

bipartisan effort with Congresswoman KRISTI NOEM in urging the EPA to revise its proposal because if energy independence is a national priority, then so, too, should be biofuels.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 3547, SPACE LAUNCH LIABILITY INDEMNIFICATION EXTENSION ACT; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JANUARY 17, 2014, THROUGH JANUARY 24, 2014; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 458 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 458

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3547) to extend the application of certain space launch liability provisions through 2014, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House (1) concur in the Senate amendment to the title and (2) concur in the Senate amendment to the text with an amendment inserting the text of Rules Committee Print 113-32 in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate. The Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of the motion specified in the first section of this resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 74 shall be considered as adopted.

SEC. 3. The chair of the Committee on Appropriations may insert in the Congressional Record not later than January 16, 2014, such material as he may deem explanatory of the Senate amendments and the motion specified in the first section of this resolution.

SEC. 4. On any legislative day during the period from January 17, 2014, through January 24, 2014—

(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. 5. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 4 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Worcester, Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my colleague and friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consider-

ation of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Madam 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. Madam Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for the consideration of H.R. 3547. The rule authorizes the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to offer a motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment with the House amendment consisting of the text of the fiscal year 2014 omnibus appropriations bill.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. Additionally, the rule conforms the title to the content of the bill by providing for the passage of an enrollment correction after the adoption of Chairman ROGERS' motion.

□ 1245

Lastly, Madam Speaker, the rule provides floor management tools to be used during next week's recess.

Madam Speaker, I want to commend my good friends Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY for bringing to this House a bipartisan bill that brings to a close the fiscal year 2014 appropriations process while maintaining the Republican commitment to fiscal responsibility.

Since Republicans took control of the House, we have cut discretionary spending 4 years in a row—the first time since the Korean war. At the same time, this bill provides no new funding for the Affordable Care Act and also includes a pension fix for medically retired personnel and survivor benefit plan annuitants. While there is still work to be done to ensure that we honor the service of our veterans and military retirees, this is a good, bipartisan first step.

Madam Speaker, I know many of my friends here voted against the Ryan-Murray compromise budget, and they voted against the fiscal cliff deal of 2011. However, look at where these pieces of legislation have brought us. We have cut discretionary spending 4 years in a row, to a level \$164 billion below the fiscal year 2008 level, the last year of the Bush Presidency. That is a feat to be commended. We have dealt with tax expenditures, in part, as a portion of the fiscal cliff deal. Yet, despite this progress, we still have not been able to close over \$600 billion of our annual budget deficit.

Madam Speaker, discretionary spending has paid more than its fair share in dealing with our budget deficit. Entitlements such as Medicare and Medicaid spending and other mandatory programs must be reformed in order to put us on a path to a balanced budget.

With the passage of this omnibus, which releases us from the threat of a government shutdown, we are showing the American people that we actually are capable of working in a bipartisan manner. I hope in the future we can work to capitalize on our bipartisan success and bring America's bloated debt and deficit under control.

Madam Speaker, passing this rule and this omnibus spending bill is the responsible thing to do. It is the thoughtful thing to do. As opposed to lurching from crisis to crisis, this omnibus is carefully crafted over a period of many months. And it sets priorities, controls spending, and reasserts congressional authority over the appropriations process far more effectively than yet another continuing resolution ever could.

Many of our colleagues have not seen regular order in the appropriations process. And, sadly, until the Senate is able to pass bills for us to conference together, I think we will be forced into relying on omnibuses in the future. But this is not a continuing resolution. The Ryan-Murray agreement gives us a reasonable foundation for our work in fiscal year 2015.

With that, I urge support of the rule and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, what we have before us can be described—very charitably—as a mixed bag. This is a 1,500-page bill that nobody has actually read. This is, by the way, two-sided. It came before the Rules Committee less than 24 hours after it was filed. Because of this rule and the process used to create the bill, no Member, Republican or Democrat, will have the opportunity to amend it or change it in any way.

To top it all off, the legislative vehicle that the Republican leadership is using to rocket this bill over to the Senate is H.R. 3547, the Space Launch Liability Indemnification Act. No wonder the American people think Congress is living on another planet.

When people talk about regular order, this ain't it.

But we are where we are. And I do want to thank Chairman ROGERS, Ranking Member LOWEY, and the House and Senate appropriators for their hard work in putting the underlying omnibus appropriations bill together.

I will support this bill, very reluctantly, because the alternative is far worse—yet another Republican shutdown of the government, yet another unnecessary economically devastating and politically motivated mess, yet another attempt by congressional Republicans to damage an economy still

struggling to recover from the worst recession in our lifetimes.

So, yes, I will vote for the bill, but we need to curb our enthusiasm. The numbers in this bill are awful. They may be slightly less awful than the Republican sequester numbers, but they are still awful.

Fewer kids will be cut from Head Start, but we are nowhere near meeting our educational needs. More funds will be provided for critical medical research, but not enough. There will be more funding for LIHEAP for our cities and towns and for antihunger programs. While it begins to undo the sequester, it does so for only 2 years. We need to get rid of it forever—permanently.

With this bill, we are waist-deep instead of neck-deep in manure. Hooray, I guess.

Even so, I am sure that many Tea Party members of this House will vote against this bill today because they still think it spends too much. All of the right-wing outside groups who really call the shots around here are whipping hard against it.

But more importantly, Madam Speaker, what is missing from this bill or from the Republican leadership's agenda is any acknowledgment of the immediate problem of millions of people who are losing their long-term unemployment benefits.

On December 28, 1.3 million unemployed Americans saw their long-term unemployment insurance expire, including more than 58,000 in Massachusetts. Since then, unemployment insurance has expired for an additional 72,000 more Americans each week. Yet the Republicans continue to do nothing.

Let me remind my colleagues how we got here.

After a difficult economic period in the early nineties and prolonged budget fights, President Clinton left us with a budget surplus, a surplus that was then squandered through unpaid-for wars and reckless tax cuts championed by President Bush and the Republican Congress. The Clinton surplus turned into a then-record deficit that was exacerbated by the global recession that started at the end of the Bush administration.

Six years after President Bush left office, we still have an unacceptable level of unemployment and an economy that is getting better for some while, at the same time, leaving many behind. And that is where unemployment insurance comes in.

This program is a lifeline for millions of people who lost their jobs—for most, because of the recession and not because of any issues regarding job performance. Unemployment insurance helps millions of families pay their bills and put food on their tables, things they could do if they had jobs, but they can't because they are unemployed.

Yet Republicans in the Senate continue to filibuster a bill to extend un-

employment insurance, and the House Republican leadership refuses even to consider any bill. We can't even get a bill on this floor so that Members of both sides of the aisle can have a chance to express their views. It is shameful, it is unconscionable, and it hurts our economic growth.

Madam Speaker, this isn't about some abstract piece of Federal policy. This is about the lives of our own citizens. It is about our neighbors who are simply trying to get by. It is about people who are willing to work but need help until they find a new job. They deserve a hell of a lot better than they are getting from this Congress.

Madam Speaker, I urge that we defeat the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to hold a vote on a clean, 3-month unemployment insurance extension. This has been introduced by my colleague from Massachusetts, Congressman TIERNEY. If Congress doesn't act, over 18 million Americans will be denied the vital relief that they so greatly depend upon.

Madam 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. Madam Speaker, I will again, before this debate is over, remind my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question.

Let me just close, again, by saying we need to move this process forward. I expect that that is what this omnibus will do. But we are about to leave for a break, starting tomorrow, one of the many breaks that the Republican leadership constantly gives us. So we are going to leave town, and meanwhile all these millions of Americans who are depending on us to help them get through this difficult time are just going to be left alone. We are going to turn our backs on them. That is, to me, unconscionable.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand with us and defeat the previous question so we can deal with this issue of unemployment insurance.

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to respond to my friend.

I want to thank my friend for his support of what is a bipartisan bill, a bill for which the President of the United States also issued a statement of support. We appreciate that. I would suggest that we are actually doing what my friend quite often suggested we do—work in a bipartisan manner and arrive at a common solution.

I would add one thing to my friend's description of the 1990s. We ought to

give a little bit of credit to the Republican majority who actually voted for those agreements—when most Democrats did not—that balanced the budget, and particularly Speaker Gingrich, because, with all due respect to President Clinton, he never once submitted a balanced budget.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), my good friend, a colleague from the Rules Committee and a classmate.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I rise to engage in a colloquy with Agriculture Committee Chairman LUCAS of Oklahoma and Interior Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman CALVERT of California regarding the issue of Federal land ownership and Payments in Lieu of Taxes, commonly known as PILT.

PILT is a program for counties all across America that have federally owned lands within their boundaries. Counties in every State, except Rhode Island, benefit from this program first established in 1979. PILT helps to offset the loss of property tax revenues caused by the presence of Federal land. The Federal Government is the largest landowner in the United States, and PILT fulfills the Federal Government's obligation to local communities where their ownership presence is the greatest.

One out of every 3 acres in our country is federally owned. As you can see from the map, most of this land is concentrated in the West. Counties with Federal land in their jurisdictions are denied property tax revenues typical of communities with privately owned land. The diminished tax base hinders rural communities from fulfilling some of their most basic functions, such as education and public safety.

PILT's previous funding has expired, and now we are in a situation where we have to find a new source. We were pleased yesterday when the Speaker and majority leader pledged their support to the Western Caucus that qualified counties would receive 2014 funding.

Subcommittee Chairman CALVERT, as we continue to work on 2014 funding matters, it seems apparent that funding for PILT will be included in another important legislative vehicle in the future. Is that your understanding?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. The gentleman is correct. PILT has been a mandatory program under the jurisdiction of authorizing committees since fiscal year 2008. Fiscal year 2007 was the last year that PILT was funded with discretionary funds. In fact, funding for PILT last year was provided within the MAP-21 transportation bill.

Had PILT funding been provided in the Interior division of the omnibus, the committee would not have been able to adequately address other critical issues important to the western Members.

PILT is very important to my own State of California, which is the largest recipient of PILT payments, with over \$41 million received in fiscal year 2013. Like my good friend, I am absolutely committed to securing PILT funding for our counties in fiscal year 2014.

It is my understanding that Chairman LUCAS has agreed to carry PILT funding in the farm bill in the conference report.

Chairman LUCAS, do you concur?

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

Mr. COLE. I yield my friend an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, Mr. CALVERT, I do. I have already had a conversation with Chairwoman STABENOW, who is a strong supporter of PILT funding, as well as Chairman HASTINGS of the House Natural Resources Committee, whose committee oversees the program. I also have the backing of House Republican leadership.

I can assure you both that it is my intention to provide funding for PILT in the final conference committee agreement on the farm bill. I am very much aware of the importance of this program for rural communities across America in providing funding for necessary functions like police, education, and infrastructure.

Thank you for this opportunity to discuss this important issue, and I look forward to working with you on this in the very near future.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Thank you.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the ranking member on the Committee on Ways and Means.

□ 1300

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

Mr. LEVIN. Thank you to the gentleman for yielding.

More than 1.5 million long-term unemployed have now been cut off unemployment insurance with the expiration of the Federal program, thrown out of work through no fault of their own, and desperately, desperately looking for a job. They are powerless and, to many in Washington, they are nameless, only a number.

So those who oppose extending this lifeline of unemployment insurance can talk about their compassion, but rather than meeting and talking with Americans searching for work, they are throwing them to the wolves, whether of hunger, helplessness or even homelessness.

We, I promise everybody, will strive to help change that these next 11 days, as House Republicans recess.

Consider this: when Walmart advertised 600 jobs in D.C., 23,000 people applied. When a dairy plant was reopened in Hagerstown, Maryland, 1,600 people applied for a few dozen jobs.

This should not be a partisan issue. Republicans are making it such with their cold shoulder and their stonewall in this House.

It is unconscionable for Republicans to close down this House without lifting a single finger to help 1.5 million Americans and to prevent a vote by those of us ready to act. It is unconscionable.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a great Member from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO), my friend and colleague.

Mr. PALAZZO. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman SMITH and Chairman ROGERS for their work to put this bill together. This is a product of months of work on the part of our appropriators, under regular order, to give us the framework for this bill.

I have the pleasure of serving as chairman of the Subcommittee on Space, as well as being one of the lead sponsors on the underlying indemnification bill. This is a simple, yet crucial, policy that allows our space industry to remain globally competitive as they support and service satellites Americans rely upon every day.

I welcome this 3-year extension, and I also appreciate the consideration this package has given my NASA reauthorization bill.

The larger package also begins to address issues facing homeowners across the Nation, not just in coastal areas, by including the Palazzo-Cassidy-Grimm-Richmond amendment that has received wide bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate.

This provision halts all FEMA work through the end of this fiscal year to implement rate increases on some of those homeowners affected by flood map changes. This provision sets the stage for broader reforms that we are working towards later this month or the next.

With this bill, we also maintain our commitments to our men and women in uniform by restoring damaging defense cuts. We address cost-of-living adjustments for 63,000 medically retired military personnel and survivors receiving those benefits. I plan to continue working to address cost-of-living increases for all of our military retirees.

We provide for a well-deserved 1 percent increase in troop pay, and it also provides funding for homeland security priorities, such as the seventh and eighth National Security Cutters for the Coast Guard.

Finally, this bill continues the pattern of responsible cuts to government waste, fraud and abuse. It represents \$165 billion in total discretionary cuts since 2010, and is part of our commitment, as House Republicans, to continue cutting spending responsibly.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their work on this bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), who is the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, while this agreement is an improvement over the harmful sequester, it fails to adequately fund Wall Street's cops, shortchanges many housing programs, and ignores the global economy.

While the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission need more resources to oversee Wall Street, this bill only provides flat funding to the already-underfunded SEC and a nominal bump for the CFTC. Yes, no furloughs, but no new examiners either.

Regarding housing, the bill offers minimal increases for section 8 vouchers and the Community Development Block Grant program but not enough for Americans struggling with long-term unemployment and foreclosure.

Finally, Republican isolationists have excluded the International Monetary Fund reform package. Democrats and businesses agree a well-equipped IMF that leverages billions of global dollars is in our national interest.

Despite these concerns, we must pass this bill. Reluctantly, I support this bill. We have to stop the sequester and prevent another government shutdown.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3824 to end the Republicans' refusal to extend unemployment benefits that protect 238,855, and counting, workers in my home State of California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is advised that all time has been yielded for purposes of debate only. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE. No, Madam Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3824 to end the Republicans' refusal to extend unemployment benefits that protect 49,965 workers in Michigan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE. No, Madam Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3824 to end the Republican majority's refusal to extend unemployment benefits that would protect 137,315 workers in my home State of New York, and that number is growing as we speak.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE. No, Madam Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3824 to end the Republicans' unconscionable refusal to extend unemployment benefits that protect 137,315 workers in my home State of New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE. No, Madam Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. TITUS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3824 to end Republicans' refusal to extend unemployment benefits that protect over 19,000 workers in Nevada.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE. No, Madam Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3824 to end the Republicans' refusal to extend unemployment benefits that benefit over one-quarter of a million people in my home State of California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE. No, Madam Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman

from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3824 to end the Republican leadership's refusal to extend unemployment benefits that protect unemployed workers in my State of New Hampshire.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE. No, Madam Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3824 to end Republicans' refusal to extend unemployment benefits that protect 238,855 workers in California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE. No, Madam Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3824 to end the Republicans' refusal to extend unemployment benefits that protect 238,855 workers in my home State of California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE. No, Madam Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), my colleague, for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3824 to end the Republicans' refusal to extend unemployment benefits that protect nearly 63,000 workers in Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE. No, Madam Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3824 to end the unfortunate Republican refusal to extend unemployment benefits that protect 238,855 workers in my home State of California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE. No, Madam Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3824 to end Republicans' shameful refusal to extend unemployment benefits that protect 238,855 workers in California, my State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE. No, Madam Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3824 to end Republicans' refusal to extend unemployment insurance benefits that protect 19,285 workers in the great State of Nevada.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE. No, Madam Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3824 to end the Republicans' refusal to extend unemployment insurance that protects 238,855 workers in California who lost their job through no fault of their own, and who actively seek work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE. No, Madam Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS) for a unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. First, the Chair would make a statement.

The Chair would advise Members that even though a unanimous consent request to consider a measure is not entertained, embellishments accompanying such request constitute debate and will become an imposition on the time of the Member who yielded for that purpose.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring to this floor H.R. 3824 to end Republicans' refusal to extend unemployment benefits that protect families in the San Fernando Valley of which I represent. These individuals deserve the right to eat and should not be tossed out on the street and become homeless.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE. No, Madam Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Time will be charged to the gentleman from Massachusetts for the last request.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3824 to end the Republicans' very cruel refusal to end unemployment benefits that would protect more than 80,000 Floridian job seekers in my home State of Florida.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE. No, Madam Speaker, I will not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3824 to end Republicans' refusal to extend unemployment benefits that protect nearly 239,000 workers in the great State of California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE. No, Madam Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

□ 1315

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3824 to end the Republicans' refusal to extend unemployment benefits that protect 80,473 workers in my home State, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE. No, Madam Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3824 to end the majority's refusal to extend unemployment benefits to some of our Nation's neediest families, including 137,315 workers in the great State of New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE. No, Madam Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, with the hope of a different response from my friend on the other side of the aisle, I ask one more time for unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3824 to end the Republicans' refusal to extend unemployment benefits that protect 5,585 workers in my home State of Rhode Island.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE. My good friend from the other side of the aisle clearly hasn't dealt with a lot of Native Americans, where the answer is normally pretty much the same. So, Madam Speaker, I do not yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring forward H.R. 3824 to end the Republicans' unconscionable refusal to extend the unemployment insurance which, in my State, would benefit some 62,900 workers in search of work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE. No, Madam Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend for giving me the opportunity to renew so many acquaintances with my good friends on the other side and make some new ones. So I appreciate that.

I want to reiterate my earlier announcement that all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only, and we are not yielding for any other purposes.

I would like to make the point that this legislation is genuinely bipartisan. The legislation that my friends have asked for consideration was not within the scope of consideration of this legislation. I have no doubt it is being dealt with in the Senate right now, but it is simply not appropriate, in my opinion, to bring it into this debate, particularly since we are under time constraints. Were we to fail to pass this rule and the underlying legislation in a timely fashion, we would risk a government shutdown, which I know my friends on the other side of the aisle want to avoid as much as we do.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me just say to my colleague from Oklahoma, we are not asking to amend this bill. We are asking for the right to be able to bring up a bill that would extend unemployment insurance.

Let's be clear so everybody understands this. The majority, if they agreed, could allow us to bring this up at any time. We could have this debate right after we pass the omnibus. So there is absolutely no reason at all that we shouldn't have the right to be able to debate the issue of extending unemployment insurance to millions of our fellow citizens who are looking to us for help.

It is very challenging during these economically difficult times to be able to find employment, and we have many of our citizens who have tried but have been unsuccessful in finding employment. They ought to be able to support their families through this difficult time. All we are asking for is the right to be able to bring this up and vote on it. We are not talking about delaying passing the omnibus bill. We are talking about unemployment insurance. We

are talking about doing our job and not skipping town and going home for a week while people who are unemployed and have lost their benefits have nothing.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY), whose legislation we could bring up, if we were to defeat the previous question, to extend unemployment insurance for the millions of Americans that have been impacted.

Mr. TIERNEY. Madam Speaker, some 1.3 million workers have lost their jobless benefits as of December 28. That number grows by an estimated 72,000 more a week. In my home State of Massachusetts, alone, some 62,915 families have been adversely impacted, and that includes 20,000 veterans.

We can hear the urgency of families who have exhausted every avenue, have exhausted the savings, the generosity of family and friends, even as they look for work. About 4 million people have been cut out of work for 27 weeks or longer. They have about a 12 percent chance of finding a new job in any given month. There are still not enough jobs to go around, almost three unemployed workers per every job opening. That is worse than the ratio at any point during the 2001 recession.

If the fate of individuals doesn't move the Members of this Chamber, perhaps a look at the economy would. For every \$1 of unemployment insurance, the economic impact is a positive \$1.52. That is money with which to buy essential services and products of our local and small businesses, who greatly need that demand.

Seventeen times over the last decade or so we have extended benefits in a bipartisan manner. Fourteen of those times were bipartisan in nature, and five of those were under the administration of George W. Bush.

The urgency is now; the need is critical. I have introduced, Madam Speaker, the responsible legislation, entitled the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act, H.R. 3824. It has over 140 cosponsors already, even though it has been filed only a matter of days. Speaker BOEHNER should bring this bill to the floor immediately for a vote. Let us act now and extend it for 3 months, and help our neighbors help themselves as we help our Nation.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I want to remind my good friend that this legislation is comparable, and this is actually under consideration in the United States Senate right now. Frankly, my friends on the other side of the aisle control the majority there.

I would also like to remind them that when the President first raised this issue about a week before the end of the year, the Speaker said, If you will help us find a way to pay for it, we will consider it. So far I don't recall that that offer has been taken up in any serious way by anybody.

The cost of this is extraordinary: \$25 billion over a year; a temporary 3-

month extension would cost between 7 and 8. We are trying to deal with what have been, really, deficits that have been extraordinary. This program has been extended for 5 years.

Again, we would love to continue our dialogue with our friends. We hope something productive happens in the United State Senate. For now I am going to keep the focus where it belongs. That is on this omnibus spending bill, which is a bipartisan accomplishment, which the President has urged that we pass, which I know many of my friends on the other side also favor.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, before I yield to the next speaker on our side, I think it is important to point out that, yeah, the Democrats do control the majority in the Senate, but a majority of Republicans right now are filibustering consideration of extending unemployment insurance, led by MITCH MCCONNELL, the Republican minority leader.

Maybe rather than waiting for them we can show some leadership here and demonstrate to these millions of Americans who have fallen on tough times that somebody cares; that we are not just going to let them just dangle and be without any kind of compensation during these difficult times; that we are going to step up to the plate and let them know that we understand that the economy is still going through hard times and that there is a need to extend this benefit.

I don't know how we can just turn our backs on these people who are struggling. I mean, our job here is to help people, not to ignore their problems, not to turn a cold shoulder when they fall on difficult times. We all know we are emerging from one of the worst economic crises in our lifetime. These aren't normal times. So we ought to be there to provide some help. Let us show them a little compassion. I don't think that that is unreasonable. I don't care what your ideology is. We ought to not turn our backs on those who are unemployed in this country.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nevada, (Mr. HORSFORD).

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, so we finally have a chance to bring up unemployment insurance, which is what the majority of Americans want us to be addressing at this time. It is completely insensitive, unjust, and flat out wrong that Congress would deny 1.4 million Americans unemployment insurance benefits, including over 19,000 Nevadans.

This is the week that unemployment checks stop coming. This is the week where families will be faced with very unnecessary hardships and impossible choices. Why? Because this Congress fails to act. Republicans are holding unemployment benefits hostage, and it is completely hypocritical.

On December 14, 2002, in his weekly radio address, then-President George W. Bush scolded Congress for failing to extend unemployment insurance benefits. He said: "These Americans rely on their unemployment benefits to pay for their rent, to pay their food and other critical bills."

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HORSFORD. "They need our assistance in these difficult times, and we cannot let them down."

The unemployment rate then was 6 percent. It is much higher now. That Congress voted 416-4 to extend unemployment benefits, and under George W. Bush they did it five times. They didn't ask for one pay-for because it was important for the American public. It is time for us to do the right thing on behalf of 1.4 million Americans.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I want to remind my friends—and I have no doubt about my friend's compassion, I genuinely do not. We have had the opportunity to serve together on the Rules Committee. I would argue the compassionate thing to do here would be actually to start creating jobs.

This recession ended in 2009. It has been a lot of years. We have 140 pieces of legislation stacked up in the United States Senate waiting for the Senate to act on that we think would generate jobs, everything from Keystone pipeline to enhanced energy production. There is a disagreement, but I think if the Senate would act proactively we would actually do what I know we both want to do and create jobs.

The other thing I would suggest, I have some sympathy with my friends on the other side of the rotunda in my party. They have not been allowed to present any of their ideas or any of their amendments on the floor. I think they would probably like to work with our friend in that regard, let's just see.

Again, I would suggest today we should concentrate on the thing that we know we can do in a bipartisan fashion: pass an omnibus spending bill that will prevent a government shutdown and will provide a firm foundation for our economy that both sides and the President of the United States have agreed is the right thing to do for the country.

You usually make progress one step at a time. It seems to me that is an important step and a step we ought to make today by passing the rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Oklahoma's comments, and I appreciate his expressing the frustration of the minority in the Senate not being able to express themselves, to be heard. I feel that same frustration here because we now have just completed a year in which I think that there have been more closed rules than any other time in history. So I think we all on the minority side here understand what it feels like to be shut out.

At this point, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, the low level of funding in the omnibus bill for the Labor-HHS Subcommittee is far from meeting the needs of our country. Nevertheless I will support the bill because this compromised measure does make important improvements in health promotion, medical research, Head Start, and Job Corps.

I commend Ranking Members LOWEY, DELAUNO, and their staff, who passionately fought to protect the programs decimated by sequestration. I am particularly grateful the bill fully funds STOP Act programs so we can continue the progress we have made against the public health crisis of underage drinking. I am pleased it funds newborn screening programs that save the lives of babies with genetic disorders.

Madam Speaker, spending bills are a statement of our values and our priorities as Americans. Unfortunately, this bill falls short of truly reflecting those values in critically underfunded programs like Healthy Start and Hispanic-serving institutions.

My hope is that our 2015 appropriations bill will, in fact, reflect our commitment to investing in a better future for all Americans, including the most vulnerable among us.

□ 1330

Far be it from me to debate too much about what goes on in the United States Senate, but I do think it is worth adding for the record that, since July of this year, Republicans in the Senate have been allowed to submit exactly four amendments. So I think we know who holds the world's record in terms of keeping the minority off the floor.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON), my distinguished friend, colleague and former chairman on the Interior Committee and the new chairman of the Energy and Water Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I rise to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. NUNES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for all your hard work in putting this bill together.

Mr. Chairman, the underlying bill includes funding for three environmental programs that have shown very little accountability since they were enacted, specifically, the Central Valley Project Improvement Act Restoration Fund, the CALFED Program, and the San Joaquin River Restoration Fund.

I remain concerned about the expenditures in these programs and whether they are going to the intended purpose. I urge the committee to conduct an

oversight hearing into these programs, and would urge you, Mr. Chairman, perhaps you could contact the Government Accountability Office to conduct a study of these programs run by the Bureau of Reclamation's Mid-Pacific region.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for your work, and I appreciate your willingness and the opportunity to bring accountability, as many of you know, to the challenge that we have in California and the devastation of the drought, but what is wreaking havoc throughout the Valley—which is the breadbasket—we find many times much of this money is not being held accountable and the lack of water that is not being supplied throughout California. We appreciate your work on this.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank both my friends from California for their attention to these issues. We have been discussing these issues with both of you and your concerns for some time now, and I look forward to exploring the issues further during a hearing and to working with the Government Accountability Office to provide further oversight on these programs.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield to our distinguished minority whip, Mr. HOYER, for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3824 to end the Republicans' refusal to extend unemployment benefits that protect 25,092 people in my State of Maryland.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise the minority whip that the Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY for their hard work on this funding package and specifically their help in adding a first-time accountability provision to make our Federal Government more efficient and more effective. This accountability language will, for the first time, direct each agency head in preparing funding requests as part of the President's annual budget in consultation with the GAO to directly link the agency's performance plan and performance goals to such funding requests.

It will require that performance measures examine outcome measures, output measures, efficiency measures, and customer service measures. This will provide the American taxpayer with results-oriented government.

This first-time accountability language represents a real step forward for the integration of performance-based budgeting in government operations.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I am here to express my disappointment that we are not bringing up H.R. 3824, a bill that would extend for 3 months emergency unemployment compensation. It causes me to think of what the American people would expect of us here in Congress if we were facing a national emergency of some type that resulted in the immediate loss of basic support for the basic needs of 1.3 million Americans.

What would we do, especially if that national emergency somehow caused every week 72,000 additional Americans to lose the basic help that they need to provide rent, to provide heat, put food on the table—to take care of the basic human necessities? We would act. Sure, as the gentleman pointed out, we would discuss ways to prevent future national emergencies that would cause this sort of problem. We would find ways to prevent those sorts of things from happening.

The gentleman referred to job training, economic development programs like job training. We would do those things for sure. But in the meantime, we would—and today we should—act to restore those benefits.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I commend Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY for their tremendous leadership in putting together this compromise budget.

The bill is a step forward. It increases funding for many important priorities like housing authority operations and section 8. We have got an affordable-housing crisis in New York City, and these additional resources will help.

The bill also makes important infrastructure investments. It fully funds the President's request of \$14.6 million for the Second Avenue Subway in the district I represent and \$215 million for the East Side access that will help create thousands of jobs in our Nation's largest city and is in the district of Mr. KING and my district.

I am also pleased to see that there isn't a single anti-woman rider that would threaten women's access to comprehensive health care.

This bill isn't perfect, but it is a step forward. I had hoped it would include an extension of unemployment insurance and refund the cuts for the National Institutes of Health, but it is a vast improvement over the current budget, and I will be supporting it.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3824 to end the Republicans' refusal to extend unemployment benefits that protect over 72,000 workers in Texas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, in the last 18 days, nearly 1.5 million Americans have been cut off from their emergency unemployment benefits, and tens of thousands more Americans will lose their benefits every week without congressional action.

Yesterday, The Wall Street Journal reported that 2.3 million children live with a long-term unemployed parent, triple the number since the recession started in 2007; and losing unemployment benefits will be devastating to so many of these families. This is unconscionable. And what have my Republicans colleagues in the House done to address this issue? Nothing.

Speaker BOEHNER's refusal to have a vote to extend emergency unemployment benefits is shortsighted, bad for our economy, and devastating for the 1.5 million Americans who have been cut off from this vital lifeline.

Congress is set to adjourn in 24 hours; and instead of offering a solution to extend emergency unemployment benefits, this rule does not allow us to preserve this important assistance and ignores the serious needs of our constituents. It is outrageous that the House of Representatives would leave town again without taking action to renew this critical program to help struggling American families.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can bring this important legislative fix to the floor without delay to resolve this problem for our constituents.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I remind my friends on the other side of the aisle that supposedly we are in the 5th year of a recovery and that we have extended these extraordinary benefits for 5 years at the cost of hundreds of billions of dollars.

Now, the Speaker has indicated that if our friends, either the administration, our friends on the other side of the aisle, or our friends in the Senate have an idea how to pay for this extension, he would give it due consideration. So far, it doesn't appear that such an idea has been forthcoming.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me just remind my colleagues that Republican President George Bush extended unemployment benefits on a number of occasions, never paid for it; and I don't recall my friends on the other side of the aisle raising a big to-do over that.

But the bottom line is to simply say that, well, we have extended it multiple times, so tough luck to these people who are still struggling in this difficult economy is unacceptable. How can we do that? We are here to represent these people and to make sure that they have enough to get through these difficult times until the economy gets better so they can get a job.

This should not be controversial. This shouldn't be a big deal. I am stunned that extending unemployment insurance to the unemployed in this country is a controversial issue. Only in this Republican-led House of Representatives are our priorities all messed up. Nobody talks about pay-fors for tax cuts for Donald Trump or subsidies to Big Oil or any special deals for corporate donors to the Republican National Committee. No one says a word about that. But when it comes to extending benefits to unemployed Americans, we are going to find pay-fors.

Well, do you know what? Let's take the initiative in this House to figure out how to get this thing done rather than leave town tomorrow and we don't come back for a week and a half and just leave these people hanging.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, while I intend to support the omnibus appropriation bill, I wanted to voice my deep concern and disappointment that the omnibus appropriation bill fails to address the unemployment insurance issue, as well as it fails to address the rising flood insurance premiums facing millions of those who have been impacted by Superstorm Sandy.

Rather than amend the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Act in a comprehensive way, the omnibus contains language that temporarily delays flood insurance premium increases for a year and for just a segment of policy owners. After that year, flood insurance premiums could continue to rise exponentially for newer policies. This is crippling our housing market recovery in areas like New York City, New Jersey, Connecticut, and others that were hard hit by Superstorm Sandy.

Though this temporary delay may be better than nothing, it is not the certainty that the Nation's 5.5 million flood insurance owners deserve and need. Again, I call on Congress to bring up a comprehensive flood insurance reform legislation quickly in order to provide economic certainty to at-risk neighborhoods across our great country.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the gentleman. I want to thank the chairman and ranking member on the House Appropriations Committee.

Madam Speaker, I want to speak in support of the underlying matter, the appropriations bill. There is a lot that I could say, a lot of progress that we have made on a number of issues; but I want to, at this moment, talk in particular about the investments we are making in science and innovation.

The World Economic Forum says that the American economy is an innovation-driven economy; and throughout this appropriations bill at NASA, at NIH, in terms of our Federal laboratories and across our whole spectrum of activities including DARPA and others, we are making significant investments.

I want to say that working with Chairman WOLF over the last three bills that we have moved through this floor and through the process, we have launched a high-priority research effort on neuroscience or brain research, and we have added to that each year. This bill is no exception. We have worked now in this legislation to internationalize this collaboration in important ways because the E.U. and others have launched similar initiatives in terms of understanding the complexities related to human brain diseases and disorders therein. So I thank the chair and the ranking member.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, could I inquire from my friend if he has any additional speakers.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I do.

Mr. COLE. In that case, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3824 to end the Republicans' refusal to extend unemployment benefits that protect over 26,000 workers in my State of Connecticut.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I will be the last speaker on our side.

Mr. COLE. I thank my friend.

□ 1345

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, in a few moments, I will offer an amendment to the rule. The amendment is necessary due to a late request submitted by the administration to ensure that the fix for disabled military retirees works as it was intended. The amendment was fully vetted by the relevant House and Senate committees, majority and minority, and the administration. The

Congressional Budget Office has confirmed that the change does not affect the cost of the bill. This amendment will ensure that we properly execute the agreed-upon compromise.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, just to kind of summarize here, my colleagues are being asked to vote on this, over 1,500 pages that nobody has read. And again, coming from the party that talked about reading the bill, I am a little surprised that they wanted to present it this way. But I am urging my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule simply because, under the process that we have before us, nobody has an opportunity to amend anything in this bill or change anything. I am willing to bet that in a week or so we are going to read an article about something that was in here that nobody even knew about, and if they did, they would have wanted it out of the bill. So I think the process that my Republican friends have utilized in this House of Representatives really is very disappointing—the number of closed rules, the way they have shut down debate, and even the way we have gotten to this point. So I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule.

At the end of the day, people are going to have to vote for this bill anyway because the alternative is shutting the government down or going back to the sequestration levels which my Republican friends embraced, which were unacceptable—so unacceptable they couldn't pass a Transportation appropriations bill on this House floor. They couldn't bring an HHS bill to this floor because the numbers were so unacceptably low that even their own Members couldn't deal with voting for a bill like that. As far as the underlying bill goes, I think the best that can be said about it is it begins to chip away at sequestration. The numbers are still awful, but the alternative is even worse.

I would also urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so we can bring up a bill to extend unemployment insurance for those who are unemployed. I am fascinated by the debate on the other side of the aisle saying we are reluctant to do it because we have done it a number of times. That seems more important to my Republican colleagues than whether or not people are in need, whether or not it is necessary to extend these benefits to keep families afloat.

Because Congress failed to act, more than 1.3 million struggling unemployed Americans were cut off from extended emergency unemployment benefits in the middle of the holidays. We all went home for Christmas, and the gift we gave to these struggling Americans was we cut off their unemployment compensation. Another 1.9 million Americans will lose this support in the first half of this year if we don't do anything.

Too many families are still struggling to rebuild and regain what they

had before the economic crisis. It is both unfair and devastating to cut off these benefits at the time of a 7.0 percent unemployment rate. We should not leave Washington tomorrow, on a Thursday, and go home for a week and a half and not address this issue. To blame the Senate, maybe it is an easy way to just kind of brush this off, but the bottom line is in the Senate, if you want to be of any help, talk to the minority leader who is leading a filibuster so that this can't be brought up over in the Senate.

But that is no excuse for us in the House not to act. That is no excuse for us to turn our back on millions of Americans who desperately need our help. They are going through difficult times. Our job here is to help people, not just those who are well off, not just those who have super-PACs or who write out checks to campaigns. Our job is to help everybody, and that includes those who are the most vulnerable in this, those who are struggling during this difficult economy.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD an editorial that appeared in The New York Times, entitled, "No Jobs, No Benefits, and Lousy Pay." I will also include for the RECORD an article, entitled, "New Economic Analysis: \$400 Million Drained from State Economies in Unemployment Benefits This Week Alone."

By not extending unemployment benefits, we are not only hurting these families who are unemployed, we are hurting our local economies. We are hurting the economy of this country. We need to get our priorities straight here. Our job is to stand up for those who are in need. On too many occasions, this Republican-led House has turned its back on those who are most vulnerable.

So I urge my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, to vote "no" on the previous question. This is our only opportunity before you go home on a recess to be able to deal with the issue of extending unemployment insurance. Vote "no" on the previous question so we can bring up the extension of unemployment compensation so we can help millions of families in this country who are desperately in need of help.

I yield back the balance of my time.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 10, 2014]

NO JOBS, NO BENEFITS, AND LOUSY PAY

(By The Editorial Board)

There is nothing good to say about the December employment report, which showed that only 74,000 jobs were added last month. But dismal as it was, the report came at an opportune political moment. The new numbers rebut the Republican arguments that jobless benefits need not be renewed, and that the current minimum wage is adequate. At the same time, they underscore the need, only recently raised to the top of the political agenda, to combat poverty and inequality.

The report showed that average monthly job growth in 2013 was 182,000, basically unchanged from 2012. Even the decline in the jobless rate last month, from 7 percent in November to 6.7 percent, was a sign of weak-

ness: It mainly reflects a shrinking labor force not new hiring as the share of workers employed or looking for work fell to the lowest level since 1978. That's a tragic waste of human capital. It would be comforting to ascribe the dwindling labor force mainly to retirements or other longterm changes, but most of the decline is due to weak job opportunities and weak labor demand since the Great Recession.

One result is that the share of jobless workers who have been unemployed for six months or longer has remained stubbornly high. In December, it was nearly 38 percent, still higher by far than at any time before the Great Recession, in records going back to 1948.

And yet, nearly 1.3 million of those long-term unemployed had their federal jobless benefits abruptly cut off at the end of last year, after Republicans refused to renew the federal unemployment program in the latest budget deal. Each week the program is not reinstated, another 72,000 jobless people who otherwise would have qualified for benefits will find there is no longer a federal program to turn to. Worse, in the Senate this week, after a show of willingness to discuss renewing the benefits, Republicans objected to a bill to do just that. They had demanded that a renewal be paid for, but they didn't like how Democrats proposed to do that—with spending cuts at the end of the budget window in 2024 in exchange for relief today.

There was no need to pay for the benefits, which have such a crucial and positive effect—on families, the economy and poverty—that it would be sound to renew them even if the government borrowed to do so. But Republicans would rather criticize President Obama's handling of the economy than help those left behind.

A similar dynamic is developing around the drive for a higher minimum wage. In the December jobs report, the average hourly wage for most workers was \$20.35. That means that the minimum wage, at \$7.25 an hour, is only one-third of the average, rather than one-half, as was the case historically. Raising the wage to \$10.10 an hour, as Democrats have proposed, would help to restore the historical relationship. But even that would fall far short of the roughly \$17 an hour that workers at the bottom of the wage scale would be earning if increased labor productivity were reflected in their pay, rather than in corporate profits, executive compensation and shareholder returns.

Republicans, however, are opposed to any increase, as if the numbers don't speak for themselves. Their stance also dismisses research, and common sense, which says that raising the wages of low- and moderate-income workers is essential for lessening both poverty and inequality.

Instead, in the past week, they have introduced ostensibly "antipoverty" ideas, most prominently Senator Marco Rubio's plan to transform federal safety net programs into state block grants, another of the shopworn Republican ideas that also include privatizing federal services and slashing domestic spending. Block grants have allowed states to disregard the needs of the least fortunate. The proposal would set back the debate on wages, poverty and inequality.

The December jobs report is telling Congress what it needs to do. Unfortunately, that will not lead to action anytime soon.

NEW ECONOMIC ANALYSIS: 400 MILLION DRAINED FROM STATE ECONOMIES IN UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS THIS WEEK ALONE—JANUARY 3, 2014

WASHINGTON.—The expiration of federal unemployment insurance at the end of last week is already taking more than 400 million out of the pockets a SHARE of American job

seekers nationwide and state economies, according to a new analysis by Ways and Means Committee Democrats. Unemployment insurance is viewed as a very effective fiscal stimulus because jobless Americans tend to spend their unemployment insurance right away. The analysis spells out how much federal funding each state is going without in the first week since the emergency Federal Unemployment Compensation program expired. In Illinois, nearly 82,000 people lost an average 313 weekly benefit for a total statewide economic impact of 25 million. In Ohio, more than 39,000 people lost an average weekly benefit of 312 for a total statewide economic impact of 12 million.

At 11 a.m. this morning, Ways and Means Ranking Member Sander Levin (D-MI) and Democratic Whip Steny H. Hoyer (D-MD) will join former Labor Secretary Robert Reich and Harvard economist Lawrence Katz in holding a press call to highlight the harmful economic impact that will result if Republicans in Congress don't agree to extend the program.

"In state after state, Americans who have lost their federal unemployment insurance in one fell swoop last week are struggling to get by," said Ways and Means Ranking Member Levin. "Every week that Republicans fail to act tens of thousands of additional long-term unemployed Americans lose this vital lifeline as they look to get back on their feet after the worst recession in generations, and the economy in each state is taking a hit."

Overall, failing to renew the EUC program will cost the economy 200,000 jobs this year, according to the Congressional Budget Office. Note that the below estimate is conservative because it only takes into account the total dollar amount provided per week by the now expired EUC program. Economists generally multiply these estimates by 1.5 to 2 to show the true economic impact.

State	Number of people who lost benefits Dec. 28	Avg. weekly benefit lost	Total benefit lost this week
AK	4,300	\$247.61	\$1,064,723
AL	12,036	206.21	2,481,944
AR	9,300	286.11	2,660,823
AZ	17,100	219.06	3,745,926
CA	213,793	303.37	64,858,382
CO	20,237	359.12	7,267,511
CT	23,997	335.95	8,061,792
DC	4,600	300.87	1,384,002
DE	3,600	243.57	876,852
FL	73,000	231.20	16,877,600
GA	54,400	266.23	14,482,912
HI	1,900	415.82	790,058
IA	4,300	325.95	1,401,585
ID	2,600	258.36	671,736
IL	81,867	312.77	25,605,542
IN	19,200	238.24	4,574,208
KS	4,400	333.42	1,467,048
KY	18,000	288.60	5,194,800
LA	7,832	205.80	1,611,826
MA	58,700	444.00	26,062,800
MD	22,900	326.30	7,472,270
ME	3,300	284.84	939,972
MI	43,311	293.92	12,729,969
MN	9,231	375.15	3,463,010
MO	21,329	235.04	5,013,168
MS	13,400	192.15	2,574,810
MT	1,876	283.80	532,409
NC	NA	NA	NA
ND	300	386.11	115,833
NE	1,200	272.31	326,772
NH	1,004	287.49	288,640
NJ	90,300	381.79	34,475,637
NM	6,000	288.66	1,731,960
NV	17,600	306.90	5,401,440
NY	127,100	305.75	38,860,825
OH	39,100	311.82	12,192,162
OK	4,907	294.62	1,445,700
OR	20,067	321.14	6,444,316
PA	73,330	343.31	25,174,922
PR	30,700	117.76	3,615,232
RI	4,900	337.13	1,651,937
SC	15,400	248.29	3,823,666
SD	200	261.34	52,268
TN	19,500	236.07	4,603,365
TX	64,294	338.59	21,769,305
UT	2,500	344.58	861,450
VA	9,700	296.95	2,880,415
VI	1,300	310.91	404,183
VT	600	298.13	178,878
WA	24,414	395.14	9,646,948
WI	23,700	266.09	6,306,333
WV	6,933	271.37	1,881,408

State	Number of people who lost benefits Dec. 28	Avg. weekly benefit lost	Total benefit lost this week
WY	600	371.36	222,816
Total	1,336,158	304.86	408,224,089

*Estimates exclude North Carolina, which ended its EUC08 program in July 2013. US Dept. of Labor, Office of Unemployment Insurance.

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

Madam Speaker, in closing, I would again like to thank my friends Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY for their efforts to bring an important product to this floor, a product which fulfills our constitutional responsibility of appropriating funds for the government for the fiscal year 2014.

While this is not the bill I would have drafted, or I am sure that my friend would have drafted, I believe it strikes an appropriate balance between key Republican and Democratic priorities, and I believe it will attract the majority of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle as well as the majority of my friends on my own side of the aisle.

I want to thank my friend in the sense that, while we have had a contentious debate, we are actually going to be, on the underlying legislation, voting together. That may have been gotten lost in the debate. I will be voting with the majority of his colleagues and at the urging of the President of the United States. So we ought to recognize that, while we have had some partisan differences here, the legislation itself was crafted in a bipartisan manner. It was brought to this floor. I would agree with my friend, I would have preferred 12 different bills and a lot more time, but we have a limited time frame here. It was brought in a cooperative manner. Both the ranking member and the chairman are urging its passage. It is something that we ought to take, frankly, some pride in and certainly congratulate those who had a hand in it.

I want to also point out to my friend on the unemployment issue, here we probably do disagree. But the Speaker has made it apparent, if there are appropriate pay-fors, he is willing to consider that. Without questioning my friends on the other side of the rotunda, so far they simply have not provided that. I think the Speaker's offer has been out since before the end of the year, since before the benefits ended.

It is also worth noting that this does not affect regular unemployment benefits. Those are still there for all Americans. This is a program which has been extended 5 years. We are now in a time when the recession is 4 years in the rearview mirror. Unemployment has been coming down. If it still needs to be extended for some people, we ought to find a way, in my view, to pay for it, and I think the Speaker has made it apparent that he would consider any serious proposal in that regard. So far, we haven't had that.

Sometimes, Madam Speaker, the smart vote and the easy vote are the wrong vote. I know some of my friends

on the other side might decide to vote "no" on the underlying legislation. I never quibble with a rule vote. I respect that process because from their perspective there is a lot to criticize here. Certainly from my side of the aisle, there is a lot to criticize as well. We are going to have some "no" votes. But I think there is not much question that the right vote here is to vote for the underlying legislation, assuming that the rule is adopted, and I think it will be. I think it is the right thing for the country. I think it is the right thing for the process itself to actually get back to regular order, to consider the bills in the manner that I know my friend would like them to be considered in, and to have an open amendment process, which we do on appropriations legislation. This is an essential first step to doing that.

I think that Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY have probably done more in this legislation to restore the process and rebuild. They have given us a foundation for the next fiscal year that will allow us to do precisely the things that my friend would like to do and that I agree, in a normal process, ought to be done.

So I would obviously urge support for the rule, but more importantly, after the rule passes, assuming it does, the underlying legislation so that we can work together in a bipartisan fashion; we can make sure that we have no government shutdowns next year. I think that will do more to create jobs and economic certainty than probably any single thing we could do.

Our Appropriations Committee, working in a bipartisan fashion under the leadership of Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY, has done that. I would suggest that all of us should reflect upon, congratulate upon, and then try to spread throughout the institution. If we worked the way they worked in putting this bill together and bringing it to the floor on every other piece of legislation, I think the country would be well served; and, frankly, all of us would have a great deal to be proud of. With that, again, I urge the passage of the rule and the underlying legislation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COLE

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I offer an amendment to the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 6, after "Rules Committee Print 113-32" insert "(as modified by section 6 of this resolution)".

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. The modification referred to in the first section of this resolution is as follows: page 363, strike lines 12 through 16 and insert the following:

"(1) COMBAT-RELATED SPECIAL COMPENSATION.—Section 1413a(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

"(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting 'with adjustment under paragraph (2) of section 1401a(b) of this title to which the member would have been entitled (but without

the application of paragraph (4) of such section),’ after ‘under any other provision of law’; and

“(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ‘whichever is applicable to the member.’ and inserting ‘with adjustment under paragraph (2) of section 1401a(b) of this title to which the member would have been entitled (but without the application of paragraph (4) of such section), whichever is applicable to the member.’.”

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 458 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3824) to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3824 as specified in Section 6 of this resolution.

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. Fitz-

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam 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, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the amendment, if ordered, and adopting the resolution, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 195, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—228

Aderholt	Benishkek	Bridenstine
Amash	Bentivolio	Brooks (AL)
Amodei	Billirakis	Brooks (IN)
Bachmann	Bishop (UT)	Broun (GA)
Bachus	Black	Bucshon
Barletta	Blackburn	Burgess
Barr	Boustany	Byrne
Barton	Brady (TX)	Calvert

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

NAYS—195

Andrews	Clarke (NY)	Eshoo
Barber	Clay	Esty
Barrow (GA)	Clyburn	Farr
Bass	Cohen	Fattah
Beatty	Connolly	Foster
Becerra	Conyers	Frankel (FL)
Bera (CA)	Cooper	Fudge
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Gallego
Bishop (NY)	Courtney	Garamendi
Blumenauer	Crowley	Garcia
Bonamici	Cuellar	Grayson
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Green, Al
Braley (IA)	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Brown (FL)	Davis, Danny	Grijalva
Brownley (CA)	DeFazio	Gutiérrez
Bustos	DeGette	Hahn
Butterfield	Delaney	Hanabusa
Capps	DeLauro	Hastings (FL)
Capuano	DelBene	Heck (WA)
Cárdenas	Deutch	Higgins
Carney	Dingell	Himes
Carson (IN)	Doggett	Hinojosa
Cartwright	Doyle	Holt
Castor (FL)	Duckworth	Honda
Castro (TX)	Edwards	Horsford
Chu	Ellison	Hoyer
Ciilline	Engel	Huffman
Clark (MA)	Enyart	Israel

Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeback
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney

Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes

Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Buchanan
Cleaver
Gabbard

Hurt
Jones
McCarthy (NY)

McIntyre
Rush
Stockman

□ 1420

Mr. VELA changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT. Madam Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 19, on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 458. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 191, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

AYES—230

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)

Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell

Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook

Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Garlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Greene (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)

Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert

Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—191

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers

Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallagher
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene

Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin

Lewis
Lipinski
Loeback
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke

Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David

Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Cleaver
DeFazio

Gabbard
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McIntyre

Rogers (MI)
Rush
Stockman

□ 1429

Ms. SINEMA changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the resolution, as amended, 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 the clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

SUBMISSION OF MATERIAL EXPLANATORY OF THE AMENDMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO THE AMENDMENTS OF THE SENATE TO H.R. 3547

Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 458, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations submitted explanatory material relating to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate to H.R. 3547. The contents of this submission will be published in Book II of this RECORD.

SPACE LAUNCH LIABILITY INDEMNIFICATION EXTENSION ACT

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 458, I call up the bill (H.R. 3547) to extend the application of certain space launch liability provisions through