have unemployment insurance for the millions of people who are unemployed? They are saying, well, we'll consider it, but you can't tax billionaires to find the money for that. And, by the way, we want a trinket there as well.

Let's make sure that that final bill, they're saying, has an exemption for environmental law so you can build a huge pipeline, the Keystone XL Pipeline, extra large pipeline right through the middle of America, waiving the environmental laws, and at the same time, ladies and gentlemen, having no guarantee that the oil that comes from Canada through the United States will be sold in the United States. They won't accept that provision, neither TransCanada nor the Republicans, even though they say we would do it for our national security.

So here we are at the end of the year, lightbulb efficiency out the door. They like to do the same thing, by the way, for increased efficiency in the vehicles we drive, the planes which we fly in, the boats which we sail here in the United States, as we see the Middle East in turmoil, as we see Iran and Iraq perhaps growing closer together, they're trying to reduce the efficiency of our country by making it more likely we consume oil.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MARKEY. So here we have, again, misunderstanding on the part of the Republicans on our key national security issue, and that is changing our relationship with the energy sources which we consume, because it comes disproportionately out of the Straits of Hormuz, out of the Middle East into our country. And so this issue goes right to the core, this lightbulb efficiency. It's a small symbol of all the other things that they oppose in terms of increasing the efficiency of our society, and it's stuck right in the middle of this so-called omnibus bill, and they wouldn't be happy unless they got it.

Mind you, this attempt that was defeated earlier this year on the House floor, when Members could vote for it, must be snuck into the omnibus end-of-the year bill. So whether it be the XL pipeline for the oil industry, whether it be the lightbulb bill for the coal industry, whether it be the billionaire tax break staying on the books, rather than helping to make sure ordinary people get tax breaks; billionaires, oil or coal industry, that is what the agenda is all about.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

□ 1050

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Bainbridge Township, Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank the chairman.

One of the useless sorts of pieces of trivia I carry around in my head is that the originator of Superman comics was from Cleveland, Ohio. I think he sold the rights to it for a pittance and was very sorry after that. One of the things I could never get my arms around in the Superman series was the Bizarro Superman. As I listen to this debate, I think that I have landed in a ''bizarro'' world.

To go to another children's story, everyone knows the story of the three little pigs. Those who are criticizing the process or the criticism of the process, not those, the criticism of the process that has brought this bill to the floor, is a little bit like there is a fourth little pig that didn't even bother to build a straw house or a wood house but gets to the brick house where the wolf can't get in and is complaining that the brick furniture is too hard.

Now, listen. No budget was produced in the last Congress. Not one. And so, for the process lovers around here, you know where all of the numbers came from that we had to deal with in the appropriations committee? In the mind of one man from Wisconsin who is now retired. That didn't happen. The budget was passed. You know what else? The budget this year gave lower numbers for the second time straight under this majority, and it is a little more difficult to spend less money than more money. It's easier to spend more money.

But Mr. DICKS and Mr. ROGERS did something that was never done under the stewardship of the previous Speaker, and that is we had bills come up in subcommittee. You know what? Any Member could offer an amendment—good amendments, bad amendments, stupid amendments, wonderful amendments—and we voted on them. They went to full committee. The same thing occurred.

I'm going to tell you, the bills came to the floor under open rules. I think I could count on—I wouldn't have to take off my shoes to figure out the number of open rules under the previous Speaker's administration, as they privatized the Nation's health care, one-seventh of the economy of the United States, as they put in place a national carbon tax with no amendments. So for those who are squealing about process, it's really an inappropriate exercise.

And relative to the other body, and I have nothing but respect for Mr. DICKS, but to say that the Senate wasn't doing anything nefarious by linking this bill that was going to put on furlough and shut down the government at midnight tonight and link that to the payroll tax cuts and others, listen, the Senate has become again and again and again the place where legislation goes to die. It is not enough to sit over there in the lofty Senate Chamber and say, ''We don't like what you did, House,'' and not produce a product.

The time has come for them to pass a bill, and then the process is we're only one-third of the government. You can't have this bill unless the Senate passes it and the President signs it.

So again, Merry Christmas to all, and we should get on with this.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi, the ranking member on Homeland Security, Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying measure, the conference report on H.R. 2055.

When presented with this 1,219-page funding bill, it's hard to know where to start. As the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee, I choose to start by looking at how it will affect our Nation's first responders and the communities they protect.

This package, 10 years after the attacks of September 11, 2001, is a dangerous departure from the path we've been on as a Nation to build up our preparedness and our response capabilities. It abandons the men and women we count on to save lives.

Since 9/11 there has been a general recognition that, as a Nation, we are dangerously unprepared for the emerging threats we face. That is why past Congresses established an array of Federal grant programs targeted to specific homeland security gaps and needs. Across the country, we've seen the benefits of the path lead by the Congresses towards preparedness as evidenced by the response to this year's wave of disasters.

Today, however, this Congress not only strays from the path but bulldozes it.

The conference report slashes more than $2 billion from first responder funding. Last year, $3.38 billion was provided to communities across the country under FEMA's grant program, most notably: the State Homeland Security Grant program, Urban Area Security Initiative, Metropolitan Medical Response System, Operation Stonegarden, Citizen Corps program, Port Security Grant Program, transit security grant programs, interoperability community grant programs, and emergency operation centers. This year, under this package, just $1.35 billion is designated for all of the grant programs.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. That is less than half of what we were provided this last year.

To make matters worse, this package punts responsibility for the tough decisions about funding levels for each program to Secretary Napolitano.

The approach taken here should surprise no one. Tough decisions about funding have been punted throughout this session, and as a result, the Congress has moved from shutdown crisis to shutdown crisis.

If this package is enacted, the Congress will be punting responsibility for meeting the Homeland Security challenges of a post-9/11 world to State, local, and tribal governments. The timing of the shift of responsibility could not be worse.

We must not ignore the cause from public safety and first responder organizations that have warned us about devastating effects of cuts. For this reason and probably a hundred more, I oppose the conference report.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of my friend how many speakers she has remaining on her side.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. We have no further speakers.

May I inquire if my colleague has any.

Mr. DREIER. I plan to close and then move the previous question so we can move ahead to ensure we don't shut down the government.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question and the martial law rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

We all know that the American people are hurting. We have a protracted unemployment problem that has gone on for an extended period of time, the longest period of time since the Great Depression, and it's important for us to realize the reasons for this.

One of the very important reasons for this is that we have seen a dramatic expansion of the size and scope and reach of government. During the 4 years that my friends on the other side of the aisle were in the majority, we witnessed an 82 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending.

We now have a $15 trillion national debt, and I think Democrats and Republicans alike acknowledge that that cannot be sustained.

As I've been saying throughout this week, our job is jobs. Right now our job is jobs. We need to have a laser-like focus on creating job opportunities for our fellow Americans, people who are so frustrated they've given up the effort to look for work.

So that's why the things that we're dealing with today are so critically important to address those needs.

Now, since there has been bipartisan recognition that we can't continue down the road with an 82 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending which we witnessed over the past several years, it's important for us to come together, and that's exactly what's happened.

This is NORM DICKS' birthday, and we're very happy about that. We're happy that on his birthday we're going to see a bipartisan agreement that will bring about a $95 billion reduction in non-defense discretionary spending. And that's what this work product does, Mr. Speaker.

And again, bipartisan recognition and even bicameral recognition, and even recognition from down Pennsylvania Avenue with the second branch

of government, that we are right now altering the course that we had been on of dramatically increasing spending. And we're doing it, Mr. Speaker, in a very fair and balanced and open way.

□ 1100

I don't like the process that got us to where we are right now. I said earlier that I believe that this multi-thousand-page package was available on Monday; it was agreed to on Monday; but it wasn't made available until early Thursday morning. Yet we are where we are, and there was an agreement. Mr. INOUYE and Mr. ROGERS came to this agreement on Monday.

We could have done this earlier, but we know that our friends in the other body chose—and as I said, I wasn't going to say it earlier, but it has been characterized in the media as having held hostage this very important appropriations bill. We also dealt with the threat of a government shutdown that would take place 13 hours from now. We are not going to see that happen. We are not going to see that happen because Mr. DICKS and Mr. ROGERS and other members of the Appropriations Committees in both bodies—and the leadership—came together to ensure that that doesn't happen.

We still have a long way to go. We still have much work that needs to be done. But by the passage of this measure today, Mr. Speaker, we are going to do exactly what is necessary. We are going to finally have a clean slate. We've all commiserated over the fact that we've had this mess to clean up of the past. It's been ugly and it's been difficult; but we have, in fact, by virtue of this agreement cleaned it up so that we can continue to work down this path towards balancing the budget, getting our fiscal house in order, and doing what we need to do—our jobs, which is to create jobs.

I think we have a chance to do that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this rule, and I urge support of the previous question so that we can move ahead and make sure that we have what's necessary to meet this very important deadline by midnight.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 500, if ordered; motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1892; and motion to suspend the rules on S. 278, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 179, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 937]

YEAS—239

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—179

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Bachmann
Clay
Coble
Davis (KY)
Diaz-Balart
Filner
Giffords
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Johnson, E. B.
Myrick
Napolitano
Paul
Pingree (ME)
Speier

□ 1130

Ms. FUDGE, Ms. BERKLEY, Messrs. CLARKE of Michigan, FATTAH, and RUSH changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 937, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, December 16, 2011, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 937 in order to attend an important event in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of the Conference Report on H.R. 2055—Consolidated Appropriations Act, H.R. 3672—Disaster Relief Appropriations Act and H. Con. Res. 94—Directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 3671.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 252, nays 164, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 938]

YEAS—252

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Dicks
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—164

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Bachmann
Bishop (UT)
Coble
Connolly (VA)
Davis (KY)
Diaz-Balart
Filner
Giffords
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Johnson, E. B.
Myrick
Napolitano
Paul
Pingree (ME)
Speier
Velázquez

□ 1137

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 938, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, December 16, 2011, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 938 in order to attend an important event in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on H. Res. 500—Rule providing for consideration of the Conference Report on H.R. 2055—Consolidated Appropriations Act, H.R. 3672—Disaster Relief Appropriations Act and H. Con. Res. 94—Directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 3671.

## 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 and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following tiles:

H.R. 3421. An act to award Congressional Gold Medals in honor of the men and women who perished as a result of the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001.

H. con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution providing for a correction to the enrollment of the bill H.R. 2845.

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. 1612. An act to provide the Department of Justice with additional tools to target extraterritorial drug trafficking activity.

## INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1892) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 396, nays 23, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 939]

YEAS—396

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dicks