order to strike them out, to at least eliminate them. We can’t do that here because this is not a conference report. This is an amendment between the Houses.

We have had that before. Rules are only going to bring you further from what you want to do. I think the figures are, about 400 percent more earmarks than last year. It is hardly, hardly a mark of fiscal discipline to have 9,200 earmarks in this bill when you have already had 2,000 pass in the defense bill. For one, that is not a 40 percent reduction, and two, it is about a 400 percent addition to last year.

Let’s reject this rule and reject this bill.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York, the chairwoman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs, Mrs. LOWEY.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, specifically division J on State and Foreign Operations. Division J reflects a bipartisan compromise effort by Ranking Member WOLF, myself, Senator LEAHY and Senator GREGG to address our strategic priorities, national security interests and invest in development, poverty reduction and global health. I also wanted to thank Speaker PELOSI and Chairman OBRY for their knowledge and their commitment to the priorities in this bill.

Just a few highlights. For those of us who did read the bill, what do we have, 20 hours, 3,500 pages. I am sure if you who did read the bill, what do we have, the priorities in this bill.

Finally, there is all this talk about supporting and saluting our veterans. This bill stops talking and starts acting with a request that matches the veterans service organizations of this country asked for, the largest increase in military and veterans programs in the history of the history of the country. The responsible vote is “yes.” The irresponsible political course is to complain. Let’s do the country’s business, pass this rule, and pass this bill.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I will be asking for a “no” vote on the previous question that we think about our responsibility to accept this rule and allow the House to consider a change to the rules of the House to restore accountability and enforceability to the earmark rule while closing the loopholes we have found over the last few months.

Under the current rule, so long as the chairman of a committee of jurisdiction includes either a list of earmarks contained in the bill or report, or a statement that there are no earmarks, no point of order lies against the bill. This is the same as the rule in the last Congress. However, under the rule as it functioned under the Republican majority in the 109th Congress, even if the point of order was not available on the bill, it was always available on the rule as a “question of consideration.” But because the Democratic Rules Committee specifically exempts earmarks from the waiver of all points of order, they deprive Members of the ability to raise the question of earmarks on the rule or on the bill.

The earmark rule is also not applicable when the majority uses a procedure to accept “amendments between the