United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2014 No. 133

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 17, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID W. JOLLY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE END OF LIFE REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, for the last 6 years, I have been spending a significant amount of time making sure that the Federal Government is a better partner in helping families as they deal with some of the most difficult times they will ever encounter, as a loved one enters their last stage of life.

This often involves an elderly spouse or relative, but not necessarily. This is a challenge that faces all of us, regardless of age, health, or family circumstance. The youngest, healthiest, most vital member of your office could suffer an accident or come down with a disease this afternoon.

We all must at some point face this challenge that requires that we do a better job of meeting those needs, helping our families understand the circumstances and choices and that we make their wishes known, and that those wishes are respected.

This afternoon there is an important landmark in this effort to protect families, as the Institute of Medicine releases key facts and recommendations on improving the quality and honoring individual preferences at the end of life. It is entitled ''Dying in America,'' sort of a jarring title, but it should be required reading for everyone in government, health care, insurance, anyone who is involved with this complex web that should be supportive of families in their time of need, but too often fails them.

This report makes clear that most people nearing the end of life are not physically, mentally, or cognitively able to make their own decisions about care, and that the majority of those patients will receive acute care from physicians who don't even know them.

The default is often for more hospital days, intensive care, and emergency care, which means that there are more transitions about care settings, which can be unnerving for patients and complicate their care. All this combines to jeopardize the quality of end of life care, while obviously adding to its cost and complexity.

This panel of experts, after months of intense study, makes a compelling case that we all should be working to provide comprehensive care for individuals nearing end of life, how it should be seamless, high quality, integrated, patient-centered, family-oriented, and consistently accessible around the clock.

It should be tailored to the needs and desires of the families, and the resources that we can save by doing it right can be redirected to enhance the quality of their last days. Often done right, it will enable them to live longer as well as more comfortably.

This report is an opportunity for all of us to step back and make sure we are doing everything we can to play our part in meeting the critical responsibilities not just for our constituents, but for our family members.

Dr. PHIL ROE and I have introduced H.R. 1173, the Personalize Your Care Act. There are 60 bipartisan cosponsors focusing on the Federal Government placing value on this relationship, on these critical conversations, and empowering families and patients to control the circumstances that matter so much to them.

We strongly urge that everyone looks at this Institute of Medicine report and that you cosponsor the Personalize Your Care Act. I congratulate the Institute for the careful research, the clear analysis, and the strong recommendations. It is an important step to make sure that critical assistance to support our families, that they deserve and demand, is available.

HONORING JAMES C. RUSSELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Mr. James C. Russell, master distiller at the Wild Turkey Distillery in Lawrenceburg, Kentucky, and to mark the event of his 60th year in the industry.

Mr. Russell, or Jimmy as he is warmly known to family, friends, and acquaintances alike, is the living example of the maxim that you ought to do what you love. Born into a family of distillers just 3 miles from the Wild Turkey Distillery in Lawrenceburg,

Printed on recycled paper.

Jimmy has been instrumental in the craftsmanship of nearly every barrel since he began working at the facility on September 10, 1954, when he was just 19 years old.

Since becoming master distiller in the late 1960s, Jimmy has been prolific, distilling more than 3 million barrels with his keen eye for detail and palette for flavor. When he is not in Lawrenceburg overseeing production, Jimmy is traveling the world as one of perhaps the most famous ambassadors for Kentucky's signature bourbon industry.

Mr. Russell has seen the ebbs and flows of the industry over the years and has been a key player in fostering the recent explosive growth of bourbon. Treated like a rock star wherever he goes, as adoring fans clamor for his autograph or a bottle of American Honey or his Russell Reserve, the indefatigable spirit of this Kentucky Bourbon Hall of Famer, or the so-called ''Buddha of Bourbon,'' will help guide the bourbon industry long into the future. Jimmy's son Eddie, himself a Hall of Famer, will ensure that the family's time-honored tradition of producing complex, finely honed bourbons continues into the fourth generation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join Jimmy's friends, family, fans, and fellow master distillers in raising a toast to celebrate Mr. Russell's contributions to a distinctively American and Kentucky industry on this momentous anniversary. I know I speak for millions more across the country and around the world when I say that I look forward to enjoying the fruits of Jimmy's labor for many more years to come.

WOMEN OF THE YEAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, the success of our districts and the livelihood and future of our communities relies heavily on the devotion and service of those who go above the call of duty. The helpers willing to devote their time and energy to improving the lives of those around them deserve to be recognized.

This fall, through my 2014 Women of the Year awards, I have made an effort to recognize, honor, and celebrate the vital contributions of outstanding women in my district. Through their work or volunteerism, these women have all vastly improved the quality of life in their communities.

My office will recognize the achievements of Pat Ash, Marci Coglianese, Deborah Eernisse, Gloria Estrada, Lee Ann Grigsby-Puente, Mary Grimmer, Samina Masood, Dr. Frances Nelson, Gloria Partida, Linda Plummer, Lonetta Riley, Denise Rushing, Michelle Scully, and Nicole Van Vleck.

These are exemplary examples of sacrifice and devotion. These civic leaders have helped improve their communities in various ways. They are advocates for education, agriculture, flood protection, environmental stewardship, the arts, promoting healthy communities, organizing events to promote world peace, and raising community awareness to end bullying.

Throughout our history, America's foremothers have made great strides in securing their equal rights and equal treatment under the law. And while we have come very far, there is still work to be done. We stand on the shoulders of those giants, but that does not mean we should cease to reach further.

The success these women have had in their lives translates directly to the success of their communities. The correlation is undeniable. When women succeed, our communities succeed, and our States succeed. ''When women succeed, America succeeds.''

I will continue to work to shape a Nation that fosters possibilities, opportunities, and equity for women. A large component of that mission is the Economic Agenda for Women and Families, which highlights three areas of importance.

The first is pay. Women in this country make only 77 cents for every dollar earned by men doing exactly the same work. For African American and Latino women, the pay gap widens to 64 cents and 55 cents to the man's dollar. The minimum wage has not kept up with inflation, and when adjusted is more than 30 percent lower than it was in 1968. This is an unacceptable impediment to our success, and particularly the success of women.

Women cannot succeed if wages are inequitable or insufficient. Paycheck fairness and increase in the minimum wage that includes tipped workers are just two solutions that will begin to mend the chasm created by the wage gap.

The second area is work and family balance. The lack of policy ensuring earned paid sick days and paid maternity leave is, quite frankly, appalling. Our inaction on ensuring work and family balance not only affects the lives of parents, but the lives and the development of their children.

The third area is child care. The passage of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014 in the House of Representatives is a good first step towards ensuring access to child care, but there is still much more to be done.

Ensuring the success of women, and thereby the success of America, is imperative. I am proud and extremely thankful to have these women working and serving in the communities I represent. The devotion, care, and service shown by them, and by those like them, are what make my district and America succeed.

OPPOSITION TO ARMING SYRIAN REBELS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, we will be asked as a Congress later today to vote on authorization of the President's request to arm Syrian rebels.

I rise this morning to oppose the President's request, and I do so with a heart of conviction that says we must do more to combat, confront, defeat, and destroy ISIS, but also with the conviction, respectfully, that the President's request is simply wrong.

ISIS constitutes a direct threat to the national security of the United States. My belief on this is clear. I was one of a little over a dozen Members of Congress to recently introduce legislation authorizing the President to do more.

We must eradicate the ISIS regime that perverts a religion founded on peace and uses it as a platform to engage in crucifixions and beheadings and mass murders.

But I oppose today's request because it fails to seek the full authorization of this body. It fails to seek a clear mandate of the American people and because it asks this body to approve only one small portion of an overall strategy that is continuing to evolve. And that portion is most controversial, most questioned, and most vulnerable to failure.

We should be here today as a Congress debating whether we are a Nation at war, whether ISIS constitutes a direct threat to the national security of the United States, and if we are at war, we as a Congress should be asking the question: Are we fully engaged as a Nation to defeat ISIS, and are we fully committed to accepting the consequences and the casualties required to do so? But that is not what today's vote is about.

Today's vote is whether we as a Nation put our reliance on Syrian rebels, and that leaves far too many unanswered questions. We tried this in Iraq, to mixed results. We know Syrian rebels—we know this—some will cooperate with ISIS and, in fact, contribute to the additional killings of Syrian Christians and religious minorities. Are we prepared as a body to accept those collateral casualties of terror?

We know training will take months. What will we be doing tomorrow? We know Russia has declared this will be an act of aggression. What is our Nation's response, and what is this body's response? And how does today's debate contribute to our Article 1, Section 8 authority under the Constitution? Are we quietly allying with the Syrian Government, a regime that 18 months ago we said we wanted to topple, or is this an act of aggression against Syria's sovereignty? And where is this Congress in this debate?

The final question is: Do we seriously think, as the President portends, that this will not require a single pair of boots of our Special Operations community to touch Syrian soil? Do we

truly rely on Syrian rebels to lay the targets for our elite air assets?

There are boots on the ground today. We can call them military advisers, but the fact is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff yesterday said, if necessary, he would recommend putting them in a combat role. We are not having that debate here on the floor of the House.

The American people deserve a President and a Congress that are honest about what we face as a Nation militarily. The doubt in this debate in this Congress has been palpable. We question the strategy, we question the trust of Syrian rebels, we question our constitutional responsibility, and yet we are prepared as a body to ignore all doubt, to ignore our uncomfortable conviction of opposition to this request simply out of a desperate hope that somehow this matter might resolve itself without the President and the Congress having a hard conversation, recognizing that we are a war weary and tired Nation faced again with an asymmetric threat from terrorists who have threatened our homeland.

We want to believe the beheadings and the audible threats of terror to our shores is not real, but we know it is. We as a Nation do not have the luxury to choose what threats confront us; we only choose our response.

So my request of my colleagues in this House is that we have a full debate on what we face as a Nation. The President has brought us this very limited request merely out of statutory convenience, not out of constitutional conviction. We should not accept that.

My request of the President is this: very respectfully, do not trample on the constitutional authority of this Congress as you reluctantly march to the drumbeat of war that you are rightfully hesitant to engage in and with an elusive strategy that leaves so many unanswered questions today.

This body should have a full debate. The American people deserve to know that the President has requested full authorization and this Congress has had an opportunity to deliberate on it. I reluctantly oppose the request today, knowing we must do so much more to confront ISIS. I ask my colleagues to do the same.

CONGRESS AND THE USE OF MILITARY FORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, later today we are likely to see bipartisan support for an amendment to authorize the Secretaries of Defense and State to provide limited assistance to properly vetted factions within the Syrian opposition as part of the broader effort to ''degrade, and ultimately destroy'' the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant. The President specifically asked Congress to provide these authorities, and I somewhat reluctantly will agree to support it.

But I want to add a caution, that this action should not be interpreted as granting congressional authorization for the broader use of military force to combat the growing threat posed by ISIL. Quite the contrary, the amendment specifically prohibits the introduction of U.S. Armed Forces into hostilities absent such explicit authorization.

Now, the President asserts he already has the authority to confront ISIL. In his most recent notification to Congress, he cites the executive's constitutional authority ''to conduct U.S. foreign relations and as Commander in Chief . . .'' While this issue has been the subject of long-simmering debate between our branches and among historians and scholars, I would modestly note that the Constitution explicitly grants to Congress, and only to Congress, the power to declare war. If there are inherent unenumerated powers in the role of Commander in Chief, most surely logic dictates there are similar inherent, unenumerated powers Congress is vested in with our role to declare war.

Let us make no mistake, we are confronting here on this issue a matter of war and peace. Yet, in the same breath we are discussing the danger, we are preparing to shutter Congress for another 7 weeks until after the election.

The President said he welcomes congressional support for this effort to show the world we are ''united in confronting this danger.'' I am glad he welcomes congressional input, but I, for one, believe the President actually needs specific congressional authority, whether he wants it or not, for what he himself acknowledges will be a prolonged campaign to eradicate the cancer-like ISIL. Anything short of that is an abrogation of our sworn duty to defend and uphold the Constitution of the United States.

This isn't President Obama trampling on the Constitution. This is Congress, in a long 60-year history, of winking and blinking about our responsibility because we don't want to bear it. But on matters of war and peace, we either live up to our constitutional responsibility, which is quite clear, or we go on a 7-week recess.

My colleagues know there are historical cases in which congressional acquiescence has been construed to confer support or authorization where none has been given. The Gulf of Tonkin resolution is certainly a case in point. It led to a prolonged war and 55,000 U.S. deaths.

The 93rd Congress adopted the War Powers Resolution to reassert Congress' role after both Korea and Vietnam. The War Powers Resolution requires the President to consult with Congress prior to introducing American forces into hostilities.

The administration has recently argued that the aerial strikes do not constitute hostilities because they don't involve sustained fighting. But again, out of the President's own words, he said last week this would be ''a comprehensive and sustained effort.'' That doesn't sound like a temporary action by the Commander in Chief.

And to put an even finer point on the issue, I remind my colleagues of H. Con. Res. 105, which was adopted in July, that prohibits the President from deploying or maintaining U.S. Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific statutory authorization.

I agree with the President when he said we are strongest as a Nation when the President and Congress work together. On the most important issue we ever vote on, war and peace, we must come together, and this branch must live up to its constitutional responsibility at long last.

FIGHTING THE ISLAMIC STATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, contrary to the President's assertion last week, the Islamic State is Islamic and it is a State, or at least it has all the attributes of a State. It is precisely this combination that makes it so dangerous, a messianic and clearly stated intention to wage jihad on American soil and the resources and equipment to do so.

In response to this danger, the President proposes that the United States wage a continuing air war against the Islamic State, but to avoid any commitment of ground forces. Instead, he seeks to use vetted elements of the Free Syrian Army as the American proxy force and proposes to arm and train them for that purpose.

This raises two major concerns. First, many elements of the Free Syrian Army have a long history of collaborating with the Islamic State. Its principal mission is to destroy the Syrian Government, which though utterly despotic, is currently fighting the Islamic State. We court a very real risk that this equipment will either be turned against Syria as it fights the IS, or turned over to the IS as elements of Iraqi Security Forces recently did.

Second, committing insufficient force in any conflict is self-defeating, and air strikes alone cannot win a war. For 13 years, the brave young Americans who stepped forward to defend our country after 9/11 have found themselves hamstrung by political correctness on the battlefield, perilously commingled with hostile forces, endangered by rules of engagement that undermine their ability to defend themselves, and denied the full resources and commitment of our country.

We are in precarious times, with an administration that either cannot or will not learn from the mistakes of the past. Until we are prepared to put the full might and resources of our Nation behind a war against the Islamic State, we can at least act to contain IS advances, protect our people, and restore

the martial strength and national will that will certainly be needed in the years ahead.

First, I believe the President is correct to order selected air strikes in tactical support of resistance forces where they are actively engaged against the IS. Where we can turn the tide of battle in these engagements, we must. And the immediate destruction of oil fields under IS control is vital to reduce the resources that it is currently converting to cash.

Second, it is appropriate to take immediate, significant, and focused retaliatory strikes against the Islamic State in response to specific acts that it commits against American interests. This is the Reagan model in Libya, and it worked.

Third, the direct threat posed to the United States by the IS is not on Syrian or Iraqi soil, but on American soil. The Islamic State has been explicit in declaring its intention to insert a Fifth Column within our borders and wage jihad on Americans. For far too long we have ignored the threat posed by a wide open southern border, lax enforcement on the northern border, and nonenforcement of visa overstays. And this neglect needs to stop now. We must secure our borders, enforce the time limits on visas, and change the law to revoke the passports of any American who takes up arms for the Islamic State.

Fourth, we must recognize that the improving world situation that justified reducing military spending in recent years has now reversed, and so must our priorities. The world is now becoming more dangerous and unstable, and our military budget must be adjusted to meet that growing danger. Our Nation's weakened fiscal condition requires a comprehensive review of our spending priorities as a matter of vital national security.

Fifth, we must assure that our only reliable ally in the Middle East, Israel, has all the equipment and supplies and assistance it may need in coming years, and that it will have the unqualified support of the United States when it must take action for its own security.

Mr. Speaker, Islamic fascism is now advancing into a vacuum that many past blunders have created, the worst of them being to underestimate the terrible demands that war requires. These are mistakes we can no longer afford to make. Confronting the rise of European fascism in the 1930s, Churchill counseled measured resistance where possible, while undertaking utmost martial preparation. That advice lights our path that we must take today.

ANYTHING FOR FOOTBALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, ''anything for football.'' It is a phrase I have heard a lot recently, that we should ignore what happens off the field for the sake of the sport.

This creed used to mean something positive. Vince Lombardi, the namesake of the Super Bowl trophy, said he viewed his players as ''neither black nor white, but Packer green.'' ''Anything for football'' meant he had to fight racism and homophobia off the field to coach the best football team possible.

Recently, ''anything for football'' has been used to justify an organization that perpetuates violence and sexism rather than teamwork, family, and sport. Instead of fighting injustice off the field for the sake of the sport, the NFL chooses deafening silence. We are told to ignore what happens on the sidelines, in disciplinary boardrooms, or behind elevator doors, all for the sport. Well, I refuse to ignore what is happening.

The NFL thinks they can play by their own rules. As we saw in the Ray Rice case, these decisions go all the way to the top. Commissioner Roger Goodell is judge and jury, yet he is also the one who stands to profit by seeing these cases hushed and unpunished.

Since he took over the NFL in 2006, there have been 56 arrests of players for domestic violence. The NFL has been inconsistent in its response, ranging from counseling, to single game suspensions, to conditional fines, to nothing at all.

After a player is arrested, more often than not they continue to play, even if there is clear evidence for their violent crime. When a police officer is being investigated for domestic violence, they are suspended with pay until the investigation ends. If the NFL is serious about zero tolerance, why shouldn't it play by the same rules?

Of the 56 football players arrested for domestic violence, they only saw a combined 13 games suspended. The NFL would rather see these players on the field than take a stance against violence. After all, ''anything for football.'' I say, ''Bench them.''

Ray McDonald of the San Francisco 49ers was arrested at a party after his fiancee, who was 10 weeks pregnant, showed police bruises on her neck and arms. He has played the last 2 weeks. Why hasn't he been benched? ''Anything for football.'' I am an avid 49er fan, but this is disgusting. I expect more from my 49ers.

Greg Hardy of the Carolina Panthers was arrested and convicted for assaulting his former girlfriend. The woman said Hardy picked her up, choked her, threw her on a couch covered in assault rifles and shotguns, and bragged to her that they were loaded. He is appealing his case and still playing. Why hasn't he been benched? ''Anything for football.''

Ray Rice of the Baltimore Ravens, who was indicted in March with assaulting his then-fiancee, has finally received a punishment befitting his crime, but only after a video of the actual event was released. After he was indicted, his coach, John Harbaugh, said, ''He will be part of our team. Support the person without condoning the action.'' Why wasn't he benched from the start? ''Anything for football.''

The list goes on and on. Like the military and universities, the NFL thinks they can enforce their own justice internally. They have failed. The NFL should change their policies so that these players stay on the bench while they are investigated.

This week I will send a letter to Commissioner Goodell and team owners, calling on them to immediately change their domestic violence policy. When a player is arrested for domestic violence, the NFL should immediately suspend the player and continue to pay them until a preponderance of the evidence determines their guilt or innocence. This suspension should continue until the end of court proceedings, when the NFL can then apply its player policy. It is what we do with police officers. This is what zero tolerance looks like.

Two-thirds of all Americans watch the NFL. Let us work together to put an end to the NFL's inaction. Lombardi didn't just think we could fight racism through football. He said, ''People who work together will win, whether it be against complex football defenses or the problems of modern society.''

It may be difficult, but we deserve sports that show the best in our society. After all, ''anything for football.''

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 4194. An act to provide for the elimination or modification of Federal reporting requirements.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1214. An act to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government.

S. 2117. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to change the default investment fund under the Thrift Savings Plan, and for other purposes.

S. 2440. An act to expand and extend the program to improve permit coordination by the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes,

S. 2511. An act to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to clarify the definition of substantial cessation of operations.

S. 2539. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs relating to traumatic brain injury and to trauma research.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106–286, the Chair, on behalf of the President of the

Senate, and after consultation with the Majority Leader, reappoints the following Members to serve on the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

The Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) vice the Senator from Montana (Mr. Baucus).

ONLY CONGRESS DECLARES WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the plan that has been put forward by the President. As you, Mr. Speaker, just noted a few moments ago, it is a small portion of a larger and, what I believe to be, fundamentally flawed plan.

I say that for many different reasons, one of which is the simple reality that body bags from a far off battle or from a far off war don't return to Washington, D.C. They return to congressional districts and States across this country. It is for that very reason that the Founding Fathers believed so strongly in Congress having the authority, and the sole authority, for the declaration of war.

I mean, I think it is important to look to what James Wilson, who happened to be one of the biggest advocates for a strong Presidency, said to his own State delegation back in 1787. He said on the importance of congressional authority with regard to war:

> This system will not hurry us into war. It is calculated to guard against it. It will not be in the power of a single man or a single body of men to involve us in such distress, for the important power of declaring war is vested at the legislative level at large.

George Washington said this:

> The Constitution vests the power of declaring war in Congress. Therefore, no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they shall have deliberated upon the subject and authorized such a measure.

James Madison said this:

> The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature. The Executive has no right in any case to decide the question whether there is or is not cause for declaring war.

I think our Founding Fathers had it right, and if we move forward today without stopping and waiting and insisting upon the President's constitutional duty to come before this body and ask for a declaration of war, I think we are making a mistake.

I would say, secondly, that I think we are making a mistake because the news of today is that General Dempsey now says if the plan doesn't work out, he would in fact recommend American ground troops there in this crisis in the Middle East. I think that that is telling. Because if you stop and think about it, is America the only group that is expected to suffer through the ravages of war with regard to boots on the ground in this instant if General Dempsey's call is right?

Think about this. There have been 6,600 American deaths there in that part of the world in recent history. There have been more than 50,000 soldiers that have returned with life-altering wounds. I mean, their lives are changed forever, and yet we can't get a real firm commitment out of allies there in the Middle East as to what they will or won't do with regard to ground troops.

So if it is that big a threat, why is it that allies in that part of the world are not making real and substantial commitments with regard to what they will or won't do with regard to ground troops?

Thirdly, I would say what we are doing is we are signing up for an open-ended commitment, maybe a 5- or a 10- or a 15- or a 20-year commitment, without legal authority to do so. The administration is resting solely on the 2001 authorizing language, which was to President Bush, in the wake of 9/11, for pursuing perpetrators of 9/11.

And yet in this instance what they are saying is, well, no, no, that gives us authority for the next 10, 15, 20 years. That is not the case. Congress authorized for that action. I think it is a misreading of the law to move forward as they have.

Finally, I would make this point. The Bible says, ''Be hot, be cold, but don't be lukewarm.'' And I think this plan is predicated on lukewarm. I have some colleagues who say we need to commit ground troops; we need firmer involvement. I have others who say we don't need to do anything at all. And we are splitting it right down the middle. Let's bomb a bit and let's arm ''moderate rebels'' and we see how that works.

We have a snapshot of how that works because just this spring 1,000 ISIS soldiers routed two divisions of Iraqis, about 30,000 folks, in no time. Mind you, these are the same folks that American taxpayers spent $25 billion training and equipping. We equipped about 200,000 of them. It has not worked well.

I think we need to pause, first, for constitutional reasons; second, for legal authority reasons; and third, for a flawed strategy that is based on lukewarm. We have that chance today, and I would beg of my colleagues to do so.

STRENGTHEN THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, our number one priority should always be strengthening our economy and expanding job growth and opportunity.

That is why I launched the ''Brad At Your Business'' initiative, to hear firsthand about the opportunities and challenges facing the businesses in my district.

So far I have visited more than 80 companies, speaking with owners, managers, and employees about their aspirations and needs for achieving success. I have spoken with some of the largest companies in our country, but also to small- and medium-sized businesses; second-, third-, and fourth-generation family firms, startups, advanced manufacturing companies, retail, and service firms.

Throughout these visits, I have heard several recurring themes, including concerns about our growing skills gap, our aging infrastructure, the need to reform our broken immigration system, and the need to modernize our Tax Code to successfully compete in a global economy.

These conversations have subsequently led to concrete actions, such as introducing the AMERICA Works Act and the LEARN Act, that will help better match worker training programs to specific employer needs.

If we are to successfully lead a resurgence of the U.S. economy, we need more collaboration between our business owners, workers, and elected officials.

Only by working together can we reignite social mobility, rebuild the ladders of opportunity, and achieve a more inclusive prosperity for all Americans.

MORE DEBATE NEEDED ON WAR VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is 10:40, September 17, 2014. And for me, this is an historic event, because I will be able to tell my grandkids and those who would listen that on the eve of the House of Representatives taking a vote that would expand the war powers of the President of the United States, that I stood in the well of the House talking to a House that was void of any Member of the House of Representatives.

I make this point not so much to indicate the importance of anything I might say this morning, but because I really think that the whole country should be concerned about the gravity and importance of the vote that we take today, which in my 44 years I cannot think of any vote that is more important and certainly more historic.

It goes unchallenged that the vote today would expose more members of the military to bodily harm. It is clear that the administration has called this a war on ISIS or ISIL. It is abundantly clear that the threat to our national security is subject to a whole lot of debate. And while I may not have the answer to whether or not there is a threat, to me, I cannot think of anything more important than the 435 Members of the House and the 100 Members of the other body, at least before we vote, to be able to debate this issue.

I intend to vote against the amendment that would include an expansion of our military venture, which means

that I will be forced to vote against the concurrent resolution. But I think the House Members, Republicans and Democrats, should resent the fact that these votes are combined into one vote.

The vote as to whether or not it is constitutional, the vote as to whether or not it is a threat to the United States security, the vote as to how we are going to pay for it, the vote in terms of who is going to make the sacrifices, these are the things that should be debated. There is no lawful reason why these two issues have to be joined in one vote.

I do hope I get an opportunity to bring an amendment to the authority of the President to use military force by conditioning it to two things: that if this Congress and the American people believe that we have a threat to our national security, then by all means we should be prepared to make the sacrifices to protect our country.

What are those sacrifices? Well, one is financial sacrifice. Because the trillions of dollars that was spent—I think it is close to $6 trillion since we have been involved in the Middle East—most of the profits have been made by the military industrial complex. But the $6 trillion comes out of our budget, and there is not a war tax. I think we need that.

The other question has to be that we cannot dismiss the military that is in Iraq today and those that may be in that area, whose lives are endangered. That is less than 1 percent of United States population is making the sacrifice. We already lost 6,800 American lives in this war, and it is very difficult to explain to their families and friends at funerals what the cause was or whether we won or lost.

But the question should be once we make a determination that there is a threat to our national security, we should have the mandatory Selective Service Act reinstated. We already have it on the books. We should activate it to make certain that if you are voting to put more men and women's lives into jeopardy, make certain it is universal men and women would be selected to make certain that they provide for a national service of some sort.

So what I am suggesting is that I can never believe that this country would be voting this day and that the debates would be that I would be talking to an empty Chamber in pleading for the American people that if you are going to make a decision that we should really go to war, because there is a threat to the security of the United States of America, one, that should not be debated just on the question of the continuance of support of the budget of the United States.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 46 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Joseph Holcomb, St. Andrew Avellino Catholic Church, Flushing, New York, offered the following prayer:

All powerful and merciful God, we praise You and give You thanks for all Your gracious gifts, most especially the gift of Your infinite and unconditional love.

It is Your gift of love that inspires and drives us to seek peace throughout our Nation and our world to gain an awareness that we share a common destiny which is ultimately transcendent, peace that is not the mere absence of war but as a harmonious coexistence of individual citizens within a society governed by justice, one in which the good is also achieved for each of them.

Help us through Your gift of love to work diligently in these coming days, months, and years to seek peace for all.

May our deliberations in this, the United States House of Representatives, bring about understanding, tolerance, and peace in our great Nation and the world.

We pray this in Your holy name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PAYNE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND JOSEPH HOLCOMB

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce my colleagues to Father Joseph T. Holcomb, the guest chaplain today.

Father Holcomb serves St. Andrew Avellino Roman Catholic Church in Queens, New York.

A native New Yorker, Father Holcomb attended Holy Family Catholic Grammar School, Cathedral Preparatory Seminary, Cathedral College of the Immaculate Conception, and Seminary of the Immaculate Conception.

He went on to attain a bachelor's degree from Cathedral College in Douglaston, New York. He also received a master's degree in divinity from Immaculate Conception Seminary in Huntington, New York, and a master's in social work from Fordham University in New York City.

He was ordained to the priesthood in 1980 and has been faithfully serving multiple communities ever since. In July 2009, he was appointed as the sixth pastor of St. Andrew Avellino Roman Catholic Church and has worked tirelessly to make improvements where possible.

His efforts have led to crucial enhancements in the church and an enriched connection with its parishioners. Father Holcomb's work in the church has touched thousands of lives, and we are so privileged to have him in the Queens community.

Father Holcomb is a pillar of leadership and faith in my district. I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming Father Holcomb to the House of Representatives and to thank him for serving as our guest chaplain today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAINES). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

NATIONAL CONSTITUTION DAY

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 227 years ago, our Founding Fathers came together to write the Constitution, and it is on this foundation that we have built the greatest

Nation on Earth. The Constitution protects our democracy and our individual liberties that define the American way of life that we are all blessed to enjoy.

I have spent most of my life defending what the Constitution stands for, 29 years in the United States Air Force and now in the United States Congress. I consider this to be an honor and a privilege.

We can all do our part to defend America's freedom by understanding and remembering our Constitution's significance. That is why today, on national Constitution Day, I encourage all Americans to join me in reflecting on the history and the meaning of this important document. We must never take our freedom for granted.

ONE NEWARK PLAN

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I am concerned about the Newark Public Schools' One Newark plan which picks winners and losers among schools and students.

Earlier this year, I sent a letter to the superintendent of Newark Public Schools, Cami Anderson. I am deeply troubled by its actions which ignore efforts to strengthen traditional public schools; further, I question whether the One Newark plan will truly help realize this vision for all students in the Newark public school system, especially children with disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, I sent this letter in February. More than 5 months later, I have yet to receive a single response. The people I represent are very upset over the lack of answers and the complete disregard for their concerns, and they have a right to be upset.

The opening of the schools in the Newark public school system this year was a debacle. There have been protests, and there will continue to be until the voices of the people are heard.

We are talking about the future of Newark, the future of our district, the future of our State, and the children that we love.

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

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

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This landmark legislation was initially passed in 1964, permanently paving the way for the protection and growth of our Nation's natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, New York's 19th Congressional District is home to some of the most amazing scenery in the Nation. Constituents in our district can walk and bike in the Hudson and Mohawk Valleys; they can hike through the Catskill Mountains and paddle along the streams that feed into the Hudson River.

I'm proud to say my constituents know how important it is to preserve and protect our land. The Land and Water Conservation Fund has been a tremendous success for New York State.

It has been estimated that outdoor recreational activity supports over 300,000 jobs for New York and that over 4 million New Yorkers participate in hunting, fishing, and viewing wildlife each year.

Additionally, my district benefits from the Forest Legacy Program funded under the LWCF. This program helps States preserve and maintain their forest land.

Mr. Speaker, next year, we will have the opportunity to reauthorize LWCF. I would encourage all my colleagues in the House and Senate to reflect on the legislation's success, recognize our Nation's legacy of historic beauty, and to support the reauthorization next year.

CLEAN AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the importance of clean energy sources and the leading role America is poised to play in this field.

Earlier this summer, the company SolarCity announced its intention to open one of the largest solar production plants in the world in Buffalo, New York. This display of renewable energy would be a tremendous addition to the western New York community through the creation of over 1,000 jobs; however, the continued growth in renewable energy is dependent on Congress enacting the right policies.

This is why we must extend the solar investment tax credits which are due to expire at the end of 2016. We also need to ensure that consumers selling energy back to the grid are able to do so at predictable and fair prices.

That is why today I have sent a letter to the Secretary of Energy urging his office to formulate best practices for net metering. This allows those who generate their own electricity from solar power to feed what they do not use back to the grid.

Just as the Buffalo Niagara region was an early adopter of hydroelectricity, we intend to be a leader in clean energy technologies like solar power as well.

COMMEMORATING THE 225TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. MARSHALS SERVICE

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

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, since the U.S. Marshals Service was founded on September 24 of 1789, U.S. marshals have served this country with dedication and distinction, upholding its creed of ''Justice, Integrity, Service.'' I rise today to commemorate the service's 225th anniversary.

The U.S. Marshals Service will celebrate its birthday next week in my district by breaking ground on the U.S. Marshals Museum in Fort Smith, Arkansas. The museum will be funded in part by the sale of coins commemorating the 225th anniversary of the Marshals Service.

The museum's 20,000 square feet will highlight pivotal moments in our oldest Federal law enforcement agency's history and pay proper tribute to the heroism the marshals have shown over the past 225 years.

I speak for all of my constituents in the Third District of Arkansas and my fellow Arkansans when I say we are humbled to have the U.S. Marshals Museum make Fort Smith its home and honored to play a prominent role in the next 225 years of the U.S. marshals history.

Happy birthday, U.S. marshals.

PROTECTING OUR HOMELAND AND OUR HOMELIFE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the value of our Constitution. I just left the Homeland Security hearing on the horror of ISIL and held up the Constitution to say that we will not allow terrorists to undermine our values, and I am grateful that we live under the Constitution that we do.

With that in mind, I encourage my colleagues to join me on H.R. 5488, a bill that I have introduced that would call for the reviewing and looking at the watch list to make sure that no foreign fighters are left off of that list and that there is a no fly for foreign fighters, again, reminding us of the processes which we use, and I hope that there will be those who will do so.

I also want to acknowledge the fact that we are facing economic growth, but we are also experiencing problems. All I hear from the NFL are the expression of problems. I sent a letter to Director Goodell of the NFL, the commissioner, to say, ''Put your resources where your complaints are.''

There are so many groups that are dealing with violence against women and abuse of children that we need to provide the NFL the resources to all of those groups. We need the NFL wives to be engaged. Stop talking, and let's do something.

This is disgraceful, but there is an epidemic of domestic violence, and the NFL can stand up and announce a major funding—as my colleague in the Senate has indicated—to be able to lift all of these groups that struggle every day to reach these women.

I would also add to them, put a campaign: see something, say something on

domestic violence. I ask the NFL to stand up and be counted.

THE TRIBAL GENERAL WELFARE EXCLUSION ACT OF 2013

(Ms. JENKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3043, the Tribal General Welfare Exclusion Act.

Under what is known as the general welfare doctrine, the IRS excludes a broad array of public services for purposes such as education, public safety, health, housing, and culture from taxation; however, this has not always been the case for tribal nations.

Recently, the IRS has challenged tribal general welfare programs, despite many of these being nearly identical to tax exempt programs provided by Federal, State, and local governments.

Members of the Prairie Band of Potawatomi Nation, the Kickapoo, Iowa, and the Sac and Fox Nation in Kansas have all voiced their concerns to me about invasive IRS audits and examinations that seek to tax government programs and benefits to their members.

This bicameral and bipartisan legislation will positively affect many Native Americans and is an important step in bringing IRS treatment of the tribes in line with how they are currently treating States.

□ 1215

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, domestic violence should never, ever be tolerated. The NFL's inept response to the recent reports of domestic violence has thrust a tragic spotlight onto this issue that we all are well aware of.

The truth of the matter is domestic violence and sexual assault are daily realities for women across our Nation. One in four women will experience physical violence by an intimate partner in their lifetime. In 2012, in part of the area that I represent in California, 6,000 domestic violence cases were reported by the Fresno Police Department. It is hard to believe, and it is unacceptable.

Today, let's make a commitment not to let this moment fade away after the headlines are gone. As a cofounder and cochair of the bipartisan Victims' Rights Caucus, we will keep working with all the victim advocate groups to strengthen the Violence Against Women Act and end the rape kit backlog and ensure that every woman has the right to a life without violence.

OUR RIGHTS COME FROM OUR CREATOR

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, 227 years ago, our Founding Fathers signed the U.S. Constitution establishing a nation united around the principle that our rights as citizens come not from the government but from our Creator.

Today we recommit ourselves by choice to upholding and defending these fundamental principles recognized in this document, including liberty, freedom, and rule of law of our great Republic. Indeed, our first act as newly elected Members of this House is to swear an oath to uphold and protect this document.

These principles have guided our Nation well over the last 227 years, both in times of prosperity as well as discord. Now, perhaps more than ever, it is our duty and it is the duty of every American to ensure these liberties and freedoms can be passed on to our children and our grandchildren.

I am honored to stand here today and commemorate the works of these 39 brave and wise original signatories to our Constitution.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, this month we celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the Wilderness Act, two of our Nation's most effective conservation tools.

In California, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has provided more than $2 billion to protect some of our most iconic natural landmarks. In my district alone, this includes the Point Reyes National Seashore, Redwood National Park, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and countless State parks, trails, and recreation areas. The fund uses zero taxpayer dollars for these investments in the economic and environmental well-being of our communities; instead, it is funded by revenues from offshore oil and gas activities.

We celebrate also the 50th anniversary of the Wilderness Act, which has protected some of our Nation's most pristine and intact wild places. As climate change begins to take its toll, protecting these wild places will be even more vital to the survival of many threatened and endangered species and to the conservation values that are part of our national fabric.

This should not be a partisan issue. Every American benefits from these two important laws and the lands they protect. Please join me in supporting them for another 50 years.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF JOHN CLARKE

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

Mr. MCKINLEY. Madam Speaker, after more than 40 years in the construction trade, my friend John Clarke of Wheeling has retired.

John is a lifelong West Virginian, the former president of Local 141 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and served on the International Executive Committee of IBEW.

After serving in Vietnam with the Marine Corps, John returned home and gave back to his community, serving on over 25 local charitable and professional organizations.

IBEW International President Ed Hill has said, ''Working families in West Virginia have never had a better friend than John Clarke.'' And more importantly, in a world conflicted with partisanship, John proudly put his country first, not his political affiliation.

He made a difference. His decades of devotion to his country and his community can only be matched by his commitment to his wife of 43 years, Margaret, and his two sons, Justin and Lucas.

I extend my congratulations to John and wish him well in his retirement.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH 2014

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

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, each year from September 15 until October 15, the Nation celebrates the many contributions of Latinos during Hispanic Heritage Month.

In my home State of Texas, the Hispanic community continues to relish in the cultural and historical footprint in the areas of government, architecture, business, and the arts. From north Texas Hispanic elected officials, both past and present who are advocating for the Latino community, to the Rose Marine Theater in Fort Worth and the Latino cultural center in Dallas, Hispanic culture continues to illuminate all aspects of life and history in the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex.

In the area of business and commerce, the contributions of business leaders continue to make the area that we live in one of the best in the entire country. Both Dallas and Tarrant Counties are fortunate to be served by very strong Hispanic chambers of commerce that proudly serve many of those businesses.

It is undeniable that Hispanic culture is woven into all aspects of contemporary American culture, and in the Dallas-Fort Worth area we are fortunate to be known as a city that is vibrant because of its strong Latino community.

HONORING JOSEPH JAMES DUNN

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

Mr. DAINES. Madam Speaker, Montana is a State blessed with people who have a strong commitment to service. In fact, more than 100,000 military veterans call our State home, and our dedicated law enforcement officials perform critical services each and every day.

On August 14, 2014, we lost a great Montanan when Cascade County sheriff deputy and Marine Corps combat veteran Joseph James Dunn the First was killed in the line of duty.

Joe put faith and family at the center of his life, going on multiple mission trips. He was described as a ''bold ambassador for Christ.'' No one was more important to Joe than his family: his dear wife, Robynn; son, Joey; and daughter, Shiloh.

Joe will be dearly missed by all who knew him. He personified service to his country, to his State, and to his community. Joe's life is an inspiration for all Montanans.

INCREASE THE MINIMUM WAGE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, this week the House will vote on loosely related bits of campaign fodder bundled together and labeled a ''jobs'' bill. But if we really want to help American workers and boost our economy, let's take a vote to increase the minimum wage. Let's show hardworking Americans that it is simply unacceptable for a mother working full-time to live $400 below the Federal poverty line.

Let's show businesses that we understand that added buying power for our workers is the boost this economic recovery needs. President Truman once said: Full human dignity requires at least a minimum level of economic sufficiency and security.

The American people deserve that and more. The American people want and deserve a vote to increase the minimum wage.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORT CONFIRMS OBAMACARE FUNDS ABORTIONS

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise today disturbed by a report confirming that the Affordable Care Act provides for a massive expansion of abortion funded by the taxpayer.

This week, the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office revealed that 1,036 of the plans offered under ObamaCare and eligible for taxpayer subsidies cover abortion on demand. Although the President promised in 2009 that ''no Federal dollars would be used to fund abortions,'' the law's accounting gimmicks showed otherwise.

One of my heroes, the late honorable Henry Hyde, worked hard to ensure that no American would be forced to pay for someone else's abortion. That is why the House passed H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act.

Clearly, there has been a lack of full disclosure by the administration and the insurance companies who have ignored the law, a law which failed to provide adequate safeguards for the taxpayer.

Many Americans are, thus, unwittingly paying for a procedure which violates their most deeply held beliefs. It is time the administration honored both the letter and spirit of the Hyde amendment. It is time for the Senate to pass H.R. 7 and ensure no American is forced to pay for abortion.

McKEON AMENDMENT

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

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, as we prepare to cast our vote today to train and equip Syrian rebels, I want to remind my colleagues of the nearly $20.2 billion that the United States has spent to train and equip Iraqi security forces during our decade at war there.

And what happened?

The Iraqi security forces could not secure the country and fled major Iraqi cities when confronted by ISIS. $20.2 billion. And yet here we are again today ready to authorize hundreds of millions of dollars to train and equip members of the Free Syrian Army.

What in the world are we doing?

Instead of rushing into yet another war, flooding the region with more weapons and intervening further in a civil war, Congress should be pressing the pause button. Instead of rushing into yet another war authorization—which of course this congressional resolution says it is not, but the unintended consequences will expand this war—Congress should be examining all of the solutions to this crisis, not just the military ones.

That is why I called and will continue to call for Congress to live up to its constitutional responsibility and have a full debate on the authorization to use force. The costs and consequences should be made clear.

HONORING CONSTITUTION DAY

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Madam Speaker, today, September 17, 2014, marks 82,910 days since the Constitution was signed in 1787. Though I have only been a United States Congressman for 469 of those days, on every one of them, I work to uphold the oath of office I swore: to defend our Nation's most important governing document, the Constitution.

On this Constitution Day, I would like to take some time to remind us all that all parts of the founding document are important. Especially in this time of executive overreach, we should remember that our Constitution created three equal and distinct branches of government.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I rise to add my voice to the thousands of citizens who will soon descend upon New York City to call for action to combat climate change. The first-ever People's Climate March will demonstrate robust support for climate action ahead of the United Nations climate summit next Tuesday.

Climate change is the defining challenge of our time. It threatens our economy and our way of life in countless ways through catastrophic wildfires, through severe storms and rising seas; and in my home State of California, one of the worst droughts on record threatens water supplies for drinking water and irrigation of valuable crops. This year alone, the drought will cost the agricultural sector $2.2 billion dollars and over 17,000 jobs.

Our Nation is taking positive steps to curb harmful carbon emissions, but there is so much more work that needs to be done. We can't wait any longer. Our children and our grandchildren are depending upon it.

REMEMBER PUNA

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Speaker, my home State of Hawaii is a unique and a very special place. There isn't a day that goes by that either a colleague or someone stops me to share with me a very special story about Hawaii.

I stand here today to ask that you remember us in a different way: a State with a very active volcano which is now within a residential area called the Kaohe homestead, and with lava that is flowing at a rate of 705 feet a day, soon to wipe out a major highway and who knows how many other subdivisions in its way.

This area is known as Puna, the same area which took the brunt of the hurricane, later a tropical storm, Iselle in August of this year. You know, they still have not recuperated from that storm, and now they have to contend with the lava.

So I ask my colleagues, Madam Speaker, that when we look at FEMA, Department of Agriculture, other agencies which will be able to help us, that when we look at the funding of first responders, that you remember Hawaii, you remember our Big Island, and you remember the people of Puna.

□ 1230

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

Mr. GARCIA. Madam Speaker, as someone who was born and raised in south Florida, I know Miami thrives on investment exports and economic development provided by the Export-Import Bank facilities—the Ex-Im Bank.

This organization will lose its authorization unless Congress acts. It is crucial to fueling a prosperous economy, not only in south Florida but the entire country.

In 2013 alone, the Ex-Im Bank supported an estimated $37.4 billion of U.S. exports and helped sustain more than 200,000 jobs. This is key. In my own district, 300 million exports since 2007.

As a percentage of the GDP, China and India provided roughly three times as much financing as we did. We need to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank to create jobs and keep our exporters in competitive foreign markets.

I urge my colleagues to join me in working to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank. This is an issue too important in the economy for partisan politics.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY AND INTEGRITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BACHMANN). The Chair clarifies that pursuant to section 106(b)(5)(B) of the Higher Education Opportunity Act (Public Law 110–315), the Speaker's appointments of May 25, 2010, and December 22, 2010, of individuals on the part of the House to the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity expired on May 25, 2014.

The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 106 of the Higher Education Opportunity Act (Public Law 110–315), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following individuals on the part of the House to the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity for a term of 6 years:

Upon the recommendation of the majority leader:

Arthur E. Keiser, Fort Lauderdale, FL

William Pepicello, Scottsdale, AZ

Arthur J. Rothkopf, Washington, DC

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

STRONGLY SUPPORTING THE PEOPLE OF UKRAINE

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 726) strongly supporting the right of the people of Ukraine to freely determine their future, including their country's relationship with other nations and international organizations, without interference, intimidation, or coercion by other countries.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 726

Whereas the United States is strongly committed to the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of Ukraine;

Whereas the United States strongly supports the right of the people of Ukraine to freely determine their future, including their country's relationship with other nations and international organizations, without interference, intimidation, or coercion by other countries;

Whereas the Russian Federation has undertaken a campaign of political, economic, and military aggression against Ukraine;

Whereas the Russian Federation's forcible occupation and illegal annexation of Crimea, its continuing support for separatist and paramilitary forces in eastern Ukraine, and its invasion of and military operations on Ukrainian territory represent gross violations of Ukraine's sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity and a violation of international law, including the Russian Federation's obligations under the United Nations Charter and its commitments as a participating State of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe;

Whereas the Government of Ukraine continues to exercise extraordinary restraint in response to the invasion of its territory by several thousand military personnel of the Russian Federation, who are engaged in offensive military operations in support of separatist forces, the illegal occupation and annexation of Crimea, and the tens of thousands of Russian Federation military personnel positioned offensively on the Ukrainian-Russian border since March 2014;

Whereas the forcible occupation and illegal annexation of Crimea by the Russian Federation and its continuing support for separatist and paramilitary forces in eastern Ukraine are violations of its obligations under the 1994 Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances, in which it pledged to respect the independence and sovereignty and the existing borders of Ukraine and to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of Ukraine;

Whereas the Russian Federation has provided military equipment, training, and other assistance to separatist and paramilitary forces in eastern Ukraine that has resulted in ongoing conflict that is responsible for over 3,000 deaths, hundreds of thousands of civilian refugees, and widespread destruction;

Whereas the Ukrainian military remains at a significant disadvantage compared to the armed forces of the Russian Federation in terms of size and technological sophistication;

Whereas the United States strongly supports efforts to assist Ukraine to defend its territory against military aggression by the Russian Federation and by separatist and paramilitary forces;

Whereas Malaysia Airlines Flight 17, a civilian airliner, was destroyed by a Russian-made missile provided to the separatist forces by the Russian Federation, taking all 298 innocent lives on board;

Whereas the Russian Federation has used and is continuing to use coercive economic measures, including the manipulation of energy prices and supplies as well as trade restrictions, to place political and economic pressure on Ukraine;

Whereas visa, financial, and other sanctions imposed by the United States, the European Union, and other allies and partners have placed significant pressure on the Russian Federation and its leadership but have not been sufficient to end its political, military, and economic aggression against Ukraine;

Whereas the President of the United States has authority to impose stronger sanctions against the Russian Federation and its leadership;

Whereas an aggressive Russian propaganda effort through the dissemination of false information is intended to stoke ethnic divisions and incite violence, thereby posing a direct threat to the peace and stability of Ukraine;

Whereas on April 3, 2014, the President signed Public Law 113–96 for the purpose of bolstering the resources of the Broadcasting Board of Governors to counter Russian propaganda and provide the people of Ukraine and the surrounding regions with access to credible and uncensored sources of information;

Whereas the United States remains committed to Ukraine's democratic development and to the establishment of a government that includes and respects representatives from all regions of Ukraine;

Whereas the United States is committed to assisting the Government of Ukraine ensure that the parliamentary elections scheduled for October 26, 2014, are free, fair, and held in all regions of Ukraine in full accordance with international standards;

Whereas the United States strongly supports the development of a prosperous market economy in Ukraine;

Whereas the United States strongly supports the implementation of economic reforms in Ukraine, including in the fiscal, energy, pension, and banking sectors, among others;

Whereas the United States supports the development of Ukraine's trade and economic ties with other countries and especially the European Union following the signing of an Association Agreement on June 27, 2014;

Whereas the United States strongly supports energy diversification initiatives to reduce Russian control of energy supplies to Ukraine and other European countries, including the development of domestic sources of energy, increased efficiency, and substituting energy obtained from Russia with imports from other countries;

Whereas the terms of the cease-fire announced on September 5, 2014, are being violated by the Russian Federation and the separatist and paramilitary forces it supports;

Whereas this cease-fire, if its terms are fully met by all parties, may be a first step toward the reestablishment of stability that must include the full withdrawal of Russian

forces from Ukrainian territory, the establishment of Ukraine's control over all of its international borders, the disarming of the separatist and paramilitary forces in the east, an end to Russia's use of its energy exports and trade barriers to apply economic and political pressure on Ukraine, and an end to Russian interference in Ukraine's internal affairs;

Whereas the political, military, and economic aggression against Ukraine by the Russian Federation underscores the enduring importance of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as the cornerstone of collective Euro-Atlantic defense; and

Whereas the United States reaffirms its obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty, especially Article 5, which states that ''an armed attack against one or more'' of the treaty signatories ''shall be considered an attack against them all'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) strongly supports the right of the people of Ukraine to freely determine their future, including their country's relationship with other nations and international organizations, without interference, intimidation, or coercion by other countries;

(2) calls on the President to continue to work with our allies and partners in Europe and other nations around the world to reaffirm the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of Ukraine and to refuse to recognize the illegal annexation of Crimea by the Russian Federation;

(3) strongly condemns the continuing political, economic, and military aggression by the Russian Federation against Ukraine and the violation of its sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity;

(4) states that the military intervention by the Russian Federation is a breach of its obligations under the United Nations Charter and its commitments as a participating State of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, and is a violation of the 1994 Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances, in which it pledged to respect the independence and sovereignty and the existing borders of Ukraine and to refrain from the threat of use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of Ukraine; and poses a threat to international peace and security;

(5) demands that the Russian Federation remove its military forces and military equipment from the territory of Ukraine, including equipment provided to the separatist and paramilitary forces;

(6) demands that the Russian Federation end its political, military, and economic support of separatist and paramilitary forces in Ukraine;

(7) demands that the Russian Federation and the separatist and paramilitary forces it supports end their violations of the cease-fire announced on September 5, 2014;

(8) calls on the President to cooperate with allies and partners in Europe and other nations around the world to impose visa bans, targeted asset freezes, sectoral sanctions, and other measures on the Russian Federation and its leadership sufficient to compel it to end its violation of Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity, to remove its military forces and equipment from Ukrainian territory, and to end its support of separatist and paramilitary forces;

(9) calls on the President to provide the Government of Ukraine with defense articles, services, and training required to effectively defend its territory and sovereignty;

(10) calls on the President to ensure the delivery of urgently needed assistance to Ukraine and to ensure that all future assistance will be rapidly delivered;

(11) calls on the President to provide the Government of Ukraine with appropriate intelligence and other relevant information to assist the Government of Ukraine to defend its territory and sovereignty;

(12) calls on the President to work with the Government of Ukraine, our allies and other nations, and international organizations to ensure that the multinational team investigating the destruction of Malaysia Airlines Flight 17 is able to conduct an unrestricted investigation, guarantee the repatriation of remains and personal effects from the crash site, report its findings free of outside political influence or intimidation and to ensure that those directly and indirectly responsible for this tragedy are brought to justice;

(13) calls on our European allies, and other countries and international organizations, to join the United States in providing assistance to the Government of Ukraine to ensure that the parliamentary elections scheduled for October 26, 2014, are free, fair, and held in all regions of Ukraine in full accordance with international standards;

(14) calls on the President to expand United States international broadcasting efforts to Russian-speaking audiences in Ukraine and both inside and outside of Russia and include a broad spectrum of communications mediums to provide high-quality programming content, independent journalism, and credible information to counter Russia's propaganda;

(15) calls on Ukraine and other countries to support energy diversification initiatives to reduce the ability of the Russian Federation to use its energy exports as a means of applying political or economic pressure, including by promoting increased natural gas exports from the United States and other countries;

(16) strongly supports the efforts by President Poroshenko and the people of Ukraine to establish a lasting peace in Ukraine that includes the full withdrawal of Russian forces from Ukraine's territory, the establishment of Ukraine's control over all of its international borders, the disarming of the separatist and paramilitary forces in the east, policies to reduce Russia's ability to use energy exports and trade barriers as weapons to apply economic and political pressure on Ukraine, and an end to Russia's interference in Ukraine's internal affairs; and

(17) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to its obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty, especially Article 5, and calls on all Alliance member states to provide their full share of the resources needed to ensure their collective defense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous materials in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, this is a historic moment for Ukraine. It has withstood invasion by Russian forces, their illegal occupation and annexation of Crimea, the arming of separatist militias by Moscow, the cutoff of natural gas and imposition of trade barriers aimed at undermining Ukraine's economy. They have suffered under a Russian propaganda offensive designed to sow fear and exploit division, and they have had many other assaults along the way.

I had an opportunity—myself and ELIOT ENGEL of New York—to travel to Ukraine, along with JIM GERLACH. We are happy to have Mr. GERLACH and MARCY KAPTUR with us today. They are the authors of this resolution, a resolution in support of Ukraine. I will lay out what we saw both in western Ukraine and in the east, because we traveled across that country.

But before I do that, let me point out that thousands and thousands of Ukrainians have been killed by the fighting in the east and hundreds of thousands have been made refugees.

But Ukraine still stands. It stands unbowed, more determined than ever to secure its independence and its sovereignty and its territorial integrity. This resolution that the House clearly has before it states unambiguously our support for Ukraine in its effort.

The United States, our European allies, and many other countries have made clear that we will not allow Russia to bludgeon—bludgeon—Ukraine into submission, because that is exactly what they attempted to do. We have opposed tough sanctions on Russia. We have provided extensive assistance to help Ukraine through this very difficult time. Its military needs to be bolstered. And we are supporting the establishment of a democratic system representing all of the people of Ukraine.

Importantly, yesterday, the Ukrainian Parliament passed a law granting greater autonomy—including Russian language rights—to those in the east. A strong democracy respectful of individual rights is the best counter to Vladimir Putin's very autocratic ways.

Ukraine faces many challenges, including growing economic problems, the possibility of a gas shortage this winter, and a never-ending onslaught of propaganda. We will continue to assist Ukraine, but it is vital that in Ukraine—and we carried this message when we were in country—they implement the far-reaching economic and structural reforms necessary to enable that country to grow.

Ending Russia's ability to use its oil and natural gas as a weapon has got to be a priority. There are many steps that Ukraine itself can take, beginning with reforming its energy sector to expand its own production of energy and, of course, to increase efficiency. The United States and other countries, especially Ukraine's neighbors in Europe, can help by making alternative supplies available to that country.

You notice that the Polish engineers have reverse-engineered those pipes so

that gas can come into Ukraine. Western Ukraine has tremendous possibilities for oil shale. We met when we were in Azerbaijan with the government there that is building a pipeline into Central Europe, and we know that a lot more can be done in order to get gas into Ukraine.

The U.S. can take a major step forward by removing the restrictions we have imposed on ourselves that severely limit the export of our abundant supplies. We have got a glut on our market. Frankly, this is a way to create jobs here, this is a way to help our balance of payments. Let's sell this to Ukraine because they deeply need it. And, frankly, the prices in the east are very, very, high and this will give us a new market.

And the other body could act on legislation this House has passed to revamp U.S. international broadcasting so there is an effective counter to Moscow's never-ending propaganda. This is legislation that I and my colleague ELIOT ENGEL have authored in order to make certain that the people in Ukraine and, frankly, that Russian-speaking populations everywhere, can hear the truth about what is happening inside their own countries, as well as an appeal to political pluralism and tolerance and all of the values that the international community should share.

In April, Ranking Member ENGEL and I led a delegation, as I mentioned, to the Ukraine to see for ourselves the situation on the ground, including in the east in Dnipropetrovsk, in eastern Ukraine, which borders the region controlled by the separatists. There and in Kiev, we had extensive discussions with a range of senior officials, including Prime Minister Yatsenyuk, about the situation in their country. We also spoke with leaders of the civil society community: women's groups, lawyers' groups, Jewish groups, Tatar groups, Russian-speaking communities. All strongly supported a united Ukraine; all opposed Russian intervention. All shared with us that at the end of the day they wanted Ukraine whole, they wanted Russia out.

We met with Mr. Poroshenko prior to his election and assured him of strong U.S. support. Now the entire Congress will demonstrate that continuing commitment when the President of Ukraine addresses the joint session tomorrow. The message will be heard loud and clear, not just in Ukraine, not just in Kiev, but also in Moscow and around the world, that the United States stands with the people of Ukraine now and always.

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

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

I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Tomorrow, we will welcome the President of Ukraine, Petro Poroshenko, to address a joint session of Congress. It is fitting that the leader of the Ukrainian people will speak in this Chamber where over the centuries our own democracy has grown and thrived.

Today, we know that freedom and democracy in Ukraine are under threat. So with this resolution we will send a clear signal to President Poroshenko and to the people of Ukraine that we stand by them. America stands with them.

I visited Ukraine a few months ago with my friend, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Congressman ROYCE. Everywhere we went we heard the same thing: the people of Ukraine do not want Russian interference in their country.

Ukraine is an independent Nation—it is not part of another country—and the people of Ukraine have a right to make a determination for themselves as to what their policies would be without intimidation from Mr. Putin or anybody else.

This hit home, especially for me, when I visited a synagogue in eastern Ukraine. My four grandparents were born in Ukraine.

□ 1245

Two older men at this synagogue approached me to talk about the Russian threat. Over the last century, their eyes have seen the tide of history roll in and out of Ukraine.

They had fought against Hitler's army, they had lived under the yoke of Soviet tyranny, they had witnessed democracy spread across Eastern Europe, and, now, they were looking East at a new threat on the horizon. ''Don't abandon us,'' one of them said. ''America is very, very important.''

If anything, that threat has only grown worse in recent months. Separatist forces, bolstered by President Putin, continue to wreak havoc across eastern Ukraine. Russian weapons have brought down a plane full of innocent civilians. Thousands of Russian troops have spilled over the border, trampling on Ukrainian sovereignty.

Mr. Poroshenko comes to us with his country on the brink. With this measure, we say to him, ''We support Ukraine. We support the right of Ukraine to determine its own future.'' We are also saying to our friends and allies around the world that this Russian aggression must not stand and that democracies must unite to meet this challenge.

Finally, we are saying to Mr. Putin, ''If you continue to threaten your neighbors, if you continue to sow unrest, if you continue to defy the will of the global community, you will isolate your country, and your actions will have consequences.''

I should also add that I think the credibility of the NATO alliance is really hanging in the balance. For the past 20 or 25 years, we have proceeded on the fact that Russia was not a threat and that Russia, indeed, in many ways, was a partner.

That is no longer, unfortunately, the situation. Russia is an adversary, and the NATO alliance has to adjust to that. The equation that NATO has to adjust to has changed because of the actions of Mr. Putin in Ukraine.

We have to make sure that our NATO allies feel strengthened. We have to make sure that the countries bordering Russia and the rest of Europe feel that they are not being intimidated, and countries like Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova ought to be free to exert their independent thinking and what they feel is best for their country and not be intimidated by Mr. Putin.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GERLACH), cochairman of the House Ukraine Caucus and the author of the resolution we have before us.

Mr. GERLACH. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I give particular thanks to Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their great support and cooperation for this resolution and for Ukrainian people themselves; also, a special thanks to my colleagues in the House, Congresswoman KAPTUR, Congressman LEVIN, and Congressman PASCRELL, for your terrific support on these important issues involving our two countries.

This resolution sends an unmistakable message to the Russian Federation and to the entire world that this House stands united with the people of Ukraine. During the last 10 months, no other ally has experienced more internal upheaval or a more imminent threat to its sovereignty than our friends in Ukraine.

Last November, the people of Ukraine flooded the Maidan in Kiev to peacefully protest a corrupt and arrogant regime.

For nearly 3 months, Ukrainians risked their lives—and more than 100 civilians died—while ushering in a new era and a new system of governance, an era in which elected leaders will be accountable and transparent; honor the fundamental human rights all Ukrainians have, regardless of their political affiliation; and bolster alliances with the United States and European Union to foster greater economic opportunity and prosperity.

The smoldering fires of the Maidan had barely been extinguished, however, when a new threat emerged on Ukraine's eastern border with Russia. Russian President Vladimir Putin illegally occupied and then annexed Crimea. He emboldened and equipped separatists who have been fomenting discord through eastern Ukraine.

Clearly, what Putin has in mind for Ukraine is not a new era of openness, liberty, and opportunity, but, rather, a return to a bygone era of political intimidation and coercion, and Putin's gambit to reassert Russian influence has exacted a lethal toll.

The United States estimates 3,000 Ukrainian civilians have been killed

since April as a result of the clashes in eastern Ukraine, but, through all of these challenges, Ukrainian people have not wavered in their desire to remain independent and restore stability to their system of governance and an economy ravaged by the excesses of the previous regime.

I believe the people of Ukraine deserve our moral and material support as their country continues to confront challenges from within its borders and from its belligerent neighbor, and that support must include defense articles, services and training, and intelligence information that will allow Ukraine to effectively defend its territory and maintain its sovereignty.

I truly believe that an independent and democratic Ukraine enhances the security of the United States and offers greater economic opportunity for citizens in both countries; therefore, I ask my colleagues to pass this resolution and reaffirm the United States' commitment to supporting the right of the people of Ukraine to independently determine their future free from intimidation and free from outside influence.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, not too long ago—several years ago—several of us walked into this very, very historic room. The President of Ukraine at that time was President Yushchenko. A lot has happened since that ''Orange Revolution.'' A lot has happened to Ukraine.

We see in Ukraine a democratically elected Mr. Poroshenko, who will be here tomorrow, walking down the same aisle in a very, very different political environment.

I rise in support of House Resolution 726, supporting the right of the people of Ukraine to freely determine their future. That is what this resolution is all about. We must make clear our position that Russia's actions over the past year to intimidate and bring violence and death to the people of Ukraine, as well as the victims of Malaysia Flight 17—lest we forget—is behavior that is unacceptable to the entire international community.

Ukraine is a sovereign nation. That either means something or it doesn't. It has borders. It has a democratically-elected government. It has the right to govern itself as it sees fit.

Mr. Putin doesn't understand the concept of a sovereign nation. It is like he is living in a time before Westphalia. When the people of Ukraine decided they wanted to further integrate with Europe, he sent an army to invade. That was his answer.

My congressional district in northern New Jersey is home to many Ukrainian Americans. They are proud American citizens. They are proud of where they came from. They are proud of the culture and proud of this culture in this great Nation. They refuse to let Russia bully their homeland. They know how to assimilate Ukrainian Americans in the United States. They are proud Americans.

While we have already put tough multilateral sanctions on Russia, we need to do more. We wish Russia no harm, but we are not going to be dictated by Mr. Putin's dream whims.

I am pleased that we have a ceasefire that appears to be holding, but we don't know for how long. Russia needs to immediately withdraw any military assets it has in Ukraine, and the militias in the east should be disarmed.

We should provide Ukrainians with defensive arms so that they can defend their country in sovereignty. This is how you treat an ally, not with words. I am pleased this resolution calls for the President to do just this.

We cannot let up on this pressure, Mr. Speaker, on Mr. Putin. After Ukraine, he has his eyes set on allies in the Baltic States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. We know Ukraine is not a part of NATO, at least not yet. Do we have a specific treaty with Ukraine? No, we don't, but they are our allies. That much means something.

The United States of America stands with the people of Ukraine today, and we will continue to stand with them in the future. I thank Mr. GERLACH from Pennsylvania for putting this resolution forward, as well as MARCY KAPTUR from Ohio; Mr. LEVIN from Michigan; and, of course, Mr. ENGEL is always there to do the right thing in international discourse.

I am honored to be here today to present this, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me first of all echo what Mr. PASCRELL just said. I want to commend Mr. GERLACH, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. LEVIN for this.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the coauthor of this legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the ranking member for yielding and also Mr. GERLACH. Many of us have enjoyed working with him. We are going to miss you. We don't do enough work together in this institution.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly—kind of emotionally, in a way—support this resolution because of what has been going on in Ukraine. This resolution shows our support for Ukrainian people's right to determine their own future and to build a country that is free and democratic.

We stand firmly with Ukrainian people and condemn Russia's aggression. We should always remember that the impetus for Ukraine's freedom comes from within, from within Ukrainian people. It is their desire to be free that is the ultimate force behind all international efforts.

Time and events have shown, time and again, that Ukrainian people are standing up for their freedom. From the Orange Revolution in 2004 to the protests in Maidan Square earlier this year, it is clear to the world that Ukraine is determined to build her own future.

The past year has been very difficult. Ukrainian people have paid a very high price to govern according to their own wishes. The images and reports from Ukraine have been hard to accept, and we are deeply saddened by the lives lost and by the overwhelming uncertainties that still loom ahead; yet Ukrainian people have spoken through their actions.

Just yesterday, here at the Capitol, the Congressional Ukrainian Caucus held a celebration to commemorate the 400th anniversary of its oldest school, the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy.

At the event, I was delighted to see the strong support stemming from the American Ukrainian community. The community's work in my home State of Michigan and all across this Nation has led to close collaboration between our two nations and has reaffirmed our common values.

The community's work is especially important now, when others try to speak for the values and aspirations held true by Ukrainian people.

Tomorrow, we will welcome President Poroshenko to a joint meeting with Members of the House and Senate. We eagerly look forward to his remarks.

The passage of this resolution will be emblematic of the support from the American people, but we should always remember that the impetus for a free and democratic Ukraine comes from Ukrainian people themselves, but we can, should, and will help their efforts to continue to build a free Ukraine.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR). She and I traveled to Ukraine together many years ago on my first trip there.

She is also the cochair of the Ukrainian Caucus and has long been an advocate for a free and independent Ukraine.

Ms. KAPTUR. I would like to thank Ranking Member ENGEL so very much for yielding me the time, as well as Chairman ROYCE for his leadership and willingness to do all that was necessary to bring this bill to the floor today and to join JIM GERLACH, SANDER LEVIN, BILL PASCRELL, all very, very valued members of the Ukrainian Caucus.

□ 1300

We rise as colleagues in support of H. Res. 726 as we continue to strongly support the right of the people of Ukraine to freely determine their own futures, their sovereignty, without outside interference and, God forbid, further bloodshed or loss of life.

The brave people of Ukraine continue to face incredible challenges, not only an assault on their borders by Russia, but reforming their own government and their judiciary to develop a rich civil society with the rule of law.

The task that lies ahead for Ukraine is daunting but beckons liberty forward. This is Ukraine's moment in modern history. I expect her to become one of the greatest nations in Europe.

While the situation remains unstable, there are clear signs of hope, the ultimate reflection of the intrepid soul of the Ukrainian people who have endured history's raw edge. Just yesterday, Ukraine's President, Petro Poroshenko, signed the landmark and long-awaited European Union Association Agreement, a brave step forward. We recall it was this desire for a closer association with Europe and the West on the part of the Ukrainian people that was ultimately responsible for the start of the crisis which persists today.

As a great nation—the name Ukraine means ''borderland''—Ukraine should reach west and east and north and south. It is just that vast a land and its potential unlimited.

But in trying to accomplish that effort with Europe, what began as a peaceful protest in Kyiv, the capital, ended in bloodshed, first at the hands of the former corrupt Yanukovych regime, and now at the hands of Russian agitators under the directives and support of Russia's President, Vladimir Putin.

Still, we look forward to tomorrow's historic joint meeting of our Congress here in this House in honor of President Petro Poroshenko's first official visit to the United States. We must heed President Poroshenko's words and take into great consideration any request he makes of us, a vital friend and ally.

We continue to stand in solidarity with Ukraine and her people, and the passage of this bill, H. Res. 726, on the eve of President Poroshenko's visit aims to further illustrate the special friendship and bond our two countries share.

Were it not for Ukrainian Americans in our country and other Americans who had endured under the Soviet mantle for some generations, the visit here would not have as deep a meaning. We share Ukraine's struggle.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this bill's passage. I thank all of those—Ranking Member ENGEL; Chairman ROYCE; my colleague as cochair of the Ukrainian Caucus, JIM GERLACH; SANDER LEVIN and BILL PASCRELL—for making this moment possible.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a very important and valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend Mr. ENGEL from New York, and I congratulate the authors of H. Res. 726. They have done a great job in building bipartisan support for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. The United States must stand with the people of Ukraine in the face of Russia's naked aggression and reverse violations to Ukrainian sovereignty and prevent further Russian meddling and attacks on what they consider former Soviet republics.

We must remember that this assault began in Crimea, part of Ukraine. It was in Crimea that Russian military forces violated, initially, Ukrainian sovereignty, and it was Russia then that ultimately illegally arranged for the annexation of this territory, territory of a sovereign country.

Subsequently, we have witnessed further incursions by the Russian military into eastern Ukraine. Now Europe is attuned to the threat, but, Mr. Speaker, I am stuck on Crimea. Ignoring Russian aggression in Crimea only emboldened Putin to do it again in eastern Ukraine.

I am very pleased that the authors of this resolution adopted the principles of our bipartisan legislation introduced earlier this year with Mr. STEVE CHABOT, and like the Crimea Annexation Non-recognition Act, which is H. Res. 726, formerly and utterly rejects Russian sovereignty over Crimea and calls on our allies to do the same. Without a clear stance on the issue of Crimea, the West ultimately becomes unwittingly complicit in Putin's further aggression and interference throughout Ukraine.

What is next? Moldova? Georgia? The Baltic Republic?

Congress must address the Crimea underlying issue if we are going to have credibility on the whole issue of Putin's aggression in the region.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the authors of this resolution for doing just that; and again, I thank Mr. ENGEL and Mr. ROYCE for the way they comport the House Foreign Affairs Committee in true bipartisan fashion.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have the right to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I will close and say that this is a very important and timely resolution.

When Chairman ROYCE and I visited Ukraine a few months ago, we had the good fortune to meet with many Ukrainian officials and people running for President. Mr. Poroshenko, who will address us tomorrow in joint session, was one of them.

I can tell you that Chairman ROYCE and I both were very impressed with Mr. Poroshenko. We really felt that there was great hope for Ukraine and thought that he was the likely winner. Everything that he has done, in my opinion, since he has won just reaffirms our initial feeling about him.

I was very happy that Ukraine signed the European Union Association Agreement yesterday. It strikes a very good balance but moves Ukraine closer to the West where the people want it.

I can tell you that when we went to Ukraine and we stood in Maidan Square where the protests happened, you really felt—it was a palpable feeling—that you were part of history, people, average Ukrainians, coming up to us in the street thanking the United States of America for its strong support of Ukraine and for the independence of Ukraine.

Now, the resolution—and I think it is important to highlight certain things—says that the United States is strongly committed to the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of Ukraine, and the United States strongly supports the right of the people of Ukraine to freely determine their future, including their country's relationship with other nations, without interference, intimidation, or coercion by other countries.

It also talks about Crimea, and I think that that should not be forgotten. Mr. CONNOLLY is quite right. The taking of part of another country through military force cannot be fathomed and we cannot look the other way. We need to very strongly condemn it. Crimea is part of Ukraine, not part of Russia.

So what we have here in this resolution—and I again want to commend Mr. GERLACH and Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. LEVIN and all the people who put it together—is a commonsense resolution that says that the United States stands with the people of Ukraine and stands with the right of the people of Ukraine to determine its own future.

This is a very important resolution. It is a very timely resolution, and I would urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

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

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

The Ukrainian people have had a long, turbulent history of struggle. It is important to remember that when that vote for independence came, it passed overwhelmingly across Ukraine.

For me, I think the most memorable point of that trip was standing with Mr. ENGEL in the synagogue—it was Passover—adjacent to the largest community center, Jewish community center in all of Europe.

ELIOT ENGEL, whose four grandparents all came from Ukraine, spoke to the hopes that the American people have for a Ukraine which is a Ukraine that embraces tolerance, political pluralism, freedom, a Ukraine in which the persecution of people is a thing of the past but in which the future lies with the democratic ideals that we share, a Ukraine independent, a Ukraine free of threat, free of outside influence.

These are the hopes embodied in this resolution because the Ukrainian people have withstood these enormous pressures. They have endured this great suffering. They know there are many challenges still to overcome before they can rest secure. But the Ukrainians that we spoke with told us that among the most important things sustaining them throughout this difficult time is the knowledge that we in the United States stand with them.

Tomorrow, President Poroshenko will address this joint session of Congress here; and by granting him, his

country, this honor and by adopting this resolution today, we will demonstrate our continuing commitment to Ukraine and to helping its people achieve the freedom, achieve the security and prosperity that they so rightfully deserve.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 726.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 24, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 5462, by the yeas and nays;

S. 476, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

FEDERAL RESERVE TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 24) to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 333, nays 92, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 504]

YEAS—333

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—92

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Butterfield
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Green, Al
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Himes
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lowenthal
Lowey
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
Meeks
Miller, George
Moore
Neal
Pallone
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Price (NC)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sewell (AL)
Slaughter
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Barton
Castor (FL)
DesJarlais
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Nunnelee

□ 1343

Messrs. PALLONE, LARSON of Connecticut, KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. LEE of California, Messrs. CLEAVER, CLYBURN, RICHMOND, ENGEL, MEEKS, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. CUMMINGS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. WOODALL, DOGGETT, COHEN, FATTAH, and KEATING changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AIR PASSENGER FEE LIMITATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5462) to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for limitations on the fees charged to passengers of air carriers, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 505]

YEAS—423

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)

Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Barton
Byrne
Castor (FL)
DesJarlais
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Nunnelee
Rooney

□ 1351

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK COMMISSION EXTENSION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 476) to amend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act to extend to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 506]

YEAS—419

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Barletta
Barton
Bishop (NY)
Byrne
Castor (FL)
Conyers
DesJarlais
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Johnson, Sam
Nunnelee
Rooney

□ 1359

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule 19, further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 124) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed on Tuesday, September 16, 2014, 3 hours and 30½ minutes of debate remained on the amendment printed in part B of House Report 113–600 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) has 1 hour and 41½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) has 1 hour and 49 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), my friend and colleague.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of something that I am for, and that is the chairman's amendment as he has presented it.

Madam Speaker, I think that for so many of us who represent men and women in uniform who comprise our fighting forces and who have been so diligent in this battle, in this war on terrorism, we look at these votes and certainly it causes us concern; and we know that the measure that the House is taking up is a measure as requested by the President—we recognize that—and we recognize, also, the severity and importance of the issue.

Madam Speaker, this is an issue that should require the full attention of every member and every staff member of this body. And I think that we all approach this—I do—with a lot of questions, and we realize that what the Commander in Chief has asked for is really, in the opinion of so many of the men and women that I represent, a half measure.

I wish we would see more leadership, and I am hopeful that in days to come we will see leadership from our Commander in Chief. That is what the men and women deserve, and that is what the American people deserve as we seek to protect our homeland.

I wish that we could stand here and say this administration has learned their lessons, because they have so mishandled the drawdown in Iraq. And the rhetoric of al Qaeda being on the run was truly a disservice to our military forces and to our men and women in uniform and to the American people.

It would be my hope that as we take a first step that we recenter our focus and commit to annihilating ISIL from the face of the Earth.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, the threat from ISIS is real. All of us have seen the violence and the barbarism of ISIS. The rapid advance of ISIS militants within Iraq and Syria is an immediate threat to these countries in the region.

No one should be under any delusion about what will happen if the U.S. sits this one out. If unchecked, the ISIS threat will grow and become even more difficult to address down the road and directly threaten our Nation.

As we have seen since President Obama authorized the limited airstrikes against ISIS in August, we have the ability to mitigate the ISIS threat, but we cannot defeat ISIS by ourselves with U.S. airstrikes.

Thomas Friedman said it well in The New York Times:

> ISIS loses if our moderate Arab-Muslim partners can unite and make this a civil war within Islam—a civil war in which America is the air force for the Sunnis and Shiites of decency versus those of barbarism . . . It is about them and who they want to be.

As I see it, an important aspect of U.S. assistance under this amendment in the training of Syrian rebels is that it will be an occasion for nations with a Sunni majority to join in a battle against the fanatical Sunni ISIS. Hopefully, this can lead to expanded involvement of other nations in this battle at the same time as Iraq's Shi'a majority, with our active encouragement, finally provides full rights and participation for its Sunni and Kurdish minorities.

So amidst all the difficulties and the challenges—and they are serious and many—this amendment can hopefully serve as a stepping stone, as a stepping stone to a broad-based, effective coalition against the spread of ISIS.

Our country can provide air support, can provide intelligence and other logistics, but in the end, it cannot achieve for the people of Syria and Iraq on the ground what they can only do for themselves.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), my colleague and the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California, the chairman, whose amendment I support here today, and I will support any measure that will lead to the destruction of ISIS.

This administration has known about this threat for over a year. It wasn't until the two beheadings of an American journalist and a British aid worker that the American people really understood the pure evil that is ISIS. The White House has been sending mixed messages. Words do matter.

Finally, I believe this administration realized, despite its flawed narrative over the years, what the threat from ISIS really is. In fact, General Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, said, to fully defeat ISIS, we have to go into Syria. I agree with him. We must cut off the head of the snake wherever it exists, and it does exist in Syria.

While limited in nature, this authorization will begin the process to do just that by vetting, equipping, and training moderate forces by the United States military in Saudi Arabia.

I had some reservations about the vetting process. I did visit with Pentagon officials, and I got greater confidence. I do believe the numbers are a little bit too low, but the broader strategy under General Allen is to lead a coalition not only of NATO allies, but of these moderate Sunni nations to build a ground force in Syria which currently does not exist.

It is vital, Madam Speaker, that Sunni moderates stand up, Sunni moderates and Arab nations step up to the plate to defeat and combat Sunni extremists in their own backyard.

While this is a step in the right direction, I believe that, long term, the administration needs to come forward with a comprehensive strategy, one that the American people and Congress can debate, which could be fully authorized by Congress.

In closing, Madam Speaker, there is nothing more important that we debate up here, that we talk about here,

that we vote on up here than matters of war and peace. It is for that reason that I support this amendment. For, if we do not hit ISIS overseas, they will certainly hit us in the United States.

Mr. SMITH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this amendment.

I don't take that lightly. I spent 18 years on the Armed Services Committee and about 12 years on the Homeland Security Committee, and with any decision like this, we have to weigh what we know and what we don't know.

We know that, if left unchecked, ISIS would become a direct threat not only to the United States, but possibly to the entire world. That is why we are going after them currently in Iraq with partners that we know we can trust, such as the Kurds.

We know that we cannot sit on our hands, close our eyes, and hope that ISIS goes away. That is why we need a good plan.

We know that we cannot do this alone, that we need a committed international coalition to stop ISIS.

The President says we have a coalition of 40. You know, it is interesting because I remember the Iraq war and the coalition. Some of our coalition members sent one person. I would really like to know who our coalition is and what they are really going to do before I vote for any plan.

What don't we know? We don't know how moderate these Syrian rebels really are. In fact, some of my Syrian constituents, Syrian Americans who live in Orange County, have told me that there are no moderates left or, worse, that the moderates, given the choice between losing or Assad or ISIS, want ISIS, and they say people aren't going to fight against ISIS.

We don't know if somewhere down the line they will turn our guns right back on us. In fact, that is one of the scarier things that we have to face. We simply don't know who we can trust. In an uncontrolled, war-torn destabilized country, who do we trust?

We can look back, for example, at what happened in Central America, how the rebels there, who were armed by the United States, went after innocent civilians. This blood will be on our hands when that happens.

We need a winning strategy to degrade and ultimately destroy ISIS.

Now, we are in an election season. Everybody says this isn't political, but I know, I have been talking to colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and some are wondering what they do 7 weeks away from an election.

I have got to tell you, this is not a political vote. The last time people took a political vote in this House, it was on the Iraq war, and many of my colleagues say it was the worst vote they took.

□ 1415

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), my friend and colleague.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I thank our chairman.

This proposal just examines one piece of the puzzle, not the totality of the Syrian crisis. The White House should have come to Congress for a full authorization for use of military force in Syria to put all of our options on the table with no limitations.

ISIS is part of the radical Islam threat, which the 9/11 Commission identified as a serious threat to U.S. national security and to world peace and stability.

I have serious reservations about the President's plan to train and equip the so-called ''moderate opposition'' in Syria because we don't want ISIL to get even more of our equipment and arms, as it did in Iraq.

ISIL is not the only terror group in Syria, Madam Speaker, nor is it the only hurdle for stability in Syria and Iraq. There are dangerous terrorist groups operating in Syria, like al-Nusra and other terrorist organizations, that are waiting to take up the mantle should ISIL fall. And, then, of course, Assad is still responsible for the deaths of over 200,000 people.

Last year, the President failed to act militarily when Assad used chemical weapons against his own people. We cannot have a plan that does not address the removal of Assad simultaneously alongside the destruction of ISIL and other terrorist threats.

Even though I will vote for the McKeon amendment, we still won't be approaching this situation in a comprehensive manner that is required.

We were successful in isolating Iran with sanctions until we unraveled that with these nuclear negotiations. We can do the same in Syria. I am afraid that this misguided negotiations approach in Iran will preempt many to acquiesce and take a deal that will undermine our national security and leave Iran with enrichment capabilities.

That, Madam Speaker, is a real and present danger in the Middle East: a nuclear Iran. This could be a calamity for the region and U.S. national security interests, such as the safety and the security of our strong ally, the democratic Jewish State of Israel.

Yesterday, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dempsey, revealed that the use of military forces on the ground may be needed in Syria. If our military officials believe that it is absolutely necessary to use the U.S. military on the ground, I would fully support that.

We cannot take anything off the table and showcase to the terrorists what we are not willing to do. The full range of United States political, economic, and military power must be brought to bear against this radical threat. Announcing to the enemy a self-imposed limit on the part of our arsenal is signaling that we do not possess the necessary will to prevail against radical Islam.

I thank the chairman for the leadership.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank the gentleman for his leadership. I thank Mr. MCKEON for his leadership.

We will see today a bipartisan action, bipartisan action on behalf of America, on behalf of its security, on behalf of our international partners in confronting terrorism.

Madam Speaker, today, the House is fulfilling one of its most important responsibilities: to protect our national security and defend our interests overseas. Among those interests is to prevent the dangerous ISIL terrorist group from spreading and threatening American personnel, our allies, and innocent civilians.

The amendment before us will authorize the President to train and equip moderate Syrian opposition to degrade and destroy ISIL in Iraq and Syria. No sanctuaries, no place to hide. ISIL is already threatening Americans and our allies in the Middle East and Europe; and, if left unchecked, it will surely threaten us here at home.

This amendment is Congress' opportunity to demonstrate unity in support of the President's strategy and provide him with the authorization he needs to help train and equip our regional partners to go on the offense against ISIL. ISIL has already murdered and captured soldiers, innocent civilians, and journalists, including, of course, two Americans, and members of religious communities have been targeted, targeted for their faith. They are no more than a collection of criminal terrorists bent on imposing their fanatical objectives on others by force, violence, and barbarism.

ISIL constitutes a dual threat. They pose a counterterrorism threat to the United States and our regional partners and they represent a destabilizing force in the region.

Madam Speaker, we cannot ignore the challenge that ISIL presents to America and to the world. There is no question that there will be challenges. But we know empirically the cost of doing nothing is far too great.

The President was right to wait until a government had been formed in Iraq that is ready to move forward against ISIL. Americans don't want American women and men on the ground, but Americans do want ISIL confronted. Congress has an important role to play in this effort, and this amendment ought to be a strong and clear message to the world that the American people, through their elected representatives, will join those in the region to prevent the terrorist group ISIL from running rampant across the Middle East.

It is a message to our allies and regional partners that our Nation is prepared to train and equip those who are working to stop ISIL's advance. And it is a message to the world that we are united in our resolve to meet this threat. We clearly may have differences on this House floor, but we are Americans when it comes to defending our people and our country.

Madam Speaker, with regard to the underlying bill, the continuing resolution, let me make some brief comments.

House Republicans have chosen not to repeat their government shutdown from last year. I think they are making a wise decision.

There are things I would change in this bill, just as I know there are things my friends on the Republican side would change in this bill. That is compromise. That is the legislative process. That is what our Founding Fathers envisioned. That, in fact, is governing.

I am hopeful that this continuing resolution will give Congress the time it needs to complete work on appropriations for the fiscal year 2015 that meet our obligations to the American people and to America's future.

We need a budget that embraces fiscal sustainability while investing in job growth and competitiveness so that we can grow our middle class.

While it is important that Congress move forward with this 72-day funding bill, I am disappointed, Madam Speaker, that we are not extending the Export-Import Bank's charter for multiple years. Not doing so is another example of undermining our competitive position for the world and the competence of our job creators.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. As CNBC pointed out last week:

> At first glance, it might seem like a congressional deal to extend the Export-Import Bank's charter through June would be good news for the beleaguered institution, which supports American exports with loan guarantees and other credit assistance. In fact, it is the exact opposite. An extension to June could be a death sentence for the bank.

I sincerely pray it is not.

Congress has a responsibility to make sure the bank's charter is extended beyond June. We need a multiyear reauthorization along the lines of the one proposed by Ranking Member WATERS and Representative DENNY HECK.

The Export-Import Bank is instrumental in helping small businesses access foreign markets, and uncertainty over its future has already cost American businesses lucrative trade deals.

I urge us between now and June to come together in a bipartisan way to move forward with legislation that achieves this goal. I believe if the House is allowed to vote, we will achieve that objective, as we have in the past.

While I oppose this provision, I will vote for the amendment and for final passage of the continuing resolution, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. I think it is in the best interest of America, the best interest of our national security, and I urge this House to act in a way that will make our constituents proud and safer.

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

I have a letter that was written to myself and Ranking Member SMITH from four of our leading experts in the area, former Ambassadors to the area, and former generals: Ryan C. Crocker, Robert S. Ford, General Jack M. Keane, and General David H. Petraeus. This letter was dated this morning:

> Dear Chairman McKeon and Ranking Member Smith:
>
> We write to express our strong support for congressional authorization of the provision of assistance and training to properly vetted members of the Syrian opposition.
>
> The Free Syrian Army is simultaneously fighting both the murderous regime of Bashar al-Assad and the barbaric Islamic State in Iraq and al-Sham. Providing greater assistance to the Free Syrian Army is the United States' best opportunity to develop a moderate force that is capable of defeating ISIL and bringing about a post-Assad Syria that is free of terror.
>
> As you may know, Free Syrian Army forces have recently achieved some successes on the ground against ISIL forces in northern Syria, but their effectiveness is limited by their lack of sufficient assistance and training.
>
> Building up the moderate opposition in Syria will be a key element of any successful strategy against ISIL. To be sure, after 3 years of war, it will take a long time to build the moderate opposition. But there is no viable alternative. The United States must set to this task immediately.
>
> Finally, we note that approval of this measure should not prevent or circumscribe Congress from considering a properly scoped authorization for the use of military force in the future, or from otherwise revisiting or revising its position on this issue as conditions on the ground evolve. But time is of the essence, and we are convinced of the urgent need for Congress to authorize this effort.
>
> Sincerely, Ambassador Ryan C. Crocker; Ambassador Robert S. Ford; General Jack M. Keane, USA, Retired; and General David H. Petraeus, USA, Retired.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), my friend and colleague, a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my good friend, and the chairman, whom I am very, very lucky and honored to serve under and serve with.

Madam Speaker, I oppose this amendment. It is not an easy vote. I have been looking for reasons to support this amendment and I can't find it.

This amendment does nothing to destroy the Islamic state. This amendment does not crush the Islamic state. What this amendment does is start training Islamists to fight Islamists, and we may have that Islamist army to fight Islamists in a matter of a few years.

I will not vote for something that I know will not work. Arming Islamists to fight other Islamists is not a winning strategy. I don't believe the weapons and tactics that we bestow to the Islamists will only be used against America's enemies. We have been through this before in Iraq and Afghanistan. I think I am one of the only people speaking here today who has served in the U.S. Marine Corps in Iraq and Afghanistan.

In a confusing situation with many warring factions on all sides, the last thing that we should do is arm Islamic rebels to fight other Islamic rebels.

□ 1430

The truth is that the President invited the Islamic State into Iraq when he removed our eyes and ears on the ground and removed the U.S. military from Iraq 2 years ago. We will continue to be at war with radical Islam in this area well into the future, but that doesn't matter now. What matters is that the Islamic State is on the march, and it presents a serious regional threat.

We need to crush the Islamic State. We need to kill them. We need to destroy them. We need to burn the Islamic State to the ground, and you don't do that by training Islamic Syrians. You don't crush the Islamic State by training Islamists to fight other Islamists.

Arming Islamic fighters is no longer a viable strategy. It was a year ago, it was 2 years ago, but it is not now. There is no confidence that we are arming the right people, and there is no assurance that those weapons and U.S. tactics and U.S. communications gear won't fall into the wrong hands.

The Saudi Arabians are going to help us fight in Syria. If I remember right, Madam Speaker, the Saudi Arabians provided the majority of the hijackers who killed 3,000 Americans on 9/11. I refuse to stand with the Saudi Arabians.

We need to crush ISIS, not work on training more Islamic radicals.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

I rise in support of the McKeon amendment to grant the President the authority needed to fund and train Syrian opposition forces and counter the threat posed by ISIS.

Since the September 11 attacks, our Nation has taken the fight to terrorists. Our brave men and women in uniform supported by the defense and intelligence agencies have kept us safe from another attack on American soil. Now, our allies on the ground in the Middle East must take the fight to

ISIS, supported by our air power, arms, and expertise.

I agree with the administration that the most effective way for the United States to realize this goal is providing training and equipment to our allies in Iraq and select groups among the Syrian opposition. This is not a situation that can be solved by the introduction of U.S. troops into combat. In fact, such a response would jeopardize the gains made recently following the air campaign over Iraq.

It is vital, however, that the Syrian opposition groups selected to receive support be fully vetted by the administration to ensure to the greatest extent possible that no weapons or expertise will end up in the hands of our enemies, whether they be the Islamic State or another bad actor involved in the conflict.

We must only provide support to those groups that both the Department of Defense and State have determined to have the greatest chance of success. While there are no guarantees in this situation, the administration must take appropriate steps to minimize the risk and avoid repeating history.

It must also be made clear that these efforts are not the first step of an ever-escalating conflict ending with widespread U.S. involvement in a combat role. Our allies in the Arab world, both Sunni and Shi'a, must be the leaders of the international alliance to combat ISIS.

Only through a coalition and widespread involvement of Arab nations will these efforts succeed and not be seen as yet another chapter of Sunni on Shi'a violence or another chapter in a war between the Christian West and the Muslim Middle East. Our allies must make significant military commitments to support moderate groups in opposition to ISIS.

Finally, the administration must be able to give a clear view of their long-term strategy and goals going forward. Entering a conflict without clear objectives and an exit strategy is not a situation that any Member of the House wishes to repeat.

I urge my colleagues to support the McKeon amendment.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), my friend and the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Madam Speaker, we face an enemy who poses a grave and growing threat to the United States and our allies, a threat that has been ignored for too long and must no longer be tolerated.

I know that many of us in this Chamber from both sides of the aisle believe that the President's strategy should do more to eradicate those extremists from the Earth, but despite those reservations—reservations that I share—we must support this amendment and take this first step towards a comprehensive strategy to combat these brutal terrorists.

Voting against this request would send a terrible message that America is unwilling to stand with those who are already fighting a common enemy and confirm the views of many in the region that America is but a paper tiger.

I am not convinced this train-and-equip effort will change the balance of power on the ground anytime soon, and I believe this approach comes with great risks. I am also concerned that airstrikes alone will be insufficient to meet the international threat posed by these terrorists.

Congress must maintain a central role. We must conduct oversight to ensure this program is managed effectively. Under the leadership of Chairman MCKEON, we have taken the President's original request and have added substantial oversight provisions to ensure this program is properly and carefully managed.

Congress must also push the President to craft a comprehensive strategy that recognizes the inescapable reality that ISIL is but a symptom of a broader terrorist threat.

Preventing the next 9/11 requires us to confront the reality that al Qaeda, ISIL, and similar radical terrorist groups are spreading, operating out of sanctuaries across the Middle East, North Africa, and South Asia. These groups pose a grave and growing threat to the United States. Our strategy cannot ignore these growing dangers.

A President who has made ending the war on terrorism the central focus of his foreign policy must now change. He must now make winning the war a priority. The Congress will need to push the President and his administration to do this right; to confront America's enemies; and to restore America's alliances, strength, and credibility.

This institution will be in no position to do that if we block his simple request today. Congress must now vote to support the first steps of what will be a long march toward that victory.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise against this amendment to arm and equip both Syrian rebels and other Syrian groups and individuals.

I want to be clear: we need to take action against the threat posed by ISIL, and I support the President in the use of airstrikes, but our response must also be appropriate to the complexity of the situation on the ground in Syria.

First and foremost, we must make sure that any response to the threat that we face does not plunge us deeper into a complicated and sectarian civil war. I feel that this amendment may lead to that.

With their barbaric attacks against journalists, women, children, and innocent civilians, ISIL is a terrorist group, pure and simple. While they are not now a threat to our Nation, they do have the potential to be one if left unchecked.

I believe that operating with our allies in the region, like Arab nations and leaders in the newly-formed Iraqi government, we must be part of a broad coalition to address this potential threat, but I do not think this amendment is the right way forward.

Syrian President Bashar al-Assad is a tyrant. He has tortured and massacred his own people for years now. He should stand before the world and be made to pay for his crimes, but, as the very existence of ISIL illustrates, simply arming those who oppose his tyranny will not make America or the region safer.

Syria is a deeply complex situation. It is a nation in the midst of a civil war, splintered between Shi'a and Sunni, authoritarians and al Qaeda, and along countless other points of fractures.

I do not see how we are going to be able to thread the needle whereby we arm those we think are ''good guys'' in this conflict without inadvertently making the ''bad guys'' stronger as well.

We need to take action against ISIL, and I support airstrikes and other counterterrorism measures, but I believe that the amendment before us today provides much broader authority, and I cannot support it.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), my friend and colleague.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment. The President took an important step in his address to the Nation last week. He said that he is committed to ''degrading and destroying'' ISIL. The President should be commended for evolving from his position last month when he indicated that he didn't think ISIL posed much of a threat to America.

Madam Speaker, much, much more must be done. I am concerned that the President isn't fully listening to his military leaders. Reports have emerged indicating that President Obama did not choose to use the recommendations that our military leaders gave him.

Specifically, it has been reported that General Lloyd Austin, the top commander of U.S. forces in the Middle East, advised the President to send in some Special Operations Forces to advise and assist Iraqi Army units while fighting the militants.

Just today, at a Senate hearing, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Martin Dempsey said that the reality of the threat of ISIL might make the hands-off approach that the President is pursuing insufficient to deal with the threat. It is troubling when a Commander in Chief with no military experience chooses to ignore the advice of his military leaders.

On one hand, Secretary Hagel has said that we are at war with ISIL. On the other hand, it appears as if the President may be settling for what may be less than overwhelming force in confronting an enemy that he says

should be destroyed because of the threat it poses.

Again, it was encouraging to see President Obama acknowledge ISIL as the threat that they are to Americans, to our homeland, and our friend and allies; however, I hope, when this authorization expires in December, that President Obama will take the steps that his military leaders propose that will actually accomplish the President's goal of degrading and destroying ISIL.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), and—he insisted I say this—a fellow graduate of Fordham University.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment. We all agonized as to what we should do, but I want to correct the record. At 2:25 this afternoon, through the chair, when we started to pontificate on this floor about Islamists against Islamists, what we do is perpetuate the agony. What we do is stir up the pot when we stereotype who is with us and who is not with us.

Not every Muslim is the same, not every Christian is the same, as we found out in the Balkan wars in 1998 and 1999. In fact, in that war, we assisted Kosovo because it was being totally overcome with Serbs. One was Muslim; the other was Christian.

I think it is not good that the Congress go on record as pitting one group against the other. I don't think it works. I don't think it is healthy, Madam Speaker.

Let's be clear about what this vote is about. This is not an authorization for open-ended war. This is not October 2002 which was an authorization. No one knows that better than the chair and the ranking member who have done a spectacular job, I believe, in keeping this a fair debate and a fair discussion, and I want to compliment both of them.

I believe that ISIL is a threat to our national security, and I support the President's mission to end that threat. While America must lead, we cannot do this alone. We must see a real commitment from our coalition partners in the region, and we must provide the kind of support that is necessary if we are going to be successful.

In 3 months, when we get to December and we have to vote for a CR again and we have to vote whether we are going to continue to go down this path, we better have tangible evidence that those countries who signed sheets of paper that they are going to support us have tangible support out there for us and are not just sending cupcakes for the troops.

We can do our part. We can arm all the properly vetted opposition forces in Syria that we can find and provide air support and training for those on the ground, but we won't be successful in destroying ISIL unless our partners in the region help us cut off their funding, better police their borders, provide combat troops on the ground, and end the political bickering that causes the chaos and mistrust that groups like ISIL thrive under.

I am pleased that the President has chosen to come to Congress to get our support for his plan. I believe that the provisions of this amendment will allow us to perform the oversight that is constitutionally responsible.

However, as I said before, this is not a blank check. Today, we are voting for a limited mission and ensuring that we properly vet those we are arming.

□ 1445

I am pleased that we will revisit this issue later this year in the intervening months.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. If our coalition partners don't step up to the plate, I don't see how we could be successful in destroying ISIL and why we should continue.

The lesson we learned from the war in Iraq is that American military might alone is not enough to defeat enemies. No matter how murderous and vicious a terrorist organization like ISIL may be, sometimes the American military intervention cannot be the silver bullet that solves all of our problems. And we say this about the greatest air and sea and land troops in the world. It is going to take a broad regional coalition acting as one, both militarily and politically.

Madam Speaker, I close by simply saying this: We need support, not only in the short term, but in the long term to have a government in Syria. We pray to God that they will have a government that can sustain itself.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN), my friend and colleague.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, today 227 years ago on September 17, our Founding Fathers signed our Nation's most precious document, the U.S. Constitution.

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution states: Congress shall have the power to declare war. The President does not have that power, only Congress.

Congress gives our President the power to defend our country; however, that authority remains subject to checks and balances, particularly by this body.

As such, if the President believes a state of war exists between ourselves and ISIL—the comments made by both the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State indicate that he does—then let him make it constitutional by first coming to Congress and asking for that declaration.

Today, the House will vote on the President's request to authorize assistance to train and arm the Syrian rebels. I have long opposed arming the Syrian opposition out of the fear that these weapons will fall into the hands of Islamic radicals such as ISIL. Rather than supporting relatively unknown opposition groups in Syria to battle these forces, the Islamic State, we must instead turn to our longstanding allies, the Kurds.

The Kurds have shown repeatedly that they have the capacity, the tenacity, and the will to stand up to ISIL. With our support, the Kurdish Peshmerga, together with the Iraqi security forces, will be able to successfully annihilate the evil forces of ISIL.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, if the President wishes to engage this country in military action against ISIL, then I urge him to ask Congress for a declaration of war. Therefore, I ask my colleagues to join me in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I respect all of my colleagues on the tough decisions that we are asked to make today.

I believe that America must use our military might any time that our families face an imminent threat. Though ISIS, like a number of terrorist groups around the world, would like to kill more Americans, our military leadership has made it clear that ISIS does not represent such a threat today. It is a regional threat without the capacity to do the harm it would like to do.

Rejecting this one amendment does not mean doing nothing about ISIS. The President already has the necessary authority to respond to this savagery when Americans are murdered.

Now the President's response, however, has been expanded, and he proposes a full-scale war. This amendment establishes a new objective for this broader war—to end the civil war in Syria that has already consumed almost 200,000 lives.

Approving this amendment is the one vote that has been requested to enable this broader war—but without a declaration by the Congress to approve that war and without knowing what commitment those in the region will really make in order to fight this war.

I got a communication from a constituent of mine in San Antonio. Her name is Gloria Flores, and she tells me this. She poses some questions that are not being answered today in Washington.

''In my view,'' she says, ''ISIS is just one more extreme group which, if destroyed, will be replaced with another group . . . I don't say 'boots on the ground' because that phrase . . . takes away from the terrible toll that will affect a family if its son or daughter is killed. My nephew . . . was killed in Afghanistan, and we are still mourning his death . . . Any armed force should consist of almost entirely Middle Eastern soldiers. Why should American kids,'' she asks, ''carry the load for Saudis, Jordanians, et cetera?''

Why, indeed.

But this purported coalition does not carry its own load. Others may appear in photos. They may cheer from the rear, but nearby countries are not risking their young people in ground combat. In one case, we even have a neighboring country that will not even permit us to launch an attack by air from its soil.

With the number of our U.S. military on the ground already approaching 2,000 in Iraq and with General Michael Hayden, the former NSA and CIA head, expecting 5,000 by the end of the year, the danger of escalation is very real.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. Now, I do find it difficult to understand, with its hostility to Christians and brutal disdain for our American values, how Saudi Arabia can be a place for training anyone—certainly no Syrian women learning to drive there.

Ultimately, I believe that this resolution has to be evaluated on whether it secures our families in a stronger way. I think it entangles us in a conflict that we cannot get out of as quickly as those trained Iraqi soldiers dropped their uniforms and their guns.

Today is Constitution Day. Let us use our constitutional powers to consider a declaration of war before this entanglement.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), my friend and colleague and a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the President's request to train vetted moderate Syrian rebels, as I believe it is only one step in the right direction and it is supported by military experts.

Tremendous oversight is going to be necessary in this effort and, unfortunately, I fear, as do many experienced generals and military personnel, that it is part of a strategy that is insufficient to secure America's national security.

The President's stated objective is to destroy ISIL; however, I believe this overall strategy and the means requested are not enough to meet this objective.

The current strategy relies on U.S. airpower in support of local forces. This is not a counterterrorism effort, and to destroy ISIL it is necessary to have strong coordinated ground troops. The local ground forces the President is planning to rely on appear currently unready, and they will need to operate with a strong central command and control.

The President's strategy does not provide for U.S. Special Forces in the backing of our ground troops, even though our military leaders have repeatedly suggested that exact recommendation.

Our security is too important to base military strategy on political calculations. Our strategy must be firmly rooted in what is necessary in order to complete the mission and to ensure our security.

From Clausewitz to Powell, military leaders have preached the necessity of decisive force. I served in Iraq. We heeded this wisdom and committed to win with decisive force. We acted on militarily reality and not political risk. We can do this again and fulfill the American objective to destroy ISIL, but we must commit ourselves to do what is necessary—not only what it takes, but whatever it takes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank my friend.

Madam Speaker, last week I met with a constituent from Huntington Station on Long Island, and she said to me, ''Mr. Israel, war is never the answer.''

I would agree with that view that war is never the answer if I believed that ISIL agreed with that view, but they do not. I have thought a lot about my constituent's comments and I have thought a lot about this resolution. There are four things that we do know.

First, ISIL is not just a threat; it is a savage threat. And what message do we send to potential beheaders around the world if we bury our head in the sand?

Secondly, ISIL has filled a vacuum, and if we do not check that vacuum, it will spread, and instability and beheadings and savagery will spread across the Middle East and beyond.

Number three, we cannot, nor should we, do this alone. I believe that the President has helped to organize an important international coalition to ensure that this is not on our shoulders and that we do not have boots on the ground.

Finally, there should be no blank checks. We did that. We gave those blank checks from 2000 to 2008. No more blank checks.

This resolution ensures accountability; it ensures transparency; it ensures reporting. Taken all together, Madam Speaker, this resolution is a restrained, responsible and appropriate response to the spread of ISIL, to beheading, to savagery in the Middle East and potentially around the world, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), my friend and colleague.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, all of us recognize the threat posed to our Nation by the Islamic State. The question before us is whether to arm and train supposedly carefully vetted elements of the Free Syrian Army as a proxy ground force.

I respect the intentions of the supporters, but this proposal runs a great risk of backfiring.

The FSA is a marriage of convenience among many Islamic factions that have a long history of collaborating with the Islamic State. The singular purpose of the FSA is not to destroy the Islamic State. It exists to destroy the Syrian Government that is now actively fighting against the Islamic State.

The equipment we provide to the FSA could easily be turned against the Syrian Government, which, despite all of its despotic tendencies, is at least at war with the IS right now, and we would weaken our overall strategic position. Or this equipment could be turned over to the Islamic State, as we watched carefully vetted Iraqi security forces recently do. In fact, that is the reason the Islamic State is armed to the teeth with American equipment.

Neither we nor the world can afford more blunders or miscalculations in this region. We should have learned by now that alliances in the Islamic Middle East are in constant flux. An ally today is a sworn enemy tomorrow. In fact, often our allies are our enemies.

After I was elected, the first man killed from my district in Iraq, Army Specialist Jeremiah McCleery, died when ''carefully vetted'' Iraqi soldiers turned their American-provided weapons on him.

The most recent fatality from my district, Marine Staff Sergeant Sky Mote, died when ''carefully vetted'' Afghan police turned their American-provided weapons on him.

Madam Speaker, our consistent experience in this region should be screaming this warning at us. We are making a big mistake.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Speaker, I stand in opposition to this amendment because this proposed strategy actually reflects a lack of commitment to really destroy ISIL and the other Islamic extremist groups that we are at war with. Here are just a few reasons why I will be voting ''no.''

□ 1500

First, it is unrealistic. It will take way too long, and the number of fighters trained will be way too small to be truly effective in the fight against ISIL. Over that period of time, ISIL will continue to grow in strength.

Number two, the mission is unclear. The American people want ISIL destroyed, but the primary objective of the fighters whom we train will be to overthrow Assad.

Number three, we don't really know who they are. Presently, they are fighting shoulder to shoulder with al Qaeda and other Islamic extremists and therefore can't be trusted. The weapons and training that we give them may end up actually being used against us and our allies.

Voting to support this proposal is actually a vote to overthrow Assad because overthrowing Assad is the primary objective of the so-called Free Syrian Army.

If we combine the missions of destroying ISIL and of overthrowing Assad, this is not a smart or effective strategy for a number of reasons. We must focus on one mission—to destroy ISIL and other Islamic extremists who have declared war on us. Our mission should not be to topple the Assad regime, which would make the situation in the region even worse and more unstable than it is today.

Madam Speaker, we have heard this story before. We know how it ends. Look at Iraq. Look at Libya. Clearly, our leaders have not learned their lesson. We must focus on taking out our enemies and on investing in our own country here at home.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. My thanks to my friend from Texas for giving me the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of Chairman MCKEON's amendment, though I have grave concerns about the President's current plan to train and equip Syrian opposition forces in the fight against ISIL.

In my opinion, Madam Speaker, the plan does not fit the threat. ISIL has made the Middle East into a war zone and an advanced training ground for terrorists who, by their own admission, seek to do Americans great harm. Its stated objectives of redrawing the boundaries of and imposing its will on sovereign nations makes the importance of confronting this organization, in the most profound way possible, critical.

Instead of responding proportionately, President Obama has proposed we outsource the problem to other people, and as a military officer, I am concerned that he actually believes this limited use of military power can achieve the ultimate objective of destroying ISIL—a force that is 30,000 strong and growing by the day.

Madam Speaker, I fear—in fact, I firmly believe—that the problem will not be solved by the actions taken by this Congress today. However, we cannot afford to stand idly by for another day, because a step in the right direction is better than no step at all. So I join my colleagues in support of the amendment. I believe, in short order, we will be asked to do more.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, in 2011, former Secretary Robert Gates, as he was departing office, gave a speech at the West Point academy in which he said:

> In my opinion, any future Defense Secretary who advises the President to again send a big American land army into Asia or into the Middle East or Africa should have his head examined, as General MacArthur so delicately put it.

I think Secretary Gates spoke for the entire country in terms of that sentiment, which, after a long, bitter experience in Iraq and Afghanistan, speaks to the weariness that many feel today in terms of those conflicts, and, certainly, with the motion that is before us this afternoon, it still rings in people's ears. I think it is important therefore to sort of measure what we are voting on with what Secretary Gates, I think, so accurately stated.

The motion before us is to provide for title 10 authorization to allow the U.S. military to train and equip forces in Saudi Arabia to take up arms against ISIL. I checked with the Congressional Research Service yesterday to determine how many title 10 operations over the last 3 years have been conducted by the U.S. military. In 28 countries all across the world, the U.S. military has been involved in training and equipping operations, from the Philippines to Yemen to Poland.

For those who argue that what we are about to engage in is a slippery slope or that this authorization somehow broadly confers on the administration the ability to conduct a land invasion or a large military force, the fact of the matter is that the long and broad experience of title 10 that we have tells us exactly the opposite. In fact, what title 10 seeks to do is to stand up indigenous forces in those nations of allies to avoid what Secretary Gates warned about in 2011, which is to, again, not get this country involved in a large land invasion.

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

Mr. ELLISON. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, one healthy thing has occurred over the last few days, which is that folks on both sides of this measure, I think, have come to the realization that we as a Congress need to be engaged in terms of these types of decisions.

To their credit, Mr. MCKEON and Mr. SMITH have fashioned a resolution which requires by December 11 our revisiting this motion, to have regular reporting from the Department of Defense, and it requires us, I think, at some point, to take up the broader question of authorization of military force, reaching back to 2001 and 2002, in terms of limiting the scope, which, again, has been supported by this administration and which we have discussed in the House Armed Services Committee. It is also to focus on what exactly is the end game for our efforts in Syria and Iraq.

Again, the measure that is before us today, though, is simply about title 10 authorization between today and December 11. I think people should not overthink and overstate the consequences of this vote. What it provides is for America to stand up with regional allies and European allies to begin the process of degrading and, ultimately, destroying a barbaric force, which threatens stability both in the Middle East and, ultimately, America's national interests.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my thoughts and, frankly, some concerns about the President's proposal that we will vote on today to train and arm the Free Syrian Army forces to fight ISIL. We are sort of in a ''damned if you do, damned if you don't'' situation.

I have always said that our country needs a comprehensive plan, policy, and strategy to defeat the radical Islamists terrorizing Iraq and Syria. Certainly, ISIS represents the antithesis of American ideals, and they have gruesomely demonstrated their disgust for our Nation with the beheadings of two American journalists in recent weeks.

What we are considering today is a partial plan, one of which I remain uncertain as to whether it will have the desired outcome. In fact, since 2011, the administration has consistently resisted any major efforts to arm and train the moderate opposition forces in Syria even when, I believe, a window existed to effectively do that some time ago.

At a hearing in the Appropriations Committee in February of 2012, I questioned then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton about why we were not doing more to help the moderate Syrian opposition. She flatly rejected providing support then. Now, however, I fear we may have effectively missed the time in which arming the FSA will impact the barbarism of ISIL in the region. Unfortunately, since 2011 and early 2012, the situation in Syria has become dramatically more complex, and identifying true allies in the fight against ISIS will be exceedingly difficult.

Questions remain about the President's strategy:

How will we effectively vet the opposition forces? How will we ensure that arms delivered will not be sold to ISIS forces or will not be used against already persecuted people in the region, such as the Syrian Christians?

ISIL is a threat to our Nation's security, and, no doubt, it must be destroyed and defeated, but I do have trepidation regarding this initial step in equipping the FSA at this juncture. Those voting on this measure, I suspect, will do so with great reluctance. Those voting ''no'' will do so with discomfort.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I agree with the last speaker, Mr. DENT, that this is a very difficult vote, and I think everybody should approach it with a tremendous amount of trepidation and concern. I am sure that all of us are doing the best we can to come to the very best decision we can on behalf of our constituents.

Today, I plan on voting for the measure. The reason is that the civil war in

Syria has claimed thousands of lives. Thousands more are now living under the deadly rule of ISIL, and 200,000 Syrians have been killed so far as the world, for 4 years, has not done much to protect them.

Now, the fight in Syria and Iraq can, ultimately, only be solved politically, and I believe that the growing humanitarian crisis caused by conflicts in the region warrants an urgent response from the United States. Any military action against ISIL must be led by Iraqis and Syrians. I believe U.S. troops would be a magnet for a group like ISIL, and therefore this fight must be carried forth by the people most affected—Syrians and Iraqis themselves. I believe that a vetted and better armed, moderate rebel group in Syria can fight ISIL in northeast Syria when an Iraqi Army, perhaps, can push them out of their country and into Syria. There cannot be a safe haven in Syria for ISIL.

I also want to note that much has been said about the fractured nature or the weakness of the Free Syrian Army, but I would remind people who are participating in this debate that, for 4 years, the Free Syrian Army has withstood the onslaught of the Assad government, Hezbollah, Iran, Russian weapons, ISIS, and Jabhat al-Nusra. For 4 years, these people who were dismissed as nothing but bankers and bakers and not real soldiers have stood their ground and have stood for their country.

For these reasons, I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington State (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS), the chair of the Republican Conference.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the chairman's amendment, and I stand ready to work with my colleagues and the President on a long-term strategy to dismantle and destroy ISIL.

Last week, the President's address to the country began to make the case that ISIL is an immediate threat to our allies in the Middle East, Europe and, ultimately, in our homeland. This is a radical and brutal force, opposed to all who do not adhere to their narrow view of Islam and the world. ISIL has declared war on our way of life and the values on which this country was founded and has flourished for over 235 years. In fact, ISIL has made clear that they will not be deterred until they see their flag flying over the White House.

When it comes to protecting the safety and security of Americans at home and abroad, America must lead. As we know, a speech is not a plan. An F–16 is not a strategy. As the Commander in Chief, we need the President to give us an honest assessment and an in-depth strategy to defend the country and our interests around the world.

This amendment responds to the President's request to use title 10 authority to train and equip vetted Syrian opposition forces. General Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, called it a necessary but not sufficient step. Beyond the amendment and the President's limited request, the American people need to see a plan clearly articulated with a strategy to dismantle and destroy ISIL.

When we look around the world today, we see instability and numerous threats. The spread of radical Islam throughout the globe is pervasive. Iran continues to move toward a nuclear weapon. Russia continues to take aggressive action toward the Baltic states.

I support this amendment because America must lead. As we have seen, when America sits on the sidelines, there is a leadership void, which is filled by bad actors. I urge my colleagues to join us in taking this action.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

□ 1515

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I will cast my vote to approve the President's funding request to train and equip the moderate Syrian opposition forces. I do so after long consideration and am mindful of the difficulties of vetting such a force during the middle of a brutal civil war.

Any decision to supply arms to combatants must be weighed carefully. Indeed, for the last several years, I have opposed arming the Syrian rebels out of a concern for our ability to properly vet such troops and the fear that weapons we provide may end up in the wrong hands. Those concerns persist, but they have been overcome by the growing menace of ISIL and the willingness of our regional allies to play a greater—and open—role in the support of these forces.

ISIL now controls about a third of Iraq and a like portion of Syria. It has been unsurpassed in its brutality, committing mass executions, forced conversions, trafficking in women, and beheading its hostages, including Americans James Foley and Steven Sotloff.

If ISIL is allowed to consolidate its territorial gains, or expand them, it will be able to act on its stated intention of serving as the platform for attacks on the United States. The thousands of foreign fighters, including Americans, who have flocked to join its ranks will one day attempt to return to the West and attack our homeland.

Our response must be proportionate to the threat. It does not justify American occupation of Iraq or Syria or the introduction of American ground forces, all of which are likely to be counterproductive. It does justify the use of American air power, intelligence, and financial, diplomatic, and military support. And since air power alone will not be sufficient on the battlefield, it will necessitate the assistance of local ground forces.

In the case of Iraq, those ground forces will be provided by the Iraqi military and Kurdish Peshmerga. In Syria, with rigorous vetting, training, and support, the rebel opposition may provide the raw material for a credible military force.

There is no guarantee that the Syrian opposition can form a cohesive fighting force, something that has thus far eluded them. But the open support of gulf nations in housing and funding this opposition holds the promise of consolidating regional support behind them.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK of Nevada. I thank the chairman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, over the course of the debate for the past 2 days, I think one thing that most will agree on is that ISIL poses a clear and grave danger to our Nation, our interests abroad, and our allies. And I agree with the President when he stated that we must degrade and destroy ISIL no matter where they exist. And I support many of the provisions that he outlined in the speech he gave just last week: arming the Peshmerga, bolstering the Iraqi security forces, expanding airstrikes, and disrupting the flow of finances and foreign fighters to ISIL.

But the one thing I cannot support, the one thing I will not support is arming the so-called moderate opposition force, the Free Syrian Army. It is a ragtag collection of 100 disparate groups, and, just a little more than a month ago, the President stated that the notion that arming the rebels comprised of former pharmacists, doctors, and farmers would make a difference has ''always been a fantasy.''

The Free Syrian Army has no cogent leadership, no organization, no command and control. And without U.S. military advisers embedded with the forces that we train and send back into Syria, we will have no visibility on their effectiveness, their defections, or whether or not our weapons are falling into the hands of our enemies.

This is a plan that is destined to fail for the sake of saying we did something, and that I cannot support.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, while I support airstrikes, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

While there is no doubt that ISIS is a brutal terrorist group that is wreaking havoc in the region, at this time, none of the evidence I have seen, including U.S. intelligence reports, and none of the arguments I have heard convinces me that getting involved in a religious civil war in the Middle East will be successful or effective in keeping our homeland safer.

I cannot support what could turn into a war on three fronts: fighting ISIS in Iraq, fighting ISIS in Syria, and potentially Assad in Syria. Nor can

I support an unprecedented scenario in which the U.S. tries to reinvent a substantially degraded rebel army to act as our boots on the ground against a former ally of theirs, ISIS, all while ignoring their stated objective of overthrowing Assad.

And this entire plan depends on our ability to identify so-called moderates in Syria who would be prepared to die for our agenda. It is not at all clear how we are going to do that.

Trillions of dollars spent, all-out war, and more than a decade of occupation in Iraq and Afghanistan did not produce the peace we sought or the stability we were promised. We spent $25 billion to train the Iraqi Army to defend their own country, and they were decimated by ISIS in a matter of days and left their weapons to ISIS.

What would make anyone believe that spending a great deal less money to train a rebel army to defend our interests would turn out any better?

Mr. Speaker, this is a well-intentioned effort, but it is not a viable strategy. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the amendment to intervene in the civil war in Syria.

It is immoral to use the prospect of a government shutdown to pressure Members to vote for involvement in a war, much less a civil war on the other side of the globe. Because the Syrian resolution is contained within the continuing resolution, Representatives and Senators must tacitly approve the President's aggressive intervention in order to vote to fund all government programs.

It is disingenuous for the administration to tell the American public that we are arming Syrian rebels to fight ISIS when the administration's stated objective is to topple the secular government of Syria, a government, I might add, that has not committed aggression against the United States.

If the goal of arming and training so-called moderate Syrian rebels is to eliminate ISIS, this plan will not work. Military experts know this, as does the President. He acknowledged as much 5 weeks ago when he stated that the idea that arming rebels would have made a difference has ''always been a fantasy.''

What is our endgame? What is our long-term strategy? What will this ultimately cost? What are the unintended consequences that may come about? Will we follow this with boots on the ground? Who has these answers? The American people deserve these answers.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment. I also urge the same Members to stand strong and vote ''no'' on the underlying bill.

If this amendment should pass, there is no way to avoid culpability for a military action that is destined to cost innocent lives and will ultimately fail.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership in helping us all uphold the oath that we take when we become Members of Congress to protect and defend the American people. I believe that the McKeon amendment that is on the floor today helps us to do just that as well.

Last week, the President presented to the American people a forceful strategy to degrade and destroy ISIS, a strategy built on a firm foundation of nonmilitary action.

The President is to be commended for his strong leadership and humanitarian, political, and diplomatic components that must be part of any successful mission. In a humanitarian vein, for acting to help assist those impacted by ISIS and avert the genocide of religious minorities. Who could ever forget those people isolated on the mountain until the United States and others came to the rescue? Politically, for insisting and pushing for an inclusive government in Iraq.

And I commend the Vice President, as well, for his leadership. Without a change to an inclusive government that respects not only Shia, Sunni, and Kurds but also the religious minorities in the country as well, militarily actions would not be so productive.

And, again, in a nonmilitary vein, the President bringing together NATO allies, a coalition, as well as regional partners, to assist in degrading and destroying ISIS. This comprehensive strategy includes increasing our intelligence, disrupting ISIS' finances, and interdicting the flow of foreign fighters.

I have said in the past, in my view, the President already has the authority to do what he is doing. And, I will add, this House has voted overwhelmingly that should the President's actions go farther comprehensively, then Congress should vote on that authority.

Today we are called upon to authorize a discrete but critical component of the overall plan: the President's request to train and equip moderate, vetted Syrians outside of Syria to fight ISIS.

This is not an authorization for use of military force, as we had in 2001 and 2002. I do not support, nor will I support, combat troops on the ground. That is not what this is about.

I believe that the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and those who have worked so hard to put this amendment together took many precautions and set a high standard in terms of the criteria and standards that the administration must meet with this training: where it would occur, who would be trained, extensive vetting of the moderates and the rebels. That is probably the most frequently asked question: ''How do we know?'' Well, we can do the best we can to vet, to ensure that we are doing what we set out to do.

The brutality of ISIS, ISIL—whatever they call themselves on any given day—is outside the circle of civilized human behavior. We wish that this action that we are called upon to do today was not necessary. But it is really hard for us to uphold our oath of office all the time to protect and defend. It is not always easy. And most of the time, it is hard for anything that takes us down a military path.

But the fact is that with the diplomatic, political, and humanitarian foundation that the President has laid, with the narrowness of the request that he is making to us, it is not pleasant, it is not easy—it is hard, but it really is necessary for the House to approve this.

We all wish, again, that it wasn't necessary. But we will approve it to help the Syrian people take responsibility for building peace and stability in their country, to stem the threat that ISIS can pose to U.S. interests abroad and to our national security.

Now, I have frequently quoted Hannah Arendt, who said, ''Nations are driven to an endless flywheel of violence because they believe that one last, one final gesture of violence will bring peace, but each time, they sow the seeds for more violence.''

I would hope that what we are doing today takes us in a different direction, one that is predicated on a nation of inclusion in Iraq, one that defeats ISIS by the moderates in-country defeating ISIS, because ISIS is now cross-border—in Iraq and in Syria, and who knows where they may try to go next.

So this is important. It is urgent. And I hope that it will have the support of our colleagues.

As with all votes, I have never asked a Member to vote with any vote of use of force or, in this case, training of moderates. But I just wanted you to know why I am proud to support the President and salute him for his efforts.

I thank Mr. MCKEON for his leadership in shaping this resolution, and I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) for bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment, as I believe it is a plan which will not be successful.

Ronald Reagan reminded us to carry ''a banner of no pale pastels, but bold colors which make it unmistakably clear where we stand'' on the issues.

No offense, but I believe the plan before us is one of pale pastels when the world needed bold action by the leader of the free world.

Who will we be supporting by arming unknown rebels in Syria? Will we not be getting involved in a Syrian civil war?

□ 1530

If the fight is with ISIL—and I believe there must be a fight against

these genocidal extremists—then let's take it to them in Iraq, begin by assisting the Kurds who have been doing the heavy lifting against ISIL after the Iraqis cut and ran.

I could support boots on the ground once again in Iraq, reclaiming the ground for which so much American blood and treasure has been expended to liberate, but not arming unknown rebels.

Do you remember Benghazi? We armed and assisted rebels there; and, now, al Qaeda controls Libya from Benghazi to Tripoli, even swimming in the U.S. Embassy swimming pool in Tripoli.

We should not send $500 million or $1 to rebels in Syria, especially at a time when the Department of Defense and National Guard budgets are being cut here at home.

I believe even the war-weary Americans are looking to support a plan from President Obama that is decisive, lethal to the enemies of freedom, and definitive. This plan is not it.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the McKeon amendment that would grant the President the authorization that he seeks to identify, train up, and equip moderate Syrian forces to stand up to ISIL in their backyard.

I do so because I believe this is the best of the bad options that we face that could halt the advance of ISIL in that region and begin degrading their capability and guard against the rising threat that they pose to us and to those in the region.

I do so for three reasons. I believe that the President needs a strong bipartisan hand coming out of this Congress this week that would help him continue to build the coalition of opposition to ISIL in the region. It is going to be one of the keys to the outcome—the successful outcome—of degrading ISIL's capability. We can't do this alone, and it will be determined by those in the region to stand up against this evil force.

Secondly, I believe this is the best plan to help us avoid putting our own boots on the ground and our own men and women in uniform in what is, in essence, an ongoing sectarian civil war that has gripped that region for centuries between the Sunni and Shi'a.

There is a lot of concern, especially from Guard and Reserve units in my congressional district in Wisconsin who have been activated, called up, and deployed multiple times to Iraq and Afghanistan. When I talk to them today, I can see in their eyes and hear in their voices how tired they are. They are concerned about another military intervention in this region.

Finally, I believe this resolution under title 10 will enhance congressional oversight of the mission that is taking place there and, therefore, bring greater accountability but also bring a greater say of the American people in addressing this rising threat in the region.

We are going to move away from the intel agencies running the show now and move it into the Pentagon, which brings us into the oversight capabilities which I feel has been lacking for some time in this endeavor.

This is not an easy decision. I believe the steps that we can take with this comprehensive plan now can avoid further military intervention in the future. Again, I think it is the best option we face amongst a lot of bad options.

May God bless our military personnel who will be in charge of carrying out this mission, and we all hope and pray for their success and safe return.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Members are reminded to not traffic the well while another Member is under recognition.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER).

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the McKeon amendment before us that authorizes the administration to arm and train vetted moderate Syrian rebels in their fight against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, or ISIL. This amendment also contains strong reporting requirements that the administration must follow to fulfill Congress' oversight authority.

ISIL has made territorial gains militarily in Iraq and Syria and announced the establishment of a caliphate in areas under its control. They have terrorized and killed members of minority groups, including Christians in northern Iraq, and have invaded Kurdish-controlled regions.

Minority groups are not the only victims being targeted. ISIL is also targeting Muslims. Last, but certainly not least, ISIL has beheaded two American journalists and a British aid worker. This type of radical, evil behavior must be wiped off the face of the Earth.

This amendment ensures that ISIL is not only confronted kinetically in Iraq but also in Syria. Providing the means for rebel groups to aggressively attack ISIL in Syria denies them sanctuary just across the Iraqi border, as is the case with the Taliban on the Afghanistan-Pakistan border.

An armed and trained Syrian rebel force, with assistance from the U.S. and partner nations, will open up a northern front to attack ISIL. Iraqi security forces and the Kurdish Peshmerga will be the claws in the south to squeeze this radical group. American airpower will no doubt be a force multiplier for these indigenous ground forces.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one country in the world willing and able to build a coalition of nations that includes Arab countries to defeat this radical threat, and that nation is the United States of America. The United States has an obligation to lead and respond whenever the innocent are being massacred.

Our enemies should never underestimate our resolve. Yes, we may argue and disagree on many issues; but, when it comes to protecting America, our allies, and our interests, we are united. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a mother, I can see those who are now mourning because they have lost their babies, their family members. I can see the Yazidis in the mountains in Iraq fearful, and I can hear the cries of mothers whose sons were viciously beheaded by a terrorist group that most cannot understand the level of its viciousness.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to say that doing nothing is not an option, and I want to say to my friends and to my colleagues, ISIL has been here, for in 2005 Ayman al-Zawahiri, deputy head of al Qaeda, had a killer idea, and that was to establish an Islamic State.

It percolated for a number of years. In 2014, now, we have voices being raised across the world knowing that ISIL exists, and that is exactly what they want us to do, be terrorized. I refuse to be terrorized, and I also refuse to do nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I do not stand here today to vote for an authorization to use military forces. I will not vote to send our precious treasure again to that region, but I do believe that the President has a strategy, unlike some of my colleagues, a systematic campaign of airstrikes, increased military assistance, regional political effort and humanitarian aid, changing the face of the Islam religion that people believe is the Islam religion, and looking to those who support the core values of Islam.

That is a strategy; yet we have to address ISIL. There are 20,000 to 31,000 fighters making their way across the land; so I believe that an existing provision under section 10, provision 10, simply to train and to provide instruction to those individuals who can be in the fight in the region, train them with the expertise of the United States but not put our precious treasure on the ground.

ISIS has no restraint, and we remember the names of James Foley, Steven Sotloff, British aid worker David Haines, and 40-some members of the Turkish diplomatic corps held by ISIS and many others; so I believe it is important to note what we are doing here today.

In the McKeon amendment, it provides an opportunity for Congress to be advised 15 days before action. We should hold the administration to that. We should also say that any authorization for military forces, it must be a

debate on the floor of the House. I will not vote for that today. I will not vote for that.

I do believe, again, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot stand and do nothing. I think it is extremely important that we do something, and I hope others will look at the resolution that I have and the no fly for foreign fighters, H.R. 5488, which I have introduced.

I would like to add something else to the McKeon amendment. It indicates that appropriate committees will be advised. The legislative history of this debate should reflect that the Homeland Security Committee is an appropriate committee and should be one of those that is appropriately advised.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, today, we had a hearing in Homeland Security with the Secretary of Homeland Security. There is no doubt that what we are doing today is to protect the homeland.

What Americans say is they want the homeland protected. They want no more of their journalists beheaded by this heinous group.

Mr. Speaker, I close by simply saying we organized this Nation to form a more perfect Union. The Constitution says that Congress must declare war even as the President indicates that he has the authority under article II.

I believe if Congress is to do its job, we must have another debate on the authorization for military forces which we do not approve, but this is responding to the viciousness of ISIL, building up those regional forces, and making a difference.

I ask my colleagues: Can we do nothing? I think not. We must rise in support of this resolution today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee to H. Res. 124, the resolution making continuing appropriations for Fiscal Year 2015.

Specifically, the "McKeon Amendment":

1. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to train and equip appropriately vetted elements of the Syrian opposition and other appropriately vetted Syrian groups or individuals;

2. Purports to strengthen congressional oversight by requiring detailed reports, including progress reports, on the plan, vetting process, and procedures for monitoring unauthorized end-use of provided training and equipment;

3. Require the President to report on how this authority fits within a larger regional strategy;

The McKeon Amendment does not authorize additional funds, but it would allow the Department of Defense (DOD) to submit a reprogramming request to Congress should the President request Defense Department funds to execute this authority and permit the Secretary of Defense to accept foreign contributions.

Finally, the McKeon Amendment states that nothing in it is to be construed to constitute a specific statutory authorization for the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations wherein hostilities are clearly indicated by the circumstances.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, to be clear about what the McKeon Amendment does and does not do.

The amendment does not authorize the use of military force or deployment of United States combat forces to Syria.

Let me be clear: I am not voting today to authorize the use of military force or to put American combat boots on the ground.

Let me also be clear on this point: Before American armed forces may be deployed to conduct combat operations in Syria or elsewhere in the region the President must come to the Congress and request and receive from it either a declaration of war or resolution authorizing the use of military force.

This is not a political nicety but a constitutional requirement, clearly specified in Article I, Section 8, clause 11 of the Constitution, which by the way, was approved by the Constitutional Convention in 1787, 227 years ago this very day, September 17.

The McKeon Amendment simply authorizes the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to provide assistance, including training, equipment, supplies, and sustainment, to appropriately vetted elements of the Syrian opposition and other appropriately vetted Syrian groups and individuals for the following purposes:

1. Defending the Syrian people from attacks by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), and securing territory controlled by the Syrian opposition;

2. Protecting the United States, its friends and allies, and the Syrian people from the threats posed by terrorists in Syria; and

3. Promoting the conditions for a negotiated settlement to end the conflict in Syria.

The McKeon Amendment cannot be construed as giving the Administration a blank check or carte blanche in achieving these objectives.

Rather, the McKeon Amendment requires that not later than 15 days before providing assistance to a vetted group for the first time, the Administration shall provide a report to the Congressional leadership and committees of jurisdiction describing in detail the assistance to be provided and the bases for the determination that the action contemplated are consistent with the objectives stated above.

Additionally, the McKeon Amendment requires that not later than 90 days after the Secretary of Defense submits the first report required by the McKeon Amendment, and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall provide the appropriate congressional committees and leadership of the House of Representatives and the Senate with a detailed progress report.

In short, the McKeon Amendment only authorizes the Administration to identify, vet, and provide assistance to those opposition Syrian forces that can be relied upon to defend the Syrian people from attacks by the murderous ISIS jihadi.

Mr. Speaker, there is little doubt that the Islamic State of Iraq and al Sham (ISIS), is a violent extremist movement. It grew out of the remnants of Al Qaeda in Iraq and the Syrian civil war—which has claimed the lives of 191,369 persons, tens of thousands at the hands of ISIS—and has spread its reach across the border between Iraq and Syria and is now seizing military bases and holding territory throughout the region.

In response, and at the request of the Iraqi government, President Obama has sent over 1,500 military advisors into Iraq and conducted over 150 airstrikes there to break the ISIS momentum, to protect U.S. personnel and save thousands of Iraq's religious minorities.

In his September 10, 2014 address to the nation, the President announced a four-part strategic plan to degrade and defeat ISIS.

The strategy outlined by the President involves the following elements:

1. a systematic campaign of airstrikes against ISIS;

2. increased military assistance and training for allied forces on the ground;

3. a regional political effort to work with allies; and

4. a humanitarian assistance to populations targeted by ISIS.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the President, Ranking Member SMITH, and Chairman MCKEON that ISIS poses a significant threat to American interests, requiring an effective response.

I also believe that the President should be commended for the forceful but deliberate and steady but calm leadership he has displayed to date.

But we must act in a careful, measured, balanced, and limited way to assist the Iraqi and Syrian people most directly and immediately threatened by ISIS because left unchecked, ISIS will grow to threaten the United States.

ISIS presently controls about 13,000 square miles (about the size of Massachusetts), spanning territory in Iraq and Syria, and a fighting force estimated to be between 20,000 and 31,500 fighters.

ISIS also commands substantial resources, including cash reserves estimated to be in the hundreds of millions of dollars and daily revenue of $3 million from largely criminal activities.

Mr. Speaker, after its gains in Syria and Iraq, ISIS stands as one of the most dangerous jihadist groups. It was formed in April 2013, growing out of al-Qaeda in Iraq (AQI), which has since condemned and disavowed the group for its barbarity.

It speaks volumes about any group that is too barbaric to be associated with al-Qaeda in Iraq!

Unlike other rebel groups in Syria, ISIS aims to establish an Islamic emirate that straddles Syria and Iraq. Since March 2013, ISIS has seen considerable military success, beginning with its takeover of the Syrian city of Raqqa—the first provincial capital to fall under rebel control.

In January 2014, ISIS took control of Fallujah, the predominantly Sunni city in the western province of Anbar. It also seized large sections of the provincial capital, Ramadi, and has a presence in a number of towns near the Turkish and Syrian borders.

However, it was its conquest of Mosul in June that captured the world's attention because with the conquest of Mosul came control of oil fields in northern Iraq and Mosul's branch of Iraq's central bank, from which ISIS took hundreds of millions of dollars.

The international community received a wake-up call on August 2, 2014, when ISIS

fighters pushed further into northern Iraq, overwhelming lightly-armed Kurdish Peshmerga forces that had moved into areas abandoned by the Iraqi army and seized the strategically important Mosul Dam, which supplies water and electricity to much of Iraq.

Knowing ISIS's reputation for unmatched brutality, tens of thousands of people fled their homes, particularly members of religious minorities, and 50,000 of them were trapped on Mount Sinjar without food or water, until their rescue was secured by the air strikes ordered by President Obama providing cover for the Kurdish forces who wrested back control of the Mosul Dam.

Mr. Speaker, ISIS derives significant revenues from the oil fields it controls in eastern Syria and from the sale of antiquities it looted from historical sites.

Today, ISIS is considered to be the most cash-rich militant group in the world, controlling assets estimated to exceed $2 billion.

ISIS has shown no restraint in dealing with civilian populations, acting with heinous violence and savagery. ISIS fighters have murdered and kidnapped civilians throughout the territory under its control, including the grisly beheadings of two American journalists, James Foley and Steven Sotloff, and British aid worker David Haines.

More ominous, Mr. Speaker, is the fact many fighters recruited by ISIS have European or American passports, making it easier for them to return home. That is also why I introduced H.R. 5488—No Fly Foreign Fighters Act to protect the homeland.

To his great credit, President Obama has not rushed to judgment. He has been thoughtful. He has consulted with the Congress and the international allies.

And the President has been adamant that the planned assistance and training to rebels fighting ISIS will not involve, or lead to, American ground forces fighting a war that must be fought by the Iraqi people and Syrian rebels.

The threat posed by ISIS in Iraq presents the United States with a conundrum about what to do about ISIS in Syria. On the one hand, we do not want to strengthen the barbaric Assad regime that is opposed by Syrian rebels and opposition parties and by ISIS. On the other hand, if we provide assistance only to anti-Assad opposition forces, we indirectly strengthen ISIS.

The challenge is to identify, vet, and support those pro-democracy forces in opposition to both the Assad regime and ISIS.

The defeat of ISIS should be prioritized over the removal of Assad, though the latter should remain a long-term U.S. objective. And U.S. assistance to opposition groups should be designed and delivered with this sequencing in mind.

Finding, vetting, and equipping capable and reliable Syrian partners who are poised to fight ISIS and the Assad regime is the central strategic challenge facing the United States in countering the rise of ISIS.

On June 26, and again on September 10, the Obama administration announced additional assistance to vetted moderate opposition forces that are fighting both the Assad government and ISIS and asked Congress to authorize $500 million to train and equip these fighters.

But a major effort to arm, train, equip, and enable possible U.S. partners inside Syria is no easy task because potential partners are weak, causing the Obama administration to hold back additional meaningful support.

But part of the reason these potential moderate alternatives to Assad and ISIS remain weak is because they do not have organized and well-coordinated assistance. These potential partners include the Syrian National Coalition; the interim Syrian government; the Supreme Military Council; the Free Syrian Army; and the Syrian Muslim Brotherhood.

The necessary vetting to find capable and reliable partners must be thorough, rigorous, and meticulous because we cannot afford to provide training, equipment, and materiel to opposition forces that in turn combine, or enter into a non-aggression pact, with ISIS.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time for the Members of this body to be thoughtful, deliberate, and wise. This debate today is healthy and reflects and enduring strength of our democracy: open debate, deliberation, and decision.

I urge all members to reflect carefully on the threat posed to the United States by ISIS and to vote their conscience on the McKeon Amendment, guided by their best judgment as to what is the best course of action to take to protect our homeland and keep our nation and its people safe.

For my part, I will not vote to authorize the use of military force or to deploy American combat forces in Syria. Instead, I will vote for the McKeon Amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, a week ago, the President asked this House to include very narrow language in the continuing resolution that would allow the United States military to train and equip the Free Syrian Army individuals to defend themselves.

I can understand why any soldier in any country would want training from the United States military. They are the best-trained, best-equipped, best-disciplined, and best moral fighting force in the history of warfare. Many members of this body and of the administration have asked, for months, for greater training of the Free Syrian Army.

If we had not previously trained and equipped the Iraqis and the Kurds, ISIS would have already overrun Iraq and would have already moved against our allies in the region.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice the concern though of the people of Oklahoma. We believe this administration has the habit of twisting every bill into what they want it to say rather than what it actually says; so I want to clarify this amendment.

This is not an authorization for the use of military force in Syria. The President has not asked for that authority, and the Congress has not extended it.

Mr. Speaker, in 2001, this body gave specific authorization to President Bush to ''use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organization, or persons he determines''—now get this—who ''he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001.''

The fighters currently on the battlefield with ISIS were about 8 years old on 9/11. The leaders of ISIS were teenagers. Unless this administration is able to show evidence that a group that did not exist on 9/11 or that 8-year-olds in Syria planned, authorized, committed or aided in the terror attacks on 9/11, the AUMF is not in effect from 2001.

This body is willing to deliberate and to engage with the American people in the sobering question of the use of military force, but we are not willing to abdicate our constitutional responsibility.

No one in this administration should understand this vote as a request to negotiate with Iran for their cooperation, offering to turn a blind eye or to turn our head while they advance their nuclear weapons program for their help and their cooperation. The world should not have to choose between ISIS or a nuclear Iran. Both are unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, this vote is also not an acknowledgement of the President's plan to defend our Nation from ISIS. We have not seen a plan.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, this vote is not an acknowledgement of the President's plan because we have not seen the plan. Bombing some of ISIS' facilities and training 5,000 foreign fighters is not a plan.

If ISIS is a direct threat to the United States, we should treat them that way. Do not make the American people second-guess the threat by saying that the American people will be protected by the Free Syrian Army.

While I stand in support of this amendment today, the conversation must not end here. I look forward to the conversation in how the administration intends to constitutionally seek authorization to accomplish the strategy today for the American people and this body.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and my ranking member for their leadership on this issue and for the exhaustive discussions and briefings we have had. I also commend all of my colleagues for their thoughtful statements.

This is, indeed, a tough decision, but we are elected to make tough decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this amendment to equip and train the Syrian rebel forces. After countless briefings and the President's speech, I am left with more questions than answers. At a briefing today, former U.S. generals have opined that

training 3,000 to 5,000 members of the Free Syrian Army will be lame—in fact, totally inadequate.

Why would we train an inadequate number of FSAs to contain ISIL? How do we identify and vet a sufficient number of Syrians who can fight a long, protracted conflict to effectively degrade ISIL? How do we compel the Free Syrian Army to focus on ISIL instead of Assad, the brutal dictator they took up arms in the first place to destroy?

What will prevent Assad from continuing to attack the FSA? And what will we do in response? How do we avoid arming individuals that would rather do harm to the United States than ISIL? How do we create a true coalition that will share the burden of this conflict when some only agree tacitly behind closed doors?

Jordan has ISIL on both borders but cannot commit publicly to providing boots on the ground. How does a plan that relies primarily on airstrikes truly degrade ISIL's capability?

□ 1545

What I have heard in response to these questions simply doesn't add up.

We should have our eyes open wide enough to know that we are being asked to support today something much more than just training 3- to 5,000 members of the Free Syrian Army. There are consequences of what we have supported in the past, and there will be consequences today.

What happened when we spent billions of dollars to train and equip the carefully vetted Iraq military over almost a decade? They folded in the face of ISIL, many taking arms up with ISIL and others stripping their uniforms from their backs.

The plan before us is unrealistic and insufficient. None of the military experts outside the government believe that this strategy will topple ISIL. General Dempsey conceded yesterday that if this plan is insufficient, which I believe it is. He may recommend ground forces. He also said that there is no military solution to ISIL.

We should be frank with ourselves and the American people. We are not facing a limited engagement but a new war that will only escalate. We are setting out on a path to send our own troops to the ground. This is an amendment and a debate to start yet another war in the Middle East with a very uncertain future.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by Chairman MCKEON. We are way past any good solutions in Syria, but doing nothing would be the worst solution of all.

I understand and, in fact, share many of the reservations expressed by my colleagues today. This is not an easy choice. Yet we cannot ignore the threat of ISIL. They are determined to bring war to America's shores. We must respond.

The President's request to train and equip certain Syrian opposition forces is a necessary step toward defeating ISIL, so I will support it. I will also urge the President to do more to explain the true nature of this crisis to the American people.

This will not be an easy fight. Airstrikes alone are unlikely to destroy ISIL and diminish its ability to threaten America. Americans are understandably war weary, but we did not pick this fight. Our Nation always answers the bell to defend our way of life and protect our freedom. This time will be no different.

May God bless our military personnel who will be involved in this effort. May God continue to bless the United States of America.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE).

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for his leadership and the chairman for his on this very difficult issue.

I want to make one point clear to my colleagues. We are essentially declaring war through an amendment to a budget resolution.

Let's make no mistake. We are not simply training rebels in another country, Saudi Arabia, which, by the way, has been the most successful exporter of extremism and extremists in the world. We will reinsert those trained and equipped rebels back into Syria, and we will then be their air force. We will, through all intents and purposes, be a co-belligerent in a civil war.

So, if we are declaring war right now, I think we should do it with our eyes wide open, as my colleague just said, with a full debate, and only through the power vested in Congress through the U.S. Constitution.

The logical conclusion of our participation in this war, if successful, is to depose the Assad regime and replace it with one of our own making in concert with these rebels. That will be the third country in 13 years whose regime we have deposed and whose government we have replaced with one of our own choosing. It is the fourth that we have been involved in, if you include Libya, in whose government we have successfully deposed. In not one of those instances can I say that this has been a success.

We also have no Muslim-majority countries contributing ground troops to this operation. I think we owe wide deference to the President in matters of foreign affairs, but when it comes to declaring war, our Founding Fathers reserved that power for the people through their representatives in Congress.

This amendment to a budget resolution, which would enter us into this war in a formal manner, makes a mockery of that and does not do justice to the servicemembers who will be asked to put their lives on the line for this U.S. policy.

For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The terrorist Islamic State, or IS, is a grave threat to our friends and allies in the Middle East and to our homeland. There is broad bipartisan agreement that this threat must be confronted and destroyed.

It is important for the President to work with Congress to address this terrorist threat. The President should continue airstrikes and support Kurdish and Iraqi forces in their fight.

The amendment under consideration will expand the President's authority to conduct military operations in the Middle East through the training and arming of allegedly moderate Syrian rebels.

I have serious reservations about this amendment. There is simply not enough information about these rebels. Indeed, not even 2 weeks ago, the President admitted he did not even have a strategy to confront IS. I am looking to the administration to provide additional information about the rebels it is proposing to train and arm.

Several administration officials have stated that the rebels may be fighting both the Assad regime and IS. But against whom will the rebels first turn their weapons we give them? IS or the Assad regime?

I also have very serious reservations about including this expanded military authorization in the continuing resolution, a short-term funding bill. This authorization raises very serious issues.

Make no mistake. It will ultimately involve United States servicemembers, men and women from our cities, towns, and countryside, who will leave their families behind at home. Such a measure deserves consideration in a completely separate resolution.

The President should never have asked for such a serious matter to be added to a short-term spending bill.

I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment under consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, Ms. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the care that has gone into the preparation of the amendment before us.

I have perhaps more reason to be involved than most Members because my district, the Nation's Capital, is a perpetual high-level target for terrorists like ISIL.

Today I am compelled to come to the floor to convey the indignation of the residents of the District of Columbia that the Congress would even approach another period of war where participation of residents of the District of Columbia is virtually inevitable while

they have no vote whatsoever on this preeminent matter of war and peace.

District residents pay $12,000 annually, per capita, more in Federal taxes than residents of any other State, to support our government in war and peace. Regardless of what is decided on this amendment, Mr. Speaker, District residents will be there for America as they have been during every war our country has fought.

The Nation, however, should not ask D.C. residents to fight another war without consent of the governed who participate with taxes and live in the District of Columbia, the Nation's Capital.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, we will be debating an amendment which would not guard our Nation from terrorist infiltration nor even authorize our Armed Forces to eliminate ISIS personnel, equipment, and bases. Instead, the amendment authorizes President Obama to train and equip, with U.S. weaponry, members of the Syrian mujahideen, the so-called moderate rebels.

The amendment states that training and equipment can only be provided to ''vetted'' rebels, but who are those rebels? It says they can't be affiliated with ISIS, al-Nusra, and al Qaeda, which is good, but it would allow President Obama to arm other Islamist fighters who do not meet the threshold of being terrorists, including Harakat al Hazm fighters from the Muslim Brotherhood, the Syria Revolutionaries Front, and the Army of the Mujahideen.

Now, Mujahideen fighters in Syria are not moderates nor are they pro-American. They will take our arms and use them as they see fit, most likely to fight Assad in pursuit of installing a Sunni shari'a state in Syria. They cannot be counted on to vindicate our interests, which is why it is a mistake to subcontract out American national security to Islamist fighters.

Half measures like this, will not suffice. There are no shortcuts when it comes to our national defense.

So I constantly hear people say that Americans are war weary, and I disagree with that. I think Americans are willing to do what it takes to defend our people and our Nation. I think they are weary of missions launched without a coherent strategy and are sick of seeing engagements that produce inconclusive results rather than clear-cut victory. I think they are weary of a President that consistently proves himself unwilling to do what is necessary to win.

I have heard some colleagues say that arming the Syrian Mujahideen demonstrates strength and resolve. I think it is evidence of a lack of resolve. The President's strategy rests on wishful thinking. It is not sufficient to defeat the Islamic State.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I know the scourge of violent Islamic terrorism all too well. I represent the World Trade Center area in New York that was attacked on September 11, 2001. So I agree with the President that we must work together to combat ISIL.

Today, however, ISIL cannot project military power beyond the Middle East. ISIL is a direct military threat to our allies and to our interests in the Middle East. Perhaps we should help bolster the defenses of our allies, such as Jordan, Israel, Saudi Arabia, and the Emirates.

The current threat to the United States is from Europeans and Americans who may train with ISIL in the Middle East and then return to the United States to do us harm. This threat cannot be fought by military means in Iraq and Syria but by counterintelligence, appropriate surveillance, and border control here and abroad.

When it comes to ISIL operations in the Middle East, those very same operations that threaten our allies, we must ask why we do not see these threatened countries offering troops on the ground. Why are we more interested in their defense than they are?

These are some of the questions we in Congress should debate before we vote to go to war. Make no mistake; the offensive campaign of air attacks against ISIL that President Obama recently announced clearly constitutes a war within the meaning of the Constitution.

The Constitution very deliberately places the decision to go to war with the American people acting through Congress, not with the President. The decision to go to war against ISIL and to expand our efforts into countries like Syria requires congressional authorization.

The Authorization for Use of Military Force of 2001 cannot be relied upon for congressional authority for acts of war in circumstances completely unforeseen then against an enemy that did not exist then. Identification of ISIL with al Qaeda with the planning of the attacks on September 11, 2001, is specious. The Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 was, similarly, not about ISIL.

Congress must assert its constitutional power to authorize or reject the use of force in Iraq and Syria. We are not being asked today to authorize a new conflict with ISIL, even if that is implied by our vote today, and therein lies the danger. This vote without a vote on the wider Authorization for Use of Military Force will be taken by the public, the media, and perhaps even the courts as a de facto authorization of military force in Syria. This would undermine our ability to seriously debate the very real questions before us.

How deadly is the threat we are facing, and what is the best way to eliminate that threat?

What will happen when American fliers are shot down over Syria and perhaps beheaded on television by ISIL? Will the demand for revenge be overwhelming?

Just how steep is the slippery slope we are embarking upon?

How long will the conflict last?

Is there an exit strategy?

What does victory look like?

How much will it cost?

How many U.S. lives will be lost?

Whom will we be arming in Syria?

Do they share our long-term interests?

What are the odds those arms will be turned against us or allies?

It is precisely these types of questions that should be asked when Congress debates the Authorization for Use of Military Force. Until we have that debate in Congress and answer these questions and make a decision on an AUMF, we should not step foot on the slippery slope to another long war. Approving this amendment would be a big step onto that slippery slope, and so I must vote ''no.''

□ 1600

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding and for working so hard with the Armed Services Committee through Chairman MCKEON to bring forth this amendment that ultimately lets the President start a process that he laid out in his speech last week.

Mr. Speaker, the threat of ISIS is real and growing. It is not just limited to the Middle East, though. Americans know this is ultimately something that we will have to confront if we don't address it now with swift action.

If you look at the legislation that has been brought forward, there were some important protections that were put in place over the course of the last few days in negotiations with the White House that, I think, are very significant and lay out clear benchmarks for President Obama over these next 3 months that this authorization would last.

The first thing the President has got to do under this authorization is to go and build that coalition. This is not a go-it-alone strategy. That is not going to be the kind of strategy that is going to work. The President has got to go and put those countries together to carry this out. He has got to get firm commitments, not only on amounts of resources that will be put in place, but also the number of troops that those countries would put in place.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, any transfers of funds that would be needed to carry this out would have to first come back to Congress before they can move forward. Any plan for vetting

Syrians who we would train, which is going to be an incredibly important process, has to come back to Congress, and those plans have to be laid out.

I think that is so important that those protections are in place because, ultimately, Mr. Speaker, the President is the Commander in Chief. He has asked for this authorization. But there has got to be a give and take and, ultimately, a role that Congress plays where the President is letting us know each step of the way that he is carrying out the mission as he laid it out, he is building that coalition that he said he would put together. And over these next 3 months, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be important that he does those tasks.

And ultimately, as we come back here to deal with this again, it is going to be important that the President lay out the broader strategy, because so many of our Members know this is not the final step that is going to eliminate the threat of Islamic terrorism. This is the very beginning. I think not only Members here in this body—Republican and Democrat alike—but I think people all across the country want to, ultimately, see that broader strategy by the President for how he is going to take on this challenge and eliminate these terrorists from the face of the Earth.

I rise in support and urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), my friend and colleague.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the amendment is to train and equip Syrian rebels. Well, let us see how that has worked in the past when America has trained and equipped individuals.

The United States has spent billions of dollars in Iraq to train and equip Iraqi soldiers. The first time they came in contact with the ISIS members, they cut and ran.

This is ISIS propaganda that was on the Internet.

This is an American tank now in the possession of ISIS when the Iraqis cut and ran.

This is a Humvee going through a parade; also, four Humvees that, apparently, have never been used that are now in the possession of ISIS when the Iraqis cut and ran.

Now we want to arm Syrian rebels to keep them fighting for America. Well, let us see how that has worked in the past.

In September 2013, The Wall Street Journal reported that ISIS raided a Free Syrian Army weapons depot, taking small arms and ammunition provided by the CIA.

In December 2013, Free Syrian Army weapons warehoused on the Syrian-Turkey border were seized by the Islamic Front. They, like the Iraqis, cannot keep up with American arms.

Second, some say in this amendment we will support the Free Syrian Army because they are going to be examined and we will make sure that they are vetted very well. But let us understand and see how that is working out.

What is a Free Syrian Army rebel today is an ISIS member tomorrow. It looks like, in December of 2013, Saddam al-Jamal, the northeast commander of the Free Syrian Army, announced his defection to ISIS and condemned those who worked with the West.

A Washington Post article, August 18: A high-level security commander of ISIS said that there is no more Free Syrian Army in eastern Syria because they have all joined—yes—ISIS. Isn't that lovely?

It is not a good strategic plan to arm Syrian rebels. If ISIS is a national security threat, then relying on rebels in a Syrian civil war will not protect American security interests.

The United States should have a strategy to defeat the barbarians of ISIS, but we should have that debate on this House floor and not rely on mercenaries to fight American national security interests somewhere overseas.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today, I join many of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in support of giving the President the initial authority needed to confront ISIS and Syria.

I am actually surprised and disheartened by the opposition that some here in this Chamber have towards the amendment. To be clear, I have been as vocal a critic of this administration's lack of strategy in Syria as any other person. But that does not excuse us from what, I believe, is the right thing to do, which is to give the Commander in Chief the tools necessary to confront this evil.

I don't remember many of my colleagues from this body stepping forward a year ago, or even a few months ago, urging the President to do more in Syria. In fact, at the beginning of this year, I called for bombing ISIS targets as they moved into Fallujah and Iraq. By many I was called a warmonger or somebody eager to start another war in Iraq.

It is easy to come up with any excuse not to support an amendment. Some say it doesn't go far enough. I have heard from a lot of people here that say it doesn't go far enough. Some people say that it goes too far, it is too much. It doesn't include an authorization of military force, it doesn't include an overarching strategy for ISIS or Syria.

I reject those calls for a perfect strategy from a perfect President for a perfect outcome in Syria. That is simply not possible given the circumstances we now face, due to our previous inaction.

Mr. Speaker, to those who believe that the Assad regime is a partner in the fight against ISIS, I would remind them this regime has slaughtered nearly 200,000 of its own people. In fact, in Iraq, when we were fighting al Qaeda in Iraq, the Assad regime gave AQI safe haven in Syria to fight American forces. And look no further than Hezbollah—one of the greatest enemies of the West and one of the greatest enemies of Israel is strongly supported and enabled by the Assad regime. The Assad regime created the ISIS problem, gave them safe passage through regime-controlled territory and, ultimately, attacked only Free Syrian Army targets until the West looked over, and now they look like the savior of the West by attacking only ISIS. Let's not get sucked into that argument.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. I support this amendment, not because it is part of a larger strategy in Syria that we would like to see from this administration but because it is a first step in addressing ISIS in Syria.

I ask my colleagues to support this first step that many have been calling for to train the FSA before it is too late. What would our enemies and allies think if we rejected the President's authority to do this?

I urge support of this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member SMITH. I appreciate your leadership and your courtesy.

In Iraq and Syria, we are facing an excruciating set of circumstances where there is no clear path forward.

Our challenge in the face of the atrocities perpetrated by ISIS is to reduce the suffering of innocent citizens and our allies, and to protect our security at home.

To do nothing is an option, but it is likely the worst choice.

If ISIS were only a potential threat, I would feel differently. However, ISIS is a well-funded, heavily-armed militia whose strength is increasing and whose ranks have swollen to over 30,000 and counting by some estimates. They control an ever-expanding area across Iraq and Syria's border.

To stand by, allowing ISIS to expand and strengthen its hold in Iraq and Syria, we will encourage accelerated deterioration of the security in the region that will become more difficult to address and will, ultimately, become a threat to the United States.

We must also confront those in the region who say they oppose ISIS but

have yet to take action. Those regional players have an even greater stake in this struggle than the United States.

I think the ''least bad'' option is the McKeon amendment, which does not provide for an authorization for the use of military force.

I didn't support wars in Iraq or the later surge in Afghanistan, and I certainly would not support legislation that would expose us to another open-ended broad commitment.

This proposal strictly limits the use of United States ground forces in the region and would prevent an open-ended engagement in Iraq or Syria because the authority provided in this legislation sunsets December 11.

Any airstrikes or aid would come at no additional cost to our country, which has already spent hundreds of billions of dollars on war in the region, and requires the Department of Defense to reprogram existing funds or find regional allies to pay for our efforts.

This proposal to empower the President for 3 months is the most reasonable course of action at this point. It is not going to settle the long-simmering collection of conflicts in the region. Authorizing the President to train and equip highly vetted Syrian opposition fighters and strike a narrow set of ISIS targets, however, may degrade ISIS in a meaningful way.

These 3 months will give the administration an opportunity to show the progress and enlist support of other countries. Congress will then reassess these efforts in December.

In the meantime, we are not undercutting the diplomatic and military efforts of the administration. Helping the administration respond, allowing the situation to clarify, making some progress, and galvanizing support are the most we can hope for over the course of the next 3 months.

I remain open to alternatives, but after listening carefully to the debate, briefings from experts, and reviewing the materials, I see no better course at this point than the limited short-term initiative this amendment provides.

I plan on supporting the amendment and I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for this opportunity.

The President spoke last week and he presented nothing that could be remotely considered a strategy, and yet, the American people understand the destruction of radical Islamic terrorism is mandatory. It is not mandatory for creation of democracy around the world, it is mandatory for keeping people safe in places like Omaha and Denver and Wichita, Kansas, the place that I represent.

Today, the world is watching what we will do here, what Congress will do. There are folks watching this in bunkers, there are people from Hamas watching how we will vote today. They are looking at how this Congress will respond to a President who has not laid out a strategy, who has now asked us to provide one arrow in the quiver, one small piece that doesn't amount to hardly anything remotely close to a strategy. They are looking to watch and see how we will respond.

And, today, we should respond by telling the President of the United States we will support his efforts to train and equip, but that we are going to watch and demand that he develop a strategy for the destruction of ISIL and for containment in the region as well.

Remember, it is not just ISIL that is the threat. The threat extends from Damascus to Tehran, it threatens Lebanon and Jordan, it threatens all the Middle East, and, indeed, if that territory is allowed to remain inflamed, will threaten us here in the United States.

Today, we take a very small action, a measured action, one that is necessary but hardly sufficient.

I urge my colleagues to support the McKeon amendment, and I urge the President of the United States to take action in a way that will defeat ISIL and defeat radical Islam and keep us all safe here in the United States of America.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

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

This is not a perfect plan. What America wants is a plan that guarantees success, and that success should be total destruction of ISIS immediately and without U.S. casualties. But the plan is a reasonable approach. It is the only approach on this floor. The alternative is to do nothing. No one has brought a better plan to this floor.

□ 1615

For those who say, ''Let's do nothing,'' reflect what we have accomplished through the President's action. The Yazidis have been saved from genocide. The Turkmen who otherwise would have been slaughtered in the many thousands are no longer besieged. The Mosul and Haditha dams are no longer under the control of ISIS. None of that would be true if the President had already not begun to take action.

I now yield to the gentleman from California for a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, all the authority provided in this amendment will expire no later than December 11, 2014. Is that correct?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCKEON. Or the passage of the NDAA, whichever comes first.

Mr. SHERMAN. Whichever comes first. So it could even be sooner than December 11.

Second, the administration has stated that it will use this authority to train Syrian fighters outside Syria. I have a fact sheet, which I will enter into the RECORD, provided by the administration, stating that the training will take place outside Syria and that the Saudis have agreed to host facilities.

Mr. Chairman, can you confirm that it is, indeed, the administration's plan to do the training outside Syria?

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. SHERMAN. Is it your understanding that the training bases will be outside Syria?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his answers.

Attached, please find a fact sheet on the Title X program, as well as a Q&A your boss may mind helpful. I stand by ready to answer any questions.

—Robert

ROBERT N. MARCUS,
Special Assistant to the President, White House Office of Legislative Affairs.

IMPORTANCE OF TITLE 10 TRAIN AND EQUIP IN DEGRADING & DESTROYING ISIL

The President has outlined a comprehensive approach to degrade and ultimately destroy ISIL. Part of this approach involves building an international coalition and working with and supporting local partners.

The Syrian opposition can serve as an effective, local counterweight to extremist elements in Syria, particularly ISIL. That is why we have provided a variety of types of support to strengthen the Syrian opposition since the conflict began in 2012.

In his speech at West Point in May, the President announced his intention to seek Congressional approval of a Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund that would allow us to empower and enable partners in their fight against shared terrorist threats. As part of this Fund, and as described in his Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) budget request in June, the President requested authority for a Department of Defense (DOD)-led program to train and equip (T&E) vetted members of Syria's moderate opposition.

The T&E program can advance our counter-ISIL goals in Syria as well as our goal to work towards a political solution to the broader crisis in Syria. But ISIL's aggression in the region, paired with Saudi Arabia's new willingness to assist with this effort and impending expansion of our air campaign against ISIL, means that we must expedite the program's implementation. As ISIL is degraded and destroyed, a ground force capable of holding territory and taking advantage of gains is needed. The Syrian opposition can serve this critical role.

The T&E program will train vetted fighters, outside of Syria, to defend the Syrian people against extremists like ISIL as well as regime attacks; stabilize areas under opposition control; and help a subset of the trainees to go on the offensive against ISIL. Ultimately, the opposition will be able to hold territory from which ISIL is removed and help provide for a negotiated end to the broader conflict in Syria. We would provide lethal and non-lethal assistance to enable trainees to accomplish their missions and advance U.S. policy goals.

Initially, the program will rely on other U.S. government agencies and partner-nations that currently provide support to the vetted opposition to assist with the recruiting, vetting, and sustainment of the U.S-trained fighters. Saudi Arabia has agreed to host and support the training facilities. Additional allies are expected to contribute to the effort in the future, as well.

Q&A ON SYRIA T&E

1) Question: We spent billions training the Iraqi Security Forces who melted away the moment they faced ISIL, why would this force be any different?

Answer: Unfortunately, since the departure of the United States, years of leadership from former Prime Minister Maliki turned a competent force into a sectarian one, removing qualified leaders and severing normal lines of authority and communication, while alienating the broader Sunni community. The new inclusive government is committed to reforming Iraq's security forces and building a National Guard responsive to the needs of individuals communities. Syrian Opposition fighters are highly motivated to defend their homes and families from ISIL. What the opposition lacks is the resources to successfully resist and counter ISIL. That is precisely what we will work with our regional partners to give them. And, as a comprehensive approach and use of air power starts to change the momentum away from ISIL, the opposition will gain in confidence.

2) Question: How does the Syria T&E program fit into the Administration's strategy to degrade and ultimately defeat ISIL?

Answer: Building partner capacity—both the capacity of Iraqi partners and vetted opposition partners in Syria—is a key to denying ISIL safe haven, limiting its access to recruits, to include foreign fighters, and disrupting the group's finances. A multi-mission force will be trained to defend opposition-controlled areas from ISIL advances and enable the opposition to challenge ISIL's control of territory in Syria. Bolstering the vetted opposition also will increase their credibility and influence within Syria and pull potential recruits away from extremist groups.

3) Question: How can you ensure that Syrian fighters trained and equipped by DOD will not pass U.S.-provided weapons to extremists?

Answer: All participants in the T&E program will be subject to a rigorous vetting process led by our Intelligence Community, consistent with U.S. law and policy, including to ensure that they are not affiliated with extremist groups. They will undergo vetting to determine their eligibility for the program as well as after they have completed training to ensure that they will be eligible for additional U.S. assistance. We also will work closely with regional partners, including the Saudis, on our vetting process in order to capitalize on their knowledge of dynamics among the armed opposition. While we cannot guarantee that U.S. assistance will never fall into the wrong hands, we will take extensive measures to reduce the possibility that our trainees will pass weapons to extremists.

4) Question: How does the counter-ISIL strategy relate to the Administration's other goal of pressuring the Asad regime?

Answer: The T&E program is one component of our counter-ISIL strategy, but our investment in this force is not just for a counter-extremist role. As the President has said, Asad has lost all legitimacy, and Syria will not witness lasting stability so long as he is in power. Asad continues to present a false choice between radical Sunni extremists and his regime, but we know that there is a Syrian opposition. Strengthening the opposition provides the best counterweight to extremist elements within Syria as well as to the Asad regime.

5) Question: Why is the T&E program so urgent now?

Answer: Saudi Arabia has recently agreed to host and support the training facilities for this program. Their active support is a critical element of a broad coalition of countries combatting ISIL. Other Sunni countries are also getting on board. If they see us hesitate, they may back away and we will lose the momentum we are building against ISIL. In order to degrade and ultimately destroy ISIL, we need the authority to increase our efforts to strengthen the Syrian opposition.

6) Question: What is the timeline for the program? How soon will trained fighters return to the battlefield?

Answer: This is a long-term investment, and one that will require some time on the front end for infrastructure development, planning, and logistics. We anticipate that initial trainees could complete training roughly four to six months after authorization and funding. We will work to expedite this timeline.

7) Question: Given the immediate threat posed by ISIL, shouldn't we have the T&E program focus entirely on ISIL?

Answer: The Syrian opposition continues to face threats from ISIL and the regime, which is why we must train them to be able to defend themselves against both enemies.

8) Question: Has ISIL negotiated a ceasefire with any element of the Syrian opposition?

Answer: We are looking into these claims as well as reports suggesting that one local brigade in Hajar al-Aswad may have reached a 24–hour agreement with ISIL that quickly broke down but that was intended to allow both sides to retrieve the bodies of their fighters who had been killed.

We would note that the Syrian Revolutionaries Front (SRF)—which is the group that the article claims has signed a ceasefire with ISIL—has issued a statement indicating that it has never ceased hostilities with ISIL and will continue to fight ISIL and the regime.

We will be thoroughly vetting any potential recipient of US assistance and, of course, any collusion with ISIL would be automatically disqualifying. Trainees will undergo additional vetting once they return to the battlefield. This vetting process will involve multiple US agencies and regional partners, and we have been using it to determine recipients of our non-lethal support to the Syrian opposition since early in the conflict. The training process will include the need to adhere to the law of armed conflict and respect for human rights.

A critical reason for our training and equipping the vetted, opposition is precisely to ensure they are capable of standing up to and countering ISIL at the local level. We are certain a vast majority of the Syrian opposition rejects ISIL, have been fighting it, and will be even more successful with our increased support. Again, we will only work with those opposition groups and members who reject ISIL and we are confident in our rigorous, layered vetting operation.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The threat of ISIL is beyond anything in the last 13 years since the horror of 9/11. We see there are no limits to gross brutality. They are a terrorist threat to the region, to the United States, and to our allies.

This rushed amendment to arm and train vetted Syrian rebels is not the answer. This Chamber needs to have an informed, robust discussion and debate about the U.S. role in combating and dealing with ISIL and other extremists in Syria and Iraq.

It is a debate that should take place on its own. This issue and this amendment should not be attached to the continuing resolution or any other matter before the House.

This amendment authorizes the training and equipping of vetted Syrian opposition forces, but we still aren't clear on who these forces are and how these rebel groups will be chosen and vetted. How do we ensure that our weapons, training, and knowledge won't be used by ISIL or other terrorist organizations in the future?

Additionally, this amendment only highlights a piece of the President's plan for addressing ISIL, a plan that includes significant long-term bombing campaigns and military escalation in Iraq and Syria.

If the House leaves for the next 8 weeks without addressing the already expanding scope of U.S. military operations in Iraq and Syria, I fear that we will return in November to find the U.S. sliding down a slippery slope toward full military engagement in those countries.

We have been there before. We have seen before how mission creep can expand a limited mission into a full-blown U.S. armed response. I will not let this happen or let this country be dragged into another conflict once again without an informed discussion.

Congress needs to debate a new authorization for the use of military force before any expansion of military operations. I support the President's call to dismantle ISIL through robust regional and international partnerships, support for local capacities on the ground, and expanded humanitarian assistance.

Arming and training Syrians and Iraqis and perhaps eventually supporting them with airstrikes may push back ISIL's gains, but it will not defeat extremism. There is no lasting military solution to extremism. The only lasting solution is a political solution, one in which the rights and concerns of all groups are respected.

The U.S. must focus on building partnerships in the region and around the world to encourage moderate Sunni groups in Iraq and Syria to move away from ISIL and towards an alternative and inclusive future. We also need to have a plan for the development of this region beyond our confrontation with ISIL.

I have deep reservations and important lingering questions that need to be debated on this floor. I am concerned about exposing our solders once

again to a protracted conflict with unclear objectives and no clear exit strategy.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HONDA. I cannot support this rushed amendment that allows the U.S. to wade back into another conflict without a serious, informed discussion of the United States' military role in combating ISIL. We need to fully debate and discuss actions we as a Nation take against this vicious foe.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, ISIS poses a savage threat to the world, to Muslims and Christians in Iraq and Syria, to our allies, and to the United States. It has executed heinous acts of terror and violence and, tragically, will continue to do so. Allowing it to thrive unchallenged is not in the national interest of the United States of America.

Today's vote is not a blanket authority but a thoughtful, detailed, and limited effort to confront ISIS. We cannot and should not do this alone. We need tangible support from a global coalition and will evaluate the commitment level in 3 months. The administration must continue to work to ensure that Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and other Islamic nations are involved in this multinational effort.

Despite reservations and questions, in my judgment, we must take action. The threat is real, and ISIS must be confronted now. I support the McKeon amendment because it is thoughtful and it provides the experts here in Washington the authority they need to put together a clearly-defined, realistic strategy.

This amendment does not authorize the use of military force; indeed, the amendment includes language that makes it explicitly clear that this is a train-and-equip authority and not an authorization for force.

Mr. Speaker, I support this amendment, and, in the weeks and months to come, the House of Representatives must use its oversight powers under the Constitution to monitor this strategy and to demand changes as necessary.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, does the gentleman have any additional speakers?

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, yes, we do have additional speakers.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman from Texas for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the McKeon amendment and in support of the continuing resolution.

I want to say this: I have heard a lot of people say this process isn't good and that we haven't had enough hours of debate, but I would say to Members of Congress: Have we not, in fact, had days and weeks of debate? How is it that you are a Member of Congress if you haven't thought about ISIS and the situation?

In fact, have we not had 13 years to debate this very subject internally, externally, on the floor, in committee, and off the floor? We certainly have had a lot of time for deliberation on this.

Secondly, I want to say this: I am not certain that the President needs further approval from Congress, as I have gone back and read the resolutions of 2001 and 2002. I would also say, though, we should have a formal resolution. It would be good for the country, it is good for Congress, it is good for the education process, and it sends a very strong signal to our enemies.

Perhaps when the President sends it to us—and I hope he will in November or December—we will have an opportunity to have the debate again, and we can review how effective these airstrikes have been at that time, how effective is the training program, how well is it going, and what allies have actually stepped up and what have they contributed. Right now, we do not have the answer to those questions.

I will say another thing, Mr. Speaker: If we are going to fight this war because it is worth fighting, then it is well worth winning, and, speaking for myself, I want the Commander in Chief and our armed services to have all the tools that are available to them.

If that means having ground troops on the table, then I want to be sure that we send that signal because the last thing we need to do right now to our enemies abroad is say we are not going to do this or we are not going to do that.

We can't have a half-pregnant war. We have got to fight to win and wipe out this terrorist surge.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach the end of 6 hours of debate on this amendment, I think it has been a good and healthy discussion. According to our count, we have had more than 90 Members of the House come to the floor and express their opinion about this situation with ISIL and Syria and Iraq.

I think part of that is it has given all Members an opportunity to express their opinions and concerns and hopes about what we can do as a country going forward, but it seems to me, through the course of these numbers of hours, that most Members agree on at least three things.

One of the things that most everybody agrees on is that ISIL is a significant threat. It seems to me they are clearly the best-equipped, best-trained, best-financed terrorist organization we have ever faced.

In addition to that, as the ranking member noted at the beginning of the debate, there are thousands of people who have Western passports who are fighting with ISIS who can easily come to the United States and Europe to launch their attacks.

The second thing I think most people agree upon is that this is a very complex situation. We have the Syrian civil war underway. You have the change of government in Iraq. You have the situation with the Kurds.

There are many players—Iran—that make this a very complex situation. All of those Members who go down and say there is no good alternative, I think I agree with that. There is no perfect alternative to deal with this.

The third thing about which there is a lot of agreement, Mr. Speaker, is there are a lot of doubts about the President's plan, a lot of doubts about whether it is going to be enough to defeat ISIL, a lot of doubts about the commitment of the administration to follow through on the plan and to persevere over time; but, in addition to that, even if it is well-done and implemented perfectly over time, no one knows for sure how this is going to come out.

With those broadly agreed-upon facts, Members have reached different judgments and different conclusions, but it just seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that approving this amendment to give the military—the Department of Defense—the authority to train people in Syria as part of that fight makes sense.

Just to briefly review what is in the amendment—because during these 6 hours of debate there has been a lot of discussion, some of it about things that are not in the amendment—but what is in the amendment is that the amendment authorizes the Department of Defense to train folks in Syria as part of the fight against ISIL, and it is absolutely true that the Department of Defense has done this very thing in at least 40 countries.

Now, for all those people who say this is a slippery slope to war, I just note we are not in war in 40 countries. We train people around the world every day, and the military does a very competent job of it. That is what this authority does—that is it—train folks to defend themselves.

□ 1630

This amendment has an expiration date, as you just heard, either December 11, 2014, or the passage of the NDAA, whichever happens first.

There is a broad array of oversight, beginning 15 days before anything is done, and then every 90 days thereafter specific requirements of information that has to come to this Congress.

There are limits on the funding. If U.S. taxpayer dollars are used, then the Congress has to be notified and basically, through the transfer authorities, Congress has to approve.

Finally, it is absolutely clear, because it says so, this is not an authorization to use military force.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

All of those people who are concerned that it is not an Authorization for Use of Military Force may have a very good point, but that is not what this is about. This is about a narrow train-and-equip authority that would provide the Syrians the ability to get into that fight against ISIL.

So the bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that I think another thing most everybody agrees upon is you can't defeat this group from the air. You have to have folks on the ground. We have folks on the ground with the Kurds. We have folks on the ground who will be more competent with the Iraqis. We need some folks in Syria to be on the ground.

That is what this amendment does. It is narrow. It has oversight. It has limits. It has a time limit. But as General Dempsey told all Members, it is necessary, but, in and of itself, it is not enough. But it is necessary.

I believe that the House ought to take this step today to begin this training, and then it is up to the President to make his strategy work.

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

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

I think one of the things that makes this difficult is there are so many issues swirling around here: the desire; the need that I think, as Mr. THORNBERRY said, that everyone agrees on to confront and contain ISIS.

Their savagery is just unimaginable. They are clearly a threat to us and to the region, and we need a plan for confronting them, for stopping them and, hopefully, ultimately defeating them.

Now, part of that plan is what we are doing in Iraq. Part of that plan is trying to figure out how to deal with them in Syria.

But aside from all of that, this amendment is far more basic and simple, and I think Mr. THORNBERRY explained it. It is a train-and-equip mission. This is something that the Department of Defense does all over the world in a variety of different places. We have had a great deal of success training armies in Ethiopia and Kenya and Uganda to help deal with the situation in Somalia. We have had considerable success training forces in Yemen to help confront AQAP. The goal of this is to reduce the requirement for a robust U.S. military presence to advance our interests.

I have heard a number of folks, particularly on my side of the aisle, express that concern, that we don't want to go down the slippery slope of committing U.S. forces to a large-scale war, and I completely agree with them. But this amendment does not authorize military force. In fact, it is quite the opposite. It authorizes us to train local forces so that they can do the fighting.

I have also heard a number of people express the frustration which I share: we shouldn't be over there fighting these battles; we need the local populations there to stand up and fight for themselves. But that is precisely what Mr. MCKEON's amendment enables us to do. It enables the military to train local forces to fight ISIL on our behalf. And this is important, not just because it keeps us out of the fight, but because it gives us a far greater chance of being successful.

If this is perceived as the U.S. coming in against the Muslim group, then that gives ISIS a powerful propaganda message to say that they are simply defending themselves against Western aggression. If, on the other hand, they continue to do what they have been doing, which is killing Muslims and fighting Muslims, then we can recruit and get greater support from the local Sunni population to stand up against them.

This is what was successful about the Anbar Awakening back during the Iraq war, when Sunni tribesmen rose up against al Qaeda, with our support, and were able to turn the tide in Iraq at that time. That is why this is so important.

Now, the big issue of concern is what is going to happen within Syria. Are there truly moderates?

There are, unquestionably, moderates in Syria. Now they have been under a lot of pressure for the last couple of years from the Assad regime, but also from al Qaeda-affiliated groups like al-Nusra and also from ISIL. So they are clearly there. We know this because they are already, in some instances, fighting against ISIL. They are just not properly trained. They are not properly equipped, and they haven't been doing particularly well for the last couple of years. So if we can train them, they have a chance to survive.

And that is the last point that I will make. I think people can legitimately say: Is this really going to turn the tide of the war? Is this really going to defeat ISIL and give us success? This alone, absolutely not. But what it does is it gives us a chance, because if ISIL is allowed free rein in Syria, if they are not confronted by anybody but Assad, then we have no chance of defeating them.

We can do our best in Iraq, but if they can just go right across the border into Syria, as we have experienced trying to fight the Taliban in Afghanistan as they go across the border into Pakistan, if they have a safe haven where they can go without being pressured, then it is going to be very, very difficult to ever defeat them. The only way we can take away that safe haven is to find a local force that will fight our fight, and we can't get there if we don't train them.

This is about enabling the moderates in Syria enough space to survive. They survive, we slowly build from there to get us the force that we need to defeat them in Syria and, ultimately, beat back ISIL in both Syria and Iraq.

This is not a perfect plan. This is not going to solve all problems. Believe me, it wouldn't take too long to find difficulties and challenges in any plan that was put out there, but I think this is a good and prudent step that gives us the best chance of advancing U.S. national security interests in a reasonable way.

I urge this body to support this amendment. I thank Mr. MCKEON for bringing it.

I also want to join Mr. THORNBERRY. This has been an excellent debate. It is great to have so many Members come down and so articulately explain their positions. I urge support for the amendment.

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

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

I want to thank ADAM SMITH, my ranking member and partner for the last few years in this effort. I think he was very eloquent. He did a good job in working this debate. I think we have heard from both sides of the aisle, both positions, and it has been a strong debate.

I want to thank Mr. THORNBERRY. He has been my vice chairman, sidekick, for the last couple of years, carried a heavy load. He is a vice chairman of the committee, but he is also chairman of a subcommittee and also serves on the Intelligence Committee and a strong, strong Member, as you can see. He did a great job of explaining the bill, laying it all out in summary form after this long debate.

There is just one other point I want to mention, and that is that there is no new money in this bill. The President did not need additional money, and any money that is needed will be reprogrammed from money that already exists. They have to come back to the Congress and go through the process to make that change. But there will be nothing added to the top line.

I want to thank our staff who worked so hard on this. This came late in the process. The President sent us language last week. It wasn't something that we could support.

I want to thank leadership for giving us the time to work this issue, that, instead of voting on it last Thursday, we had time to work. The staff worked all weekend, both sides of the aisle. Thank you. Thank you for your strong work.

We hear sometimes about government workers and they are kind of just at the government trough. I want to tell you, these people work hard, long hours, and they are devoted to their jobs. Most of them could leave here and make more money, but they are committed to what they are doing, and I want to thank them for it.

Finally, I would just like to say, as a final wrap-up, this letter that I put in earlier, where Ambassador Crocker,

Ambassador Ford, who have spent years in this area, really understand the people, understand what is going on in that area, and then General Keane, General Petraeus, who both have spent a lot of time on this issue, the four of them have signed a letter that they sent over to us this morning that they support this amendment.

I agree with, I think, probably everybody that spoke that this will not do everything, but it is an important step at this time, and I urge our colleagues to support this amendment to give our Commander in Chief the authority that he needs to protect us in this area.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I agree with President Obama that the destabilizing and destructive actions of ISIL demand an American response. While I am supportive of President Obama's targeted actions against ISIS to date, I believe our government must be mindful of the unintended consequences inherent in training and equipping fighters in a highly complex foreign conflict For this reason, I authored a successful bipartisan amendment to the House's Defense Appropriations bill this summer, prohibiting the transfer of dangerous shoulder-fired antiaircraft missiles known as MANPADs to parties in the Syrian civil war. As President Obama uses any authority granted by Congress to train and equip Syrian rebels, I hope he honors the will of the House of Representatives to prevent the dissemination of these and other dangerous weapons in the Middle East and beyond.

We must remain cognizant that military force is not the solution to the strife afflicting Iraq and Syria. I continue to oppose the presence of U.S. ground troops in the region. We must do all we can to eliminate funding sources for ISIL and to support inclusive governance and vigorous dialogue while respecting Iraqi sovereignty. We must also do what we can to promote a peaceful settlement in Syria and to invest in employment-focused economic development throughout the region.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the H.J. Res. 124, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution of 2015 with the McKeon Amendment, which would allow for the training and equipment of Syrian opposition. Should a clean continuing resolution to provide finding to the United States government come to the floor, I would support it. However, I cannot support an authorization for war.

Since this body did not pass a budget on time, our only option is to vote to keep the government open and operating until December 11, 2014. Funding our government should not hinge on a controversial amendment added at the last minute that provides the opportunity for an open-ended war.

I am not in favor of unilateral action or troops deployed to the region and I am committed to resolving this conflict through diplomacy. I fully support any efforts by our country to provide humanitarian aid to the countless innocent civilians displaced and injured by this conflict.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and push for a clean continuing resolution.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the terrorist organization known as the Islamic State of Iraq and Levant (ISIL) is a growing regional threat that presents greater instability and turmoil across the Middle East. Today ISIL does not pose a credible strategic threat outside of the Middle East. So the U.S. response must reflect that reality. We cannot allow the Dick Cheneys of the world to use the horrific beheadings by ISIL as a call to war, just like the Gulf of Tonkin incident or the alleged weapons of mass destruction capabilities of Saddam Hussein. I am voting against this authorization to equip and train as yet unknown, perhaps non-existent ''moderate'' Syrian opposition forces to combat ISIL.

The three most successful ground forces fighting in Syria are ISIL who has ties with Saudi Arabia, the Syrian army backed by Iran, and Al Nusra which has ties to Hezbollah. The alliances between these forces are constantly shifting. One day ISIL and Nusra make common cause against the Syrian army and the other day they are all fighting each other. These sectarian wars are based on thousands of years of history and the U.S. has no role in sorting them out.

Congress is being asked to vote today on arming Syrian rebels that are yet to be vetted by the U.S. In fact, the text of this authorization requires the administration to report to Congress within 15 days on the plan for providing this assistance. Congress should know what the plan is before we vote on it. We should come back in 15 days or however long it takes for the administration to determine the scope and plan of this operation and who it is that the U.S. is going to arm in Syria. It is an abdication of our constitutional duties to vote on a vague authorization today instead of waiting and passing judgment on a more detailed assessment on this operation and an updated authorization for use of military force (AUMF).

If you turned to any of my colleagues today and asked the basic question who are the 5,000 fighters that the U.S. will train and equip in Syria, they could not give you an answer. Not even our intelligence agencies know who we can trust. Before granting authorization, Congress should at least know who it is we are giving U.S. weapons to and what their ideology and political goals are. This is a complex mess of various actors, many of whom cannot be considered trustworthy allies. The Syrian opposition is made up of hundreds of thousands of fighters from various factions that are also fighting amongst each other.

In Iraq, the U.S. is looking to form an alliance with a new government whose current Prime Minister has yet to prove he will bring Sunnis back to their proper place in an inclusive society. At the moment the Iraqi army barely exists on paper. It is extremely disturbing that the main Iraqi force currently fighting ISIL, Asaib Ahl al-haq, is incredibly hostile to the U.S. and was attacking our troops up to the last day of the U.S. occupation of Iraq.

That is why it is so critical that Congress be presented with a detailed plan of this ''train and equip'' operation including who it is that we are arming before we vote and this amendment fails to do that.

Most importantly what we are voting on today is a small part of President Obama's larger strategy to go to war with ISIL. No President can declare war without Congressional authorization. If the U.S. is going to war with ISIL as it appears that we are, then my colleagues need to stay here and debate and vote on an AUMF. It is our constitutional duty and to leave town without a vote on the overall military strategy is disgraceful. The American people did not elect us to punt the responsibility for matters of war and peace to the President. The purpose of an AUMF is to lay out in detail the scope, plan, purpose, and duration of a military operation and to provide both classified and non-classified briefings to Congress and allow them to debate and express their opinions on the merits of this. Absent an AUMF from Congress, we are committing ourselves to an open ended war, declared by the President about which we have little to no details.

Lastly, history has shown that U.S. involvement in sectarian as well as civil wars raging in the Middle East does not benefit our interests. ISIL would not exist today if it were not for the unnecessary U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003, which I voted against. ISIL is a regional threat and it is time for Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Jordan, and other so-called ''partners'' to step up and fight this war themselves. They have no incentive to do it if we keep fighting it for them. Additionally, arming Syrian rebels could drag the U.S. into the Syrian civil war. General Martin Dempsey said yesterday in his testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee that he would put U.S. troops on the ground if he felt it was necessary despite the President's numerous statements that he would not put boots on the ground. Already you can hear the march to war. In fact, it is easy to argue that continued U.S. military actions in the Middle East only create more hatred directed at our nation and increase the risk of terrorism both here and abroad.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

There is not a member of this body who does not share the view that the terrorist organization known as the ''Islamic State in the Levant'' (ISIL) is a threat to the people of Iraq and Syria. ISIL's acts of barbarism are well known. The question before us is whether arming an amorphous and largely unknown Syrian opposition is the proper response to ISIL's rise.

The idea of arming the Syrian opposition has been discussed and even debated in this body over the last several years. And until now, Congress has rejected military involvement with Syrian opposition groups because we did not truly understand the size, composition, and intentions of the various opposition groups, and were concerned that the unforeseen consequences of our involvement could easily ruin any advantages there might be. The fact that ISIL emerged unexpectedly out of the Syrian fighting and surprised us with their military success in Iraq illustrates well America's lack of understanding of the situation. Furthermore, just this week, the head of the Free Syrian Army was quoted as saying if his group received U.S. aid, he would use it against the Assad regime, not against ISIL. As I have pondered this question and discussed it with experts and with citizens in New Jersey, I have come away with more and more questions about the wisdom of the proposed action we are debating today.

The President's proposed strategy seems very similar to the one we have pursued in previous conflicts: arm and train local forces in the region and plan to turn over responsibility for the fight to those governments. That strategy failed spectacularly in Iraq. Earlier this

year, U.S. trained-and-equipped Iraqi security forces melted away in the face of ISIL forces. We have been told the reason was because of the Iraqi government under former Prime Minister al Maliki. With a new Iraqi government in Baghdad results would be better. That is hardly a believable or a reassuring argument.

The American public was told the same thing years ago after the South Vietnamese generals ousted Premier Diem in late 1963. If only we had the right leadership in Saigon, they argued, we could win the war. In the wake of that U.S.-sponsored coup, the political chaos in South Vietnam only deepened, and the Viet Cong and their North Vietnamese allies benefited from and exploited the situation to their political and military advantage, and less than a year after Diem's ouster President Johnson began committing large numbers of American ground troops to Vietnam in a vain effort to roll back the rising tide of support for the Viet Cong. Of course, the situation today in Syria and Iraq is not exactly like Vietnam under Diem or Iraq under Saddam, but we are slow to learn lessons.

Proponents of this resolution argue that a newly trained and equipped Iraqi security force may be in the field in a few months. If history is any guide, it is unlikely that schedule will be met, and in any case, Administration officials have made it clear they believe the Iraqi security forces will require significant external help for years in order to retake ISIS-controlled territory in Iraq.

In Syria, the Administration now proposes to arm an amorphous collection of Syrian opposition groups in the hopes that they can become a viable combat force. Arming Syrian rebels brings to mind our experience with the Afghan mujahedeen a generation ago. Can we have any confidence that our weapons will not be used against us eventually? The amendment before us explicitly acknowledges—through its reporting requirements—that American advisors may be killed by supposedly friendly Syrian opposition fighters, just as American advisors have been killed by Iraqi and Afghan turncoats in those nations. This amendment also recognizes—again through its reporting requirements—that American military aid may be diverted to Islamic militants through Syrian opposition traitors. If we can already see that this proposed action will lead to dead American advisors and pilfered American military aid, why are we continuing down this road?

It was telling that during his trip to the region earlier this month, Secretary of State Kerry came up empty when he sought concrete military commitments from other countries—even countries directly threatened by ISIL and its ideology. In the 1991 Persian Gulf war to oust Saddam Hussein's army from Kuwait, each of those nations contributed significant military forces or allowed the use of their bases for Coalition forces. If the governments most threatened by the march of ISIL refuse to commit combat forces against it while American pilots are risking their lives daily in airstrikes against ISIL in Iraq, why should we put more American lives at risk on the ground in Iraq and Syria? I must vote no.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the McKeon Amendment because I believe training and equipping moderate Syrian rebels to fight ISIL will increase the likelihood of success in our effort to rid the world of this threat.

We have seen that ISIL will ruthlessly slaughter anyone who does not adhere to their horrific ideology—including Muslims, Shia and Sunni alike. ISIL, with large numbers of Western fighters, is a threat not only to the Middle East but to Europe and America as well. We have seen their disgusting brutality with the beheadings of two brave American journalists, as well as others of diverse nationalities.

We must be clear about what this amendment is and what it isn't. It is not an authorization for the use of force against ISIL in Iraq and Syria. The Administration has stated that it believes it already has the authority to conduct a military campaign against ISIL, and they are proceeding pursuant to this authority. I would support a reexamination of the 2001 authorization by this Congress so we can fully debate its applicability to current threats. Thirteen years after its passage, it may be wise to refine it to empower the President to go after ISIL and other groups that pose a danger to America. This is our constitutional duty.

But this amendment is much more limited. It would simply authorize the training and equipping of Syrians to fight ISIL. Again, it does not authorize an American invasion of Iraq or Syria. If it did, I would not support it. In fact, I support this amendment precisely because I oppose an American ground war and believe we must eliminate the threat from ISIL without putting thousands of American troops in harm's way.

I oppose another American ground war not only because I believe that we have sacrificed enough already in two wars in the Middle East, although this is certainly my belief I oppose another American ground war primarily because for our campaign against ISIL to have sustained success, the combat troops driving out ISIL need to be Iraqi and Syrian, and in particular, they need to be Sunni. We actually defeated ISIL in their previous incarnation as Al Qaeda in Iraq. We were successful in doing so because we built political support among Iraqi Sunnis. Unfortunately, former Prime Minister Maliki's sectarianism alienated the Sunnis, and this, combined with Bashar al-Assad's brutality against Sunnis in Syria, allowed ISIL to emerge without really being challenged by the moderate majority of Sunnis, who saw them as the lesser of two evils.

Given this reality, the best way to eliminate the threat from ISIL is to empower moderate Sunnis in Iraq and Syria to drive them out of the areas they control. The development of a nonsectarian government in Iraq is a step in the right direction in that country, and this limited amendment is a step in the right direction in Syria. It cannot be the only step; we must continue to work with Sunni Arab countries so that the Sunnis of Iraq and Syria know that there is a much better future for them than the destructive brutality of ISIL.

The fight against ISIL will not be short, and it will not be easy. This should not, and will not, be the last time this body addresses this international challenge. Today we are asked to take a reasoned, sensible step on the path to ridding the world of ISIL's scourge. It is a step that we would be wise to take.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I support the McKeon Amendment to the Continuing Resolution.

As a nation, we have faced many threats to our national security over the 238 years of our existence. But the danger presented by the Islamic State may be unique in its hostility, raw hatred, and dedication to eliminating the United States from existence.

Less than a week ago, we observed the anniversary of the devastating attacks of September 11, 2001. Then, as today, we are reminded of the true nature of this enemy. They will attack at will, without provocation, and without regard for the lives of any innocent people who stand in their way. In fact, the more innocent the lives they take, the better—for their purposes.

I am pleased that President Obama has finally acknowledged the threat the Islamic State presents to our national security. Not content with wreaking havoc in their own corner of the Middle East, these terrorists have conquered territory, beheaded innocent Americans, forged allegiances with al Qaeda, threatened to strike us at home, and pledged to raise their flag over the White House. They are a muscular and growing menace that must be dispatched.

After our briefings on the situation in the region and the President's proposed strategic outline, I will be supporting his efforts on behalf of the nation. But I do so with some reservations.

With what we know now, this is not a perfect plan by any means, and I trust the President will listen to the counsel of his military advisers. American military strength will be evident in powerful air strikes, but on the ground, we will be relying on a fighting force trained quickly by American personnel. These are not seasoned fighters. These are just regular people—doctors, pharmacists, plumbers, or laborers. They are not soldiers, although very shortly we will be asking them to be.

These rookie ground forces will be entering into what the President has called an anti-terrorism operation, which is, in reality, a war. The administration and its representatives have been reluctant to use that word, but when our enemies have declared war on this country, there is no other terminology that is appropriate. And it will be a two-front war—on one side they will be fighting in Syria, and on the other, in Iraq. This will not be an easy fight, and I pray that they meet with more success than their military qualifications and experience suggests they might.

Another issue that I find troubling is that we do not know exactly who we will be assisting. While we trust and depend on their courage and determination in defeating what we perceive to be our common enemy, we truly do not know what their core loyalties are. This is a situation that will require constant monitoring.

The international coalition the president says he is assembling will be key, as other countries will be called upon to fund much of the effort, and, we hope, ground troops. Though the president has pledged significant air strikes, I find it hard to believe that many nations will be convinced to enter into the conflict with full commitment, while our own president has made it clear that the United States has firmly defined limits on what it will and will not do. That is another concern that I have—that the President has broadcast to the world, and the enemy, exactly what will not be in his war plan.

In the end, the President is the Commander in Chief, though I believe it is right that Congress vote on matters as important as this. The bottom line for me, Mr. Speaker, is that today we are all Americans. We are not Republicans or Democrats.

Throughout our history, presidents from different political parties have come to Congress

asking for our blessing for moving forward with armed conflict. With what I know now, and with the chance to continually examine this endeavor, I am prepared to give my consent.

That is why, despite my reservations and my concerns about the effectiveness of the somewhat vague strategy the president has outlined, I will be supporting the amendment to the Continuing Resolution. We must present a united front. It is vital that we show the world that all of us, as Americans, are together in fighting this common enemy.

Absolutely essential in gaining my support for the amendment is the requirement that the administration provide detailed and regular reports on the effectiveness and status of the ongoing training and equipping efforts. We must know that what we are doing is having the intended effect.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a perfect plan. And I worry that moving forward in such a way can be described as somewhat less than a full effort to defeat an evil that has pledged to exterminate us.

But sitting by and doing nothing was never an option.

While we take this vote, I am reminded that even with the most careful planning, any armed conflict is inherently perilous for the men and women in our military. My thoughts and prayers go with them and their families as they head toward danger.

I urge my colleagues to support the McKeon Amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Defense Secretary Hagel stated, ''We are at war with ISIL.'' He also said, ''this will not be an easy or brief effort.''

The current debate on the McKeon amendment does not address the ''war with ISIL,'' but rather solely training, arming, and supporting Syrian fighters. The CIA is already training and arming Syrian fighters in Jordan, without congressional approval. How well has that worked? We are not discussing that as a body because this is a policy debate that has been rushed. The Republican majority in the House is determined to adjourn on Friday so their Members can return home and campaign for re-election.

Yes, Congress needs to pass a continuing resolution to keep the federal government funded and prevent another government shutdown before the start of the new federal fiscal year on October 1st. But, a ''must pass'' continuing resolution should not be the legislative vehicle for sanctioning the training of Syrian fighters in what is certainly to be a long war against the Islamic State's terrorist army.

Over and over during the debate on this amendment we have heard how ISIL is a threat to the United States, expanding its reach into Iraq and strengthening its hold in Syria, while committing brutal and widespread acts of extreme violence. All Members agree that ISIL has grown into a vicious terrorist army that must be stopped and destroyed. Yet, this chamber's response is to vote on the McKeon amendment to train and arm Syrian fighters, and then leave town for seven weeks?

I have heard over and over again Republican colleagues condemning ISIL and then going on to disparage President Obama's efforts. Based on this rhetoric it appears that before this House can become fully engaged in authorizing a military campaign to defeat ISIL, campaigning against our President prior to Election Day comes first.

Yes, the mid-term election will take place on November 4th and many of us are on the ballot. But until then, we have an obligation to do our jobs which in this case is a matter of committing to U.S. military operations in Iraq and Syria based on an authorization that is outdated and demands Congressional action.

I want President Obama to conduct airstrikes against ISIL—in Iraq and in Syria if need be. I want Iraqi forces trained and equipped so they are confident and competent to take the fight on the ground to remove ISIL from Iraq. I want a broad coalition of nations sharing intelligence, working to stop the flow of foreign recruits into Syria, and cutting off the financing of ISIL.

All of this should be done based on an updated authorization approved by this Congress for the use of military force against ISIL. I voted for the 2001 authorization following the attacks on September 11th and I opposed the 2002 authorization which took the U.S. into Iraq. But today more than half of the Members in this House were not in Congress for those votes. The war against ISIL is not the war against Saddam Hussein. This Congress has an obligation to define the scope, duration, and oversight of what will require a significant and long-term use of military force and resources.

With regard to the McKeon amendment, I have serious misgivings about training and arming some thousands of Syrian fighters with the belief that they will defeat ISIL while they are also intent on removing the Assad regime from power. The New York Times on September 11, 2014 (''U.S. Pins Hopes on Syrian Rebels With Loyalties All Over the Map'') said the plan to train Syrian rebels ''leaves the United States dependent on a diverse group riven by infighting, with no shared leadership and with hard-line Islamists as its most effective fighters.'' This description of the fighting force at the foundation of our anti-ISIL policy leaves me profoundly disturbed.

The Government of Germany is training and arming the Kurdish pesh merga forces in Iraq, but refused to train the Syrian forces. They are concerned that providing arms to the Syrian rebels could end up in the hands of ISIL. According to Germany's ambassador to the United States, ''We can't control the final destination of these arms.''

Secretary Hagel is aware of this danger and assured Congress yesterday that, ''We will monitor them (Syrian forces) closely to ensure that weapons do not fall into the hands of radical elements of the opposition, ISIL, the Syrian regime, or other extremist groups. There will always be risks in a program like this, but we believe the risks are justified.'' While I respect Secretary Hagel immensely, I must disagree with him. The risks in this instance are significant and out weight the prospects of success.

The McKeon amendment's concept of vetting focuses solely on ensuring that recruits are not known terrorists themselves. That is hardly a standard of conduct the U.S. should be proud of. No one should be näive about this, there is no mention of human rights or international standards of conduct because these recruits will be sent back to a war in which they will likely be committing barbarous acts of violence. And how is this in the interest of U.S. national security?

Another issue that profoundly concerns me is the porous border between Syria and Turkey in which foreign fighters and recruits are allowed to pass freely. A New York Times report on September 15, 2014 in an article entitled, ''ISIS Draws a Steady Stream of Recruits From Turkey'', highlights this serious problem.

ISIL has grown into a force of between 20,000 and 30,000 fighters according to published CIA estimates and it appears their numbers will continue to grow, far outpacing the modest numbers to be trained by agreeing to this amendment. Unless Turkey, our NATO ally, shuts off the flow of fighters and commits to preventing the stream of new recruits from crossing into Syria, ISIL will only grow stronger in numbers.

Yesterday, in testimony before a Senate committee, General Martin Dempsey said that if airstrikes were not effective against ISIL he would recommend to the President the deployment of U.S. troops on the ground. Now, as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Dempsey has an obligation to make recommendations that will allow U.S. policy goals to be achieved. In this case that means the destruction of ISIL.

We should all expect that there will be some U.S. boots on the ground in Iraq and quite possibly Syria. Special operations forces, military trainers, and spotters to direct air strikes may all be required to enter the battle field at great risk. They need our support to achieve their missions. But a full commitment of U.S. troops on the ground to directly engage ISIL is unacceptable. This fight needs to be won on the ground by Iraqis and the Arab allies who know the risk ISIL poses to the entire region.

There is no reason why Congress cannot work with the administration, military leaders, and intelligence experts over the coming weeks to develop and approve the necessary authorization for the use of military force to demonstrate to the American people that we are united in this fight against ISIL and there are clear limits to our engagement in Iraq and Syria.

I want our Commander-in-Chief to have Congress' full support for a strategy to destroy ISIL, but I will not write a blank check to any president. Unfortunately, this amendment and the decision by Republican leadership to prioritize campaigning for re-election rather than passing a clear authorization to take the fight to ISIL should give the American people great concern about the priorities of this Congress.

Right now millions of people in Iraq and Syria are living under the oppressive, violent rule of ISIL. It is in our national interest to join the fight to stop their reign of terror. But we need real, credible allies with military forces willing to take on the fight, the fight on the ground. This amendment does not require a commitment by any other allied nations, only desperate Syrians and U.S. taxpayers. That is not enough to earn my support.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I will cast my vote to approve the President's funding request to support the training and equipping of moderate Syrian opposition forces. I do so after long consideration, and mindful of the difficulties of vetting such a force during the middle of a brutal civil war.

Any decision to supply arms to combatants must be weighed carefully; indeed, for the last several years I have opposed arming the Syrian rebels out of a concern for our ability to properly vet such troops and the fear that weapons we provide may end up in the wrong

hands. Those concerns persist, but they have been overcome by the growing menace of ISIL and the willingness of our regional allies to play a greater—and open—role in the support of these forces.

ISIL now controls about a third of Iraq and a like portion of Syria. It has been unsurpassed in its brutality, committing mass executions, forced conversions, trafficking in women and beheading its hostages—including Americans James Foley and Steven Sotlof. If ISIL is allowed to consolidate its territorial gains, or expand them, it will be able to act on its stated intention of serving as the platform for attacks on the United States. The thousands of foreign fighters, including Americans, who have flocked to join its ranks will one day attempt to return to the west and attack us on the homeland. The longer ISIL can draw new recruits, the longer the United States will have to confront the threat that these fighters will return home, many with visa-free travel to our shores.

Our response must be proportionate to the threat. It does not justify American occupation of Iraq or Syria, or the introduction of American ground forces—all of which are likely to be counterproductive. It does justify the use of American air power, intelligence, financial, diplomatic and military support. And since air power alone will not be sufficient on the battlefield, it will necessitate the assistance of local ground forces. In the case of Iraq, those ground forces will be provided by the Iraqi military and Kurdish Peshmerga. In Syria, with rigorous vetting, training and support, the rebel opposition may provide the raw material for a credible military force. There is no guarantee that the Syrian opposition can form a cohesive fighting force, something that has thus far eluded them, but the open support of Gulf nations in housing and funding this opposition holds the promise of consolidating regional support behind them.

The threat posed by ISIL is an outgrowth of the disastrously sectarian policies of the Nouri al-Maliki regime in Baghdad and the ruthless dictatorship of the Bashar al-Asad in Damascus. Our military efforts and those of our allies alone cannot succeed without addressing the political fractures created by both. I applaud the Administration for its role in urging the Iraqis to form a new and more inclusive government and look forward to the day when a representative government can take shape in neighboring Syria and this carnage can come to an end.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the McKeon Amendment to H.J. Res. 124. This is a difficult decision because there are no good options for American intervention in Iraq and Syria. However, ISIL is a barbaric group that poses a direct threat to our national interests and it is our obligation to respond in an appropriate fashion to this new threat. I believe the counterterrorism strategy laid out by President Obama represents the best way to combat ISIL without committing our country to another costly, deadly ground war in the Middle East.

This amendment is not a declaration of war, or an authorization for the use of military force. Rather, it is a limited effort to train and equip members of the moderate Syrian opposition who have been vetted by our government. I am confident that the limitations and the reporting requirements in the resolution will ensure sufficient oversight, ensuring the mission does not expand beyond congressional intent.

Americans are weary of war. Any efforts to expand our role in this conflict should be openly debated in Congress. Yet, we cannot turn our back on the threat ISIL poses to our allies in the region, and the humanitarian catastrophe they helped create. I will be closely watching this mission as it unfolds to ensure it remains limited in scope and in line with our national interest.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the Amendment to H.J. Res. 124, the Continuing Resolution, that supports training and equipping the so-called Syrian Opposition.

After attending briefings on the President's proposal, I do not believe that this Amendment has a reasonable chance of achieving his goals. Worse, it could embroil America in another endless war. I hate ISIL and the other terrorist organizations that are plaguing Syria, Iraq and eventually the U.S.; the question is whether this Amendment will ''degrade and destroy'' them, to use the President's words. I do not fault President Obama's intent; I doubt this particular Amendment will work. Most obviously, it expires in 90 days, according to the very terms of the CR. And even if, under authority granted outside of this Amendment, an air strike killed ISIL's leader, it would not stop ISIL.

First, remember the budgetary context of this train-and-equip mission. Remember that military spending cuts called ''sequestration'' will last another seven years under current law. The readiness of our military is already threatened by these cuts. Necessary long-term investments in future weapons systems are being shortchanged. Until advocates of this train-and-equip mission are willing to fully fund the U.S. military and stop sequestration, they have no business adding extra responsibilities. America's credit-card hawks must not continue to hollow out our military while pursuing questionable foreign ventures.

Second, the Syrian Opposition is not like the Peshmerga. It is a number of disorganized, unreliable and shifting groups that face three hostile armies at once within Syria itself: Assad's army, ISIL, and the Al-Nusra Front. Each of these hostile armies has demonstrated the ability to conduct advanced military operations. They are years ahead of any possible effective counter-attack by the Syrian Opposition, unless they start fighting each other or Assad's entire military defects. We are not even sure that the people we train would remain loyal. Although the Amendment talks about vetting Syrian Opposition forces, it acknowledges that there will be ''green-on-blue'' violence against us. The Amendment also anticipates that some of the weapons we supply to the Opposition will be given or sold to ISIL.

Third, we are entering a series of civil wars. They are notoriously difficult to stop without years of bloodshed. The idea that U.S. Army training, guns, and bullets will facilitate a negotiated Syrian settlement is highly implausible. Another factor is the 1,400-year-old Sunni-Shia schism, giving our Muslim allies their own religious agendas. They make excuses for their failure to commit their own forces in their own backyards, even when their inaction floods their nations with refugees. Several of these nations have large militaries with advanced weaponry, which they refuse to use except for very limited, anonymous airstrikes. They want U.S. soldiers and airmen to do their dirty work.

Fourth, ISIL was created by wealthy Sunnis in nations like Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and Kuwait who wanted an attack dog, a proxy army, to fight the Shia threat posed by Iran, Syria, Hamas, and Hezbollah. They got more than they bargained for: a pit bull that might turn against its masters. Nevertheless, they are not muzzling ISIL, or even yanking its leash. How does ISIL continue to get its funding? Aside from rape, pillage, kidnapping, and taxing infidels, it is known for its slick corporate appeals, even an annual report on its atrocities. Have the Sunni nations punished ISIL's benefactors, refused to purchase ISIL's oil, or taken other measures to cut off its funding? No. In the case of Saudi Arabia, they offer us unused training bases for no more than 10,000 of the Syrian Opposition. That is far from enough.

Fifth, how many times must the U.S. try to rebuild Muslim nations? We've tried for years, often just inflaming them. Syria will be the eighth Muslim nation we have tried to repair in the last three decades: Kuwait, Bosnia, Kosovo, Somalia, Iraq, Afghanistan, and Yemen. In most cases, we have not succeeded. The U.S. military is ill-suited for nation-building. As General Bob Scales pointed out in the Wall Street Journal recently, the Pentagon has trouble dealing with today's asymmetric wars.

Sixth, ask yourself what your reaction will be if an American airman—God forbid—is captured and beheaded on live television. Will this Amendment, that so carefully denies authorizing military force, suddenly become the prelude to American ''boots on the ground'' as Gen. Martin Dempsey has already predicted? And who believes that our trainers and equippers—and special forces and intelligence officers—are not already ''boots on the ground''? The language of the Amendment is surreal: it contains no ''authorization for the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations wherein hostilities are clearly indicated by the circumstances.'' Unless our military operates entirely outside of Syria or northern Iraq, they are in imminent danger. And if they are training in Saudi Arabia, they will be working in a nation that beheads more people for minor crimes than ISIL could dream of.

Lastly, is there a better way to degrade and destroy ISIL? Americans, with our wonderful optimism that all problems have a quick solution, have a lot to learn about the nature of the enemies we face. Unfortunately for us, our enemies do not measure action by the clock, but by the calendar. They outwait or outlast us. They use social media against us, to dare America to fight or to recruit the West's disaffected youth with dreams of martyrdom. They will laugh that this Amendment lasts only 90 days, particularly when other sections of the CR extend much longer.

America needs to understand the threats we face from radical jihadists and to fully fund effective strategies for dealing with them. Sadly, this Amendment does neither. Therefore, I oppose it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the amendment will be followed by 5-minute votes on a motion to recommit, if ordered; passage of H.J. Res. 124, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 273, nays 156, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 507]

YEAS—273

Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boehner
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Farenthold
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holding
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Hultgren
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lynch
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pittenger
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)

NAYS—156

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bentivolio
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Cooper
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dent
DeSantis
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fincher
Fleming
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Himes
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurt
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Labrador
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meadows
Meng
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Nolan
Nugent
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perry
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (GA)
Rangel
Ribble
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Rothfus
Rush
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Weber (TX)
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wolf
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—3

Barton
DesJarlais
Nunnelee

□ 1707

Mr. RANGEL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. STIVERS, CONYERS, and HINOJOSA changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mrs. BUSTOS. I am opposed to it in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Bustos moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 124 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 21, lines 4 and 5, strike "June 30, 2015" and insert "September 30, 2021".

At the end of the joint resolution (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) The provisions of the following bills of the 113th Congress are hereby enacted into law:

(1) H.R. 377, as introduced in the House of Representatives on January 23, 2013 (the Paycheck Fairness Act).

(2) H.R. 1010, as introduced in the House of Representatives on March 6, 2013 (the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2013).

(3) H.R. 4582, as introduced in the House of Representatives on May 6, 2014, except sections 3 and 4 of such bill (the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act).

(b) The provisions of an Act enacted in subsection (a) shall be effective, notwithstanding any other provision of such Act, as of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

(c) The provisions of an Act enacted in subsection (a) shall have no force or effect after December 11, 2014, and, effective after such date, the provisions of law amended by such Act shall be restored as if such Act had not been enacted.

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this joint resolution may be used to enter into any contract with an incorporated entity if such entity's sealed bid or competitive proposal shows that such entity is incorporated or chartered in Bermuda or the Cayman Islands, and such entity's sealed bid or competitive proposal shows that such entity was previously incorporated in the United States.

Mrs. BUSTOS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not delay or kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will proceed immediately to final passage, as amended.

This amendment reinforces our commitment to the middle class and making sure that jobs are created right here in America, not overseas, by taking five key steps.

First, it would extend the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank for 7

years. Illinois companies like John Deere and Caterpillar, as well as large and small businesses across our country, deserve the certainty that a long-term reauthorization would provide.

Second, it would help ensure that employers provide equal pay for equal work. Equal pay is not simply a women's issue. It is an issue for all in the middle class. With households being led by women, equal pay will help those families get further ahead. Boosting women's earnings also will increase the purchasing power of families and will help our economy.

Third, my amendment will make the minimum wage a living wage. The cost of living has skyrocketed in recent years, but wages have remained stagnant. Working full time, year round at Illinois' $8.25 minimum wage will earn a worker only $16,500 per year, a salary that is below the Federal poverty line.

Raising the minimum wage would not only lift many families out of poverty, but it would also increase the earning power of households across the country, leading to an increase in overall economic activity.

Fourth, my amendment would allow students with outstanding student loan debt to refinance their loans at the lower interest rates that are currently offered to borrowers. Student loan debt not only harms young people and prevents them from reaching their personal financial potential, such as purchasing a home and starting a family, but it is deadweight, pulling down our entire economy and preventing economic growth.

Fifth, and finally, my amendment would prevent government contracts from going to companies that have moved their operations overseas. The government should not be giving taxpayer dollars to companies that ship jobs overseas and take advantage of corporate inversions to avoid paying their fair share.

These five commonsense elements would strengthen the middle class and help create jobs right here in America. Too many families are struggling, and enough is enough. For too long, lawmakers have been looking out for themselves instead of looking out for the middle class.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion to recommit.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, this is a clean, straightforward continuing resolution that has bipartisan and bicameral support. It is our best, most clear path forward to keep the lights on in our Federal Government before the fiscal year ends.

The American people rely on the Federal Government to provide certain vital programs and services, and they expect the Congress to come together to ensure these programs continue.

Now, I would prefer to be standing here, presenting a bill that finalizes the hard work of this body to fund the entire government for the entire fiscal year. Unfortunately, the other body has refused to live up to their end of the equation.

They have yet to pass or even consider a single appropriations bill through their Chamber. Because the Senate leaves us with no alternative, we must replace politics with responsibility and pass the CR before us.

□ 1715

This motion to recommit only increases the possibility of a government shutdown, ignoring the tireless efforts of Members on both sides of the aisle to keep that from happening.

The motion to recommit would also put our national security at stake. With the addition of the McKeon amendment, this bill now provides authority to train and equip Syrian rebels to help degrade and destroy the terrorist organization ISIL.

Sadly, the minority is trying to hijack the process at the eleventh hour. They have reached deep into their grab bag of partisan agenda items in an attempt to attach, without fair consideration, sweeping policy changes that could place undue burdens on our economy, an effort that is designed to do nothing but score political points.

Funding our government and defeating ISIL are of grave national importance, and they are too important to risk over political maneuvers like this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to vote ''no'' on the motion and ''yes'' on final. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 228, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 508]

AYES—199

Barber
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
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
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
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
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
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, 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

NOES—228

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (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
Jolly
Jones
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)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
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)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
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
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—4

Barton
DesJarlais
Nunnelee
Woodall

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1723

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 319, noes 108, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 509]

AYES—319

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doyle
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Marino
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—108

Amash
Bachmann
Bentivolio
Blackburn
Bridenstine
Broun (GA)
Capuano
Chabot
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Cooper
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeSantis
Doggett
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Fincher
Fleming
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hurt
Jeffries
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kennedy
Labrador
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lowenthal
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
Matheson
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
Meadows
Meng
Michaud
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Nadler
Neugebauer
Nugent
O'Rourke
Pallone
Payne
Perry
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Rangel
Ribble
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Rothfus
Salmon
Sanford
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Slaughter
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Velázquez
Weber (TX)
Welch
Westmoreland
Williams
Wittman
Yoho

NOT VOTING—4

Barton
DesJarlais
McCarthy (NY)
Nunnelee

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1731

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently voted on rollcall 509, H.J. Res. 124. I intended to vote "yes" on rollcall 509, H.J. Res. 124.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEWART). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS WHO COMMIT, THREATEN TO COMMIT, OR SUPPORT TERRORISM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113–155)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, is to continue in effect beyond September 23, 2014.

The crisis constituted by the grave acts of terrorism and threats of terrorism committed by foreign terrorists, including the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, in New York and Pennsylvania and against the Pentagon, and the continuing and immediate threat of further attacks on United States nationals or the United States that led to the declaration of a national emergency on September 23, 2001, has not been resolved. These actions continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13224 with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 17, 2014*.

CONSTITUTION DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Constitution Day, which is celebrated today, September 17. On this day, we commemorate the day our Framers, 39 delegates from 12 States, signed our Nation's charter at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in 1787.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution is more than just a document; it is the enduring structure of our Nation's government. It is a distinctive system of checks and balances, separation of powers, and protection of freedoms that has defined and guided our Nation since its founding.

Today we reiterate the values of freedom, justice, and opportunity that have provided America with generations of prosperity. Today we honor the Framers of our Constitution and the principles they put forth more than 227 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, the future of our Nation is strong if we continue to hold these principles dear.

Happy Constitution Day.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, September 15, 2014, I was unavoidably detained attending representational activities and thus unable to return in time for rollcall vote No. 497.

I would like the record to reflect that, had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on rollcall vote No. 497, H.R. 5108, to establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes.

RETIREMENT OF JUDGE MICHAEL NASH

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the retirement of an incredible man and a dear friend, Los Angeles Superior Court Judge Michael Nash.

As presiding judge of the juvenile court for more than 16 years, a total of 29 years on the bench, his retirement is a huge loss for the community and for the Los Angeles judicial system.

During his tenure, he brought numerous changes to the juvenile court: the creation of a drug court in both delinquency and dependency courts, the development of protocols to foster communication and coordination between the courts, and simple changes such as lowering the judge's bench so that children in his court could better participate in the proceedings.

While I know Judge Nash will always continue to be a champion for children and families, I want to thank him for his distinguished career and congratulate him on his well-earned retirement.

CONSTITUTION DAY

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 227th birthday of the Constitutional Convention and the creation of America's most cherished document—our Constitution. Today is Constitution Day.

On September 17, 1787, our Founding Fathers, 39 brave Americans, created a document that to this day is the foundation of our country and is admired by people around the world.

The British statesman William Gladstone said of our Constitution:

> The American Constitution is, so far as I can see, the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man.

I wholeheartedly agree with this statement. The Framers established a new form of government that for the first time respected the rights of the individual. No longer would a king or dictator rule over their citizens. The power of the government would derive from the consent of the governed.

Responsibility of good governance is not just placed on the political leaders but on the participation of those citizens who have voted for them. Benjamin Franklin, when asked outside of Independence Hall by a curious woman as to what sort of government was created:

> A republic, ma'am, if you dare keep it.

PREVENTING THE EPIDEMIC OF SUICIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, September is Suicide Prevention Month, a time for our Nation to raise awareness about the persistent scourge of suicide.

Tens of thousands of Americans die each year purposefully by their own actions. They are our neighbors and our friends, our sons and our daughters, and too often they are the men and women who have served our country honorably in the United States military. An estimated 22 veterans commit suicide every day in our country. That is one life lost every 65 minutes.

One year ago, we came together in this Chamber during a special bipartisan order to send a clear message that this epidemic of veteran suicide must end. Now, 1 year later, the fight isn't over and more work needs to be done.

Tonight we demonstrate our ongoing support for the individuals, organizations, and agencies devoted to preventing the epidemic of veteran suicide, and we challenge the VA, the Department of Defense, and our fellow lawmakers to do more. We are failing in our obligation to do right by those who have served so honorably.

Finally, we send a message to military families who have experienced this tragedy: Your family's loss is not forgotten. We will work to stop this epidemic. We work for the memory of your loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend and colleague from Florida, Representative YOHO.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a quick moment again to thank my colleague, Representative SINEMA, for the invitation to speak today on the very important issue of veteran suicide prevention. She has been a true champion of improving access to quality care for our Nation's veterans and has been a leader in Congress pushing for the real reforms to combat veteran suicide.

By shining a light on veteran suicide rates of approximately 22 per day, we as a nation can start to understand the urgency with which we need to solve and prevent this epidemic that our veterans, their families, and their friends struggle with daily. Not coping with the stress and anxiety early enough all too often leads to the veterans taking their own life.

I want to be clear: this is not an issue that affects veterans alone; it affects all of us.

Our government asked these soldiers to place themselves in harm's way, and if when a veteran returns home they are struggling to cope, we as a nation must come together to ensure a strong support system is in place. This means we must remove the stigma associated with seeking help. This means we must hire more mental health professionals and more who have served in combat zones themselves. This means the VA must provide after-hours services. The VA must review its group therapy model. There must be a review of discharges that resulted from mental health conditions, and the Department of Defense and VA must better coordinate the transition from DOD care to VA care.

□ 1745

I have spoken with veterans throughout my district and a common theme that emerges is that they have lost faith in the VA. They feel abandoned by the very system, the very country which they fought for to preserve and to protect the liberties and freedoms we have the privileges of experiencing daily.

I had a young man send me a letter directly to my house, and I want to share some of it. He said he had been seeking care. He had served in the gulf war. He was in his mid-forties, and he had been seeking care over the course of the last 10 years. Time and time again his appointments had either been canceled or rescheduled, and he had gotten to a point where he tried to get care and over the last 13 appointments they were canceled or rescheduled. He ended the letter pleading for help, and he said that if I do not get the help and care that I need, because I have nowhere else to turn, that I am afraid I am either going to hurt somebody or myself.

We reached out to this young man, we had him come into our office, and I could see a troubled individual that had given up on life and had no hope for the future. We intervened for this young man, we called the VA system, and they got him in that night. Since then, I am happy to report that the man has called us and said it was a life-changing experience for him and he could only imagine what would have happened had he not gotten interdiction.

Congress and the VA are working to solve these deficiencies so that our soldiers have the care they need. But it should not take an act of Congress, or a Congressman or -women, to intercede on behalf of a veteran to get the care they earned, need, and deserve. I know myself and my colleagues will do what is needed to fix the shortcomings of the DOD and the VA system.

America and Americans cannot sit idly by and bear witness to the path of devastation and destruction left in the wake of a veteran suicide for their family and friends to deal with.

I thank my colleague for bringing this very important subject to light. We all need to work in a bipartisan fashion to solve this. I thank my colleague.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Representative YOHO, for your leadership and, in particular, thank you for sharing the story of a veteran that your office helped.

We hear countless stories from Members of Congress in this very body of veterans who reach out to our offices, sometime as a last resort as they are facing or contemplating suicide. I am proud to say that many Members of this body have done what it has taken to help those individuals recover and stay in touch.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to turn the time over to my colleague from Arizona, Mr. RON BARBER, for his remarks.

Mr. BARBER. Thank you, Congresswoman, and thank you for bringing us together this evening on this important topic.

I represent 85,000 veterans in my district, one of the largest communities of veterans in the country. My father was a veteran of World War II, Korea, and Vietnam. He would be appalled if he were alive today to see what has been happening at the Veterans Affairs Department in our State and in other parts of the country. I am really proud that this Congress has taken action to address those concerns to give the Secretary the authority he needs to address those concerns.

Mr. Speaker, nearly a decade and a half of brutal conflict overseas has taken its toll on our men and women who serve in the Armed Forces. I was in Afghanistan about 3 months ago, and I saw the conditions under which our military operates. The stress is immense. Everywhere you go there is a threat. Extended deployments and multiple deployments have taken their toll on people we have sent to protect our country and to fight the battles we asked them to fight.

It is estimated that perhaps as many as 500,000 veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan will return home, when all is said and done, with serious wounds, the wounds that are signature wounds of these conflicts: posttraumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury.

Military service creates a culture that demands that our soldiers are tough, and the culture can also prevent many of our servicemembers from seeking the help they need. As a result, they are left to face the ghosts of war alone.

The suicide rate among our country's brave servicemen and -women and veterans is at a frightening level. Some estimates have shown that as many as 22 veterans take their own lives every day.

We must combat military and veteran suicide with the same conviction that we take on the enemy of war because it is killing our men and women in and out of uniform. We must wage a well-funded, well-planned campaign to fight this heartbreaking epidemic.

I have been pushing for better access to health care for our veterans since I came to Congress almost 2½ years ago.

One of the first bills I introduced was the Veterans Health Access Act to ensure that veterans could get the mental health care that they needed in communities without having to endure long commutes and even longer wait times at VA facilities.

Government dysfunction cannot be the enemy of our servicemen and veterans. We must do more to cut the red tape that has kept our veterans from top quality mental health care. I am pleased that the VA bill that we passed allows the VA to contract out for services close to where the veteran lives. This is essential, particularly for treatment of mental health issues.

Mr. Speaker, we must do more for those who have borne the brunt of war. We must come together—Congress, the administration, the health care community, mental health experts—to build upon a plan that will help our veterans who have served this Nation so courageously and yet may still be suffering.

Again, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for bringing this to the House floor this evening. I stand ready to work with her and all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do what we can for our veterans, not only in Arizona, but nationwide.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Mr. BARBER, for your commitment to supporting veterans in Arizona.

Last year, I shared with you the story of a young veteran in my district, Sergeant Daniel Somers. Sergeant Somers was an Army veteran of two tours in Iraq. Diagnosed with a traumatic brain injury and PTSD, Sergeant Somers ultimately took his own

life after struggling with the VA bureaucracy and not getting the help he needed in time.

Together with the Somers family, we have worked to prevent veteran suicide and improve much-needed access to mental health care for our veterans.

We have recently developed the Classified Veterans Access to Care Act to ensure that all veterans, including those with classified experiences, get immediate access to mental health services in the appropriate care setting.

The House Veterans' Affairs Committee included this legislation in a larger veterans package, and we expect it to be on the floor before the end of the year.

While this is an important step in supporting our veterans, we have much more work to do.

I would like to take a moment to yield the floor to the gentleman from California, Representative LAMALFA, my friend and colleague.

Mr. LAMALFA. Thank you. I appreciate my colleague from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) for your efforts on this.

When you become a Member of the House of Representatives and you start receiving those calls from veterans in your district on the difficulty they have with what they thought they were promised by their government when they enlisted, when they went into the military, it really, really hits home. It really affects your heart to see these veterans who have struggled to at least be heard for their claims, for their health care, by the VA, by the treatment centers.

We have to do better than that. To see the suicide rate among veterans the way it is, to know that they felt like the government has turned their backs on them, is appalling. We have to give them the hope.

My office, I know my colleagues that have spoken here tonight, have turned towards helping as much as they can. So my message, just a brief message, for our veterans out there: Do not give up. Know that we are trying to reform the VA system, trying to reform through the measures that have been brought up the way the VA treats and gets the help for veterans who have served us.

They made a promise to us. We need to keep the promise to them. For them to go feeling hopeless and that nobody cares about them, that they can't get treatment, is one of the biggest shames we could have as a country. We have asked them to do a lot. We will continue to do so in the future. We need to be prepared to take care of them properly, if they need it, when they come home.

I appreciate, again, you having this time here tonight, Ms. SINEMA, here in the House to put a spotlight on this as you have. What I have tried to do in my office and the hard work by my own staff is to have our veterans be treated respectfully but also feel hopeful that someone hears their message, hears their plea, and then will address their needs timely and respectfully. They should not be homeless, they should not feel to the point of hopelessness that suicide is an alternative for them.

Thank you, Ms. SINEMA.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Representative LAMALFA, for your commitment to veterans. Your comment and your message to veterans of don't give up is one that I think we must all repeat every day, not just in words, but in our actions as Members of Congress to continue to reform the VA system and send a clear message to veterans that we won't give up either in reforming the system and taking care of them.

Earlier this evening, I shared the story of Sergeant Daniel Somers. The VA failed Sergeant Somers. We have since learned that the VA has failed thousands of other veterans through gross mismanagement and delays in access to care.

Veterans at the Phoenix VA and VA facilities across the country were placed on secret lists and had to wait months before seeing a doctor.

The Department of Veterans Affairs Office of Inspector General's final report on the Phoenix VA Health Care System, which was released last month, confirms that the Phoenix VA, housed in my district, left 3,500 veterans at risk of never receiving care. Additionally, 1,400 veterans on the official electronic waiting list were left waiting for unacceptably long periods of care. At least 20 veterans who failed to receive timely or appropriate care passed away.

Mr. Speaker, this is immoral, un-American, and it puts our veterans at risk. But in Arizona, we are not idly waiting for Washington to take action, we are taking action ourselves.

In Phoenix, we have established a working group of community providers, veterans service organizations, and the local VA to work together to improve access to services. We also recently cohosted our first Veterans First Clinic, which brought together community providers, the Phoenix VA, and over 20 veteran-serving organizations to help veterans in a variety of ways. Approximately 400 veterans and their families attended and got the care that they earned and that they deserve.

These are examples of the good that results when we set aside partisanship and focus instead on putting veterans first to help meet their needs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share a story from my district. Last month, a local veteran, Peter, came to our district office. He came to ask for help with his claims and for help navigating the VA.

After meeting with my social work staff for 2 hours, Peter told one of my caseworkers that he had thoughts of suicide and he had the ability to carry out those thoughts. In fact, he said, the only thing keeping him from doing so was his daughters.

Our office met with Peter for an additional 2 hours, listening to him share his feelings and focusing on solutions and next steps. We shared with him our veterans resource guide, which let him know about available community programs and organizations dedicated to supporting veterans with services that range from mental health treatment to financial assistance.

Peter told us he had no idea there were so many organizations that support local veterans, and he left our office that day feeling better than when he had arrived.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke with him personally just a few days later. He told me he had never heard of an office that would respond and care about his suicidal ideation, his depression, and his needs. I am grateful that Peter came to our office. I am even more grateful that we were able to help him.

Since meeting with Peter and other veterans in our district, we have released a veterans resource guide for the Ninth Congressional District in Arizona, a comprehensive 27-page document that provides local veterans with detailed information about community resources that are available to them. We hope that this resource guide will be replicated in districts across the country.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, the issue of veteran suicide and the systemic problems in the VA system require a substantial local and national effort. My colleagues here today believe, as I believe, that no one who comes home after serving our country should ever feel like he or she has nowhere to turn.

In response to the VA crisis, Congress recently passed and the President signed into law the Veterans Access to Care Through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act. This legislation makes needed reforms to the VA health care system and will ensure that Arizona veterans get access to the care that they have earned.

The Veterans Access to Care Through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act builds on our work to address the crisis in Phoenix by allowing veterans who have been waiting for medical care for more than 30 days to receive care from non-VA doctors.

It authorizes the VA to fire senior managers who knew about these cover-ups across the country. It reviews scheduling systems and technology so that fewer veterans slip through the cracks when seeking care.

It provides resources for more physicians and medical staff to work in VA hospitals around the country; also, it creates an independent commission to investigate the Veterans Administration to find out what went wrong and evaluate access to care throughout the VA health care system.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation was an important step forward, but more action is required. The first step is speedy and effective implementation of this important bill. I urge the VA and agencies locally who are working with

the VA to speed the implementation of this important legislation and show a change of culture at the VA. We all believe that veterans deserve the best possible care.

Carl McLaughlin, a 38-year-old Army veteran, committed suicide on December 19, 2013. He had been stationed in Bosnia, and he was released from the Army on a medical discharge in 2004.

Starting in 2006, Carl was treated at the Phoenix VA, but, as time went on, it became increasingly difficult for Carl to see his doctor. According to Carl's mother, Terry, at the time of his death, Carl was waiting to hear back from the Phoenix VA to have his medications adjusted and to see his doctor.

Carl suffered from recurring pain caused by shoulder injury, severe hearing loss, depression, and posttraumatic stress disorder. His depression worsened over time.

Terry, Carl's mom, told us:

> The last time I saw Carl was a few days before his death. He looked really depressed, and I asked him if he had a doctor's appointment scheduled because I know he had been waiting over 4 weeks for a call back from the doctor's office. He said, no, he was still waiting.
>
> He called them the next day, six times, and left three messages. He was put on hold and hung up on the other three times. This problem of calling and being hung up on and not getting calls back had been going on for over 1 to 2 years.

Terry asked us to share her son's story in the hope that his tragedy doesn't happen to another family.

Recently, I cosponsored legislation called the Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act. This bill reviews mental health staffing requirements and increases the ability of the VA to recruit and train psychiatrists. Congress should pass this legislation this year to make it easy for veterans like Carl to see a behavioral health specialist.

Mr. Speaker and Members, I want to thank my colleagues who joined me this evening. Our thoughts are with the families who have lost a loved one. Each of us can do something to raise awareness, to be that light for a struggling veteran in our community.

Businesses can display signs to let veterans know that help is always available to them. Mental health professionals can volunteer with organizations like Give an Hour to provide free counseling to veterans, their family members, and active duty members and their families.

We can all learn to recognize the signs of crisis by visiting veteranscrisisline.net and then reaching out to the veterans in our lives.

Here in Congress, we can do more. We need a VA that provides real and meaningful help to veterans in need and that puts veterans first and works aggressively with community providers to improve the quality and accessibility of care. We need a VA that is transparent and open to restore the trust and credibility it has lost.

We who enjoy our freedom every day, thanks to the sacrifices of our military servicemembers, must all step up to end the epidemic of veteran suicide.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LET'S END VETERAN SUICIDE

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, few things we do here are more important than taking care of the men and women who have fought to protect our Nation. Doing something about the issue of suicide is incredibly important.

Not so very long ago, I had the opportunity to talk to a person that I had known for a very long time who I had met while serving in the legislature and who told me that his son, who was a veteran, had come back and was doing fine; yet, one day, he got the phone call that his son had committed suicide. No family should go through that.

Here in the Congress, we have an opportunity to do something about that. It is my hope that Congress, working in a bipartisan fashion, can work together to do something about this problem and to take better care across the board of the men and women who have fought every day, day in and day out, to serve our country.

ISLAMIC JIHAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I expect that, shortly, a colleague will be here that I will hand off to for a few minutes to deal with several housekeeping issues, but, for the moment that I have, I want to focus on an issue that has gained the attention—as well it should—of the American people.

The number one duty of government, Mr. Speaker, is to secure the safety and the security of the American people. That is why we have a government. That is why we exist. It is the reason why countries enjoy sovereignty and declare themselves sovereign nations.

That means they are a separate political unit, and they exist for the purpose of preserving the safety and security of their people. That is our duty, and that is our government.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, throughout each generation that somehow, some way, there is a force that comes against a nation. In different eras, we have had different foes that the United States has had to contend with, beginning at our founding, when the United States of America, through our Declaration of Independence and through our Constitution, on this, our Constitution Day—and, by the way, we say happy Constitution Day to all Americans. We are very proud of our United States Constitution.

Contained within the Constitution is the admonition to the President, to the Congress, to the Supreme Court, again, to ensure that, in our founding document, we understand that it is the duty of the government to secure the safety and the security of the American people.

What led up to the writing of the Declaration of Independence and to the American Revolution and, ultimately, to America's founding document with the United States Constitution was a reaction of the colonists against a great totalitarian oppression that was coming against the United States. That was from the British motherland of which the United States was a colony of.

We pushed back against that oppression for many and sundry reasons, some of which were taxation, others were the taking away the rights of American citizens, whether it was forcing American citizens to take soldiers into their homes or taking away their rights as free men under the Magna Carta.

The American people rose up, and they said, ''We want to have freedom.'' They threw off the chains of the totalitarianism of the day, the British Empire.

Going further into the future with the War of 1812, again, the United States was pushed into a conflict with the British, and, again, we had to throw off that enemy. Again, we saw our own house come apart in the time of the Civil War. There was also the Spanish-American War.

The United States was engaged in a great totalitarianism in 1917 with World War I and, again, in World War II. There was a conflict in the totalitarianism of our day. It was an evil known as Communism, both from the Soviet threat and also from Nazism.

The United States came together as a Nation. We threw off the yoke of the oppressor, of the totalitarianism of our day—in other words, a regime that had an idea that it wanted to conquer the world with its evil and immoral philosophy, whether it was Communism or whether it was Nazism.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, that every generation is confronted by a great evil, and the moral questions of the day are related to that evil. The evil, Mr. Speaker, that we are dealing with today is something known as Islamic jihad.

Its face is ugly. Its face has reared not only just in recent decades and just the last few months of this summer, but Islamic jihad is something that has been around as long as the inception of Islam itself.

The regime of jihad has been defeated, summarily, time and time again throughout history, but it was defeated through military might, it wasn't defeated through diplomacy, and defeated it was.

It was defeated at Tours; it was defeated at the battle of the gates of Vienna; it was defeated again with the

collapse of the Ottoman Empire in the 1920s; but it was defeated militarily. It was an idea that had grisly consequences. Those consequences were ones that led to bloodshed and suffering and misery for thousands of people across the world. Today is no different.

Today, we see the same level of bloodshed across the world. That bloodshed is coming to us, again, at the tip of the sword. This summer, it is known as the Islamic State. Some people know it as ISIS. Some people know it by the name ISIL. The President uses the term ''ISIL.''

This organization is just a continuation of al Qaeda—and a continuation of something even greater than al Qaeda—and that is the concept known as Islamic jihad.

Baghdadi, the head of the Islamic State, initially called them ISIS, which means the Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham, or Syria.

□ 1815

That was the territory that Baghdadi was seeking to conquer. He did, in fact, conquer much of that territory.

Then he changed the name of his organization to ISIL, the Islamic State in the Levant. The Levant is a geographical area that is greater than Syria and Iraq. It would comprise much of eastern Turkey, Israel, Gaza, Lebanon, and so forth, the greater area, if you will, of the central Mediterranean area.

After that, the Islamic State issued yet another press release with yet another name change. And in the course of that name change, the Islamic State decided to drop the IS and the IL, and now they are known simply as the Islamic State.

That is because the ambitions, Mr. Speaker, of Baghdadi and the Islamic State are far grander than just Iraq or just Syria or just eastern Turkey or Israel or Lebanon or Jordan or Gaza—far bigger.

The Islamic State, you see, Mr. Speaker, encompasses the entire globe, the planet Earth. Every part of this Earth, you see, Mr. Speaker, is what is intended. It is the ultimate in totalitarianism—what the Communists planned for, which was for control of the world under the umbrella of communism, and saw themselves ultimately defeated militarily; and again, what the Nazis saw, Mr. Speaker, as control of the world, national socialism through the Nazi Party movement and, ultimately, were defeated militarily.

So too, Mr. Speaker, the Islamic State sees their evil, violent, cruel, bloody philosophy also would encompass the Earth. That would include the United States of America. That would include, obviously, our great ally Israel. It would encompass all of North America. It would also cover the Asian nations. The entire world now, Mr. Speaker, is at threat from this totalitarianism.

And often it is said, never despise small beginnings. It is breathtaking, Mr. Speaker, what we have seen accomplished by the Islamic State. The leader, again, is a man named Baghdadi.

Baghdadi was a part of the franchise known as al Qaeda in Iraq. Al Qaeda began—we know about Osama bin Laden. Well, an affiliate of Osama bin Laden was the man named Baghdadi, who is the current head of the Islamic State.

Baghdadi, when he was a part of the franchise, al Qaeda in Iraq, was number three. We were able to target and kill number one and number two in the power structure in Iraq. That left Baghdadi as the next in command.

Baghdadi decided not only did he want to be the leader of al Qaeda in Iraq, he wanted so much more. But, you see, Baghdadi was waylaid for a period of time in his life. Why? Because Baghdadi was captured by the United States. He was found to be a terrorist. He was held in detention in Camp Baka in Iraq.

So we had him, the leader of the Islamic State, the organization responsible for the beheadings of Americans, the American photojournalist James Foley and the American photojournalist James Sotloff and, this Saturday, the beheading of another British journalist. Baghdadi is responsible for all of that and so much more.

Baghdadi was responsible for ordering the murdering of literally hundreds and thousands of individuals in Iraq. We saw Baghdadi line up hundreds of soldiers in Iraq, Iraqi soldiers, and they were brutally and mercilessly murdered, being shot in the back.

We also saw additional beheadings occur, and we saw also as they chased the Yazidis up Mount Sinjar. We also heard the horrific tales of how the merciless Islamic State literally stooped so low that they buried alive women and children in graves in August.

Mr. Speaker, I despise being as graphic as I am, but we must be face-to-face with the facts that we are facing. This is an evil regime. It is an evil philosophy with an evil goal. They are as equally committed to killing Jews as they are committed to killing Christians as they are committed to killing any Muslim who doesn't agree with their sick, failed philosophy.

The other thing we need to recognize, Mr. Speaker, is that this has a religious motivation, not because I say so, but because Baghdadi and the terrorists of the Islamic State say so. Their motivation is their religion. They say it is Islam that drives them to do what they are doing.

That is why it is perplexing, Mr. Speaker, that a week ago the President of the United States said in a televised address that Islam has nothing to do with the Islamic State. He said there are two fallacies of the Islamic State. Number one, he said, it is not Islam.

Well, Mr. President, you may not think it is Islam, but ask the leaders of Islamic jihad what they think it is. They say forthrightly and boldly, with everything that is within them, that their motivation for beheading individuals, for burying women and children alive, for establishing a global power to enforce their sick, religious ideas upon the world is based upon their religion of Islam.

That is their reasoning, Mr. Speaker, out of their mouths. And I believe that it is prudent and wise to listen to the enemy, to find out what their motivations are.

We look no further than the mad, evil, maniacal leader of the Nazi Party, as he was rising in the 1930s, when he wrote his book called ''Mein Kampf.'' In his book, ''Mein Kampf,'' he wrote his detailed plan. You see, he wasn't being secret, Mr. Speaker, about the evil that he wanted to bring against the Jewish people. He was very forthright. The same can be said, Mr. Speaker, of Baghdadi, who is the head of the evil regime and ideology known as the Islamic State. Baghdadi.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this is what the leader of the Islamic State had to say. This is in January, and he said this to the United States, and I quote. In a speech in January of this year, Baghdadi said to the United States: ''Soon we will be in direct confrontation. So watch out for us for we are with you, watching.''

I repeat: ''Soon we will be in direct confrontation,'' meaning with the United States. ''So watch out for us for we are with you, watching.''

That tells me, Mr. Speaker, that Baghdadi and the Islamic State don't intend to confine their bloodletting just in Iraq and Syria or in Jordan or Lebanon. Their designs are for the United States as well.

We have been told and we have read that there is an enormous amount of so-called chatter through the social media by members of the Islamic State and those who promote Islamic jihad to enter into the United States and to bring about atrocities here within the confines of our American sovereign soil.

You see, our sovereign soil has been invaded. Our sovereign soil was invaded at Benghazi. Our U.S. consulate in Benghazi when Ambassador Chris Stevens lost his life was U.S. soil. Islamic jihadists entered our sovereign soil and killed our U.S. Ambassador on that sovereign soil.

Just within a month or so ago, Islamic jihadists again took over the airport in Baghdad, and again we saw an embassy in Libya, in Tripoli, abandoned. So United States personnel were forced to flee the United States Embassy in Tripoli and leave and gain escape through Tunisia.

It is really quite sobering when you think of the advances of Islamic jihad in the region. And that is why I don't understand, Mr. Speaker, I don't understand the thinking of the President when it is coming against this evil. I don't understand it because, you see, the Islamic State has not only declared their intention, they have declared that they are at war with the United

States. They have declared they are at war. They have declared that they are a caliphate. They are a government. They are an Islamic government.

They have a leader in Baghdadi. They have already conquered territory, about half of Iraq, about half of Syria, which they control, also other parts of the Middle East as well. They also control parts of northern Lebanon.

They have made absolutely breathtaking strides in their short tenure of advancement. So they have land. They have a name. They have a leader. They have a government. It is known as shari'a law. That is Islamic law. That is their law of the land.

They also have an administration. They have a Shura Council, and they have an administration. They already have a line of hierarchy and an organizational flowchart of how they are going to run the Islamic State.

They have an army. Twelve thousand, presumably, are in the Islamic State Army, and brutal they are—beheadings, women raped, men beheaded, innocent children shot in the head. It is absolutely devastating.

We see Christians have been chased out of the Middle East region. The numbers are so dramatic, Mr. Speaker, of Christians that have had to flee Iraq, Christians in Mosul that have lived safely there. The ancient town of Nineveh, which Jonah went to preach in Nineveh, and that town is Mosul, Christians have been in Mosul since the time of Christ, 2,000 years. Mosul no longer has Christians. They were chased out of that city.

The Christians have been chased repeatedly out of Iraq. They are being chased out of the Baghdad area. They have been chased certainly out of northern Iraq and western Iraq, as Jews were chased out long ago.

Now, in Syria, we hear the horrific stories of Christians who have been killed and murdered and beheaded simply because they name the name of Jesus Christ. Jews have been slaughtered and beheaded simply because they name the name of their God.

Is there any greater intolerance, Mr. Speaker than the intolerance that has been shown repeatedly, brutally, lethally, by the Islamic State against Jews and Christians, and, yes, Muslims whom they disagree with.

It is a very sobering time. And so, quite rightly, our President, a week ago in his remarks, called upon the Congress to help him do something. The President gave his strategy. I listened with open ears to the President's strategy, and it was very curious to me because the President of the United States developed a strategy that consists of items that the United States is already doing. There was nothing new here.

The President called for an increase of 475 advisers to go into Iraq. The President said there wouldn't be any boots on the ground, of soldiers' boots.

He did not say that we are at war. Even though the Islamic State has declared war against the United States, the President did not say that the United States was going to war.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, something like 7 weeks ago, in the midst of the rise of the Islamic State in Iraq, with the horrific, breathtaking advances and murders, the President of the United States said that he wanted the Congress to withdraw the AUMF, which is the authorization of military force for the United States to be in Iraq.

It was really an unthinkable, bizarre request that this Congress received from the President. Would you please withdraw, the President said, my ability to be able to bring about military force in Iraq?

From my perspective, either the President and his advisers were incredibly shortsighted about this breathtaking rise of the Islamic State which, by the way, didn't just occur in the last 3 or 4 months. I am privileged to serve on the Intelligence Committee in the House of Representatives. We have watched, Mr. Speaker, literally, for the last several years, the rise of the Islamic State. We saw this coming.

That information presumably was available to the President of the United States as well. He knew they were on the rise. There has always been the Islamic jihad in the Middle East, but it has been at a different tempo. It has been on the rise.

Baghdadi, who is in his early to mid-forties, who is a very well-educated man with a doctorate degree, who literally has decades of veteran senior-level experience in al Qaeda, declaring war against the United States, literally, for decades, put himself in the position of being the top man at the very top of the hierarchy, the top of the line of the chain of command of the Islamic State.

□ 1830

Baghdadi knew what he needed to have. He needed to be financially self-sustaining. To do that, he ordered the robbing of banks, particularly beginning in northern Iraq. Some reports estimate that the Islamic State had stolen as much as over $400 million. We don't know the exact amount, but we do know that Baghdadi was determined, and he intended to advance. He knew he couldn't feed an army unless he had money to do so, and so he robbed it from the banks to begin his army.

Then he began to build that army by opening up prison doors and having prison breaks and bringing terrorists who had been jailed out of the prisons to join his band. So he had an army of terrorists, and he trained them even further, and he paid them with money that he stole from banks.

Then Baghdadi did something very strategic. He decided to steal oil fields, and he stole those oil fields in northern Iraq, very productive oil fields. One estimate says that one of the oil fields is worth about 10 billion barrels of oil. Whether or not that is true, that is one of the accounts that I have read. If that is true, it would be equal to about the value of the Bakken oil field, which has proven to be extremely productive and very lucrative in North Dakota here in the United States. Baghdadi is selling oil on the black market today to finance his terrorism, oil fields that he stole from northern Iraq and in the Kurdistan area.

He didn't stop there. He knew, to be viable, he also had to have refined energy products. So what did he do?

Baghdadi then stole and secured an oil refinery so that he could have oil products in order to have energy to run his army and also to be able to provide for the people under his protectorate. A ''protectorate'' is a very generous way of saying ''dictatorship'' in his caliphate. You see, he is the head guy. He is the caliph in his new self-described Islamic State, the caliphate.

You see, Mr. Speaker, he figured out how to finance himself. He took over electrical grids in Iraq and in Syria so that he could be the one who supplies the electricity to the people so that the people would be beholden to him. He put his people in charge of roads and supply lines. Baghdadi also took over a gas field in central Syria. That gas field also could be used to sell the gas for productivity or to deny that gas to Assad or to anyone he considered his enemy. You see, Baghdadi was strategic.

In August, I had the ability and the privilege to go over and visit both Turkey and Jordan and to meet with leadership there on the issue of ISIS, and, while I was there, it was stunning. There was a public display in Jordan of well over 15,000 who were protesting against Israel and in favor of the Muslim Brotherhood and the foreign terrorist-designated organization known as Hamas. There was also a reported demonstration of 7,000 Jordanians who were protesting in favor of the Islamic State. So there is pressure on Jordan—pressure within and pressure from without.

The Islamic State now controls checkpoints, so much so that there is, effectively, no longer a border between Iraq and Syria. That has been erased. Now Iraq and Syria have been joined to one another under the control and the authority of the Islamic State. They control checkpoints not only on Lebanon but also Israel.

It was horrifying to read that the Islamic State had joined up with the Free Syrian Army, the army that the United States has been involved with in the so-called ''vetting'' of moderates and in the training and equipping to fight against the Islamic State.

The Free Syrian Army reports say they had actually joined up with other Islamic jihadists, known as the Jabhat al-Nusra Front, and they took over the checkpoint that controls the area of the Golan Heights leading into Israel. There were upwards of 20 to 40 different U.N. peacekeepers at that checkpoint, and that checkpoint was taken over 200

yards from Israel, as if Israel didn't have enough to deal with in the terrorist organization known as Hezbollah, which is an Iranian proxy on her north, and from Russian influence as well coming through Hezbollah. Israel has had to suffer with indignities from Assad, from Syria, as well as from the Muslim Brotherhood franchise known as Hamas in Gaza.

It has been an extremely difficult summer. I met with refugees while I was in the Middle East region, people who were just peaceful, freedom-loving people just wanting to live their lives and raise their families and love people and worship their god. They were uprooted over this summer and late spring by Islamic jihad, both in Iraq. As for one woman I spoke to, she and her family were uprooted from their home in Iraq. They had to flee their home and abandon everything they owned and flee to Syria. Once they were in Syria, there was a rise of the Islamic jihad in Syria. They had to flee Syria and make their way to Turkey. When I spoke with her, she was on the southern border of Turkey, and she was hoping that she would have the ability, with her family, to move to the United States of America. She was going to go for yet one more final interview at the end of September, and she was hoping that her family would have that chance to come and live in freedom.

That is our wish, Mr. Speaker, for all men. We want all men to have the dignity of living in peace. It is why we honor the American Constitution today on Constitution Day. You see, this Constitution and this country mean something for the rest of the world. We think that the norms and the peacefulness that we enjoy and the prosperity that you see here in the United States must be somewhat normative across the world. We think, well, we have it, really, probably the best, but sometimes we don't recognize, really, how great we do have it. It isn't by accident—it is by design—and it came at a great cost and at a great sacrifice because our Founders recognized these ideals:

Number one, that all men are created equal and that we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights, rights that aren't given by government, rights that are only given by God: the right to life, to our liberty—our freedom—and to the pursuit of happiness, which means we have the privilege to work, and, once we work, we get to keep the fruit of our own labors.

What a brilliant concept. Where across the world do people have the right to life? Certainly not in Iraq today. Certainly not in Syria today. They don't enjoy the unfettered access to their right to life, because their life is imperiled by the Islamic State, which says to them: Under pain of death, you convert to Islam, or we kill you. You convert to Islam, or you pay us a tax. You convert to Islam, or you have to abandon everything you know and get as far away from us as you possibly can in the short term because we are coming after you in the long term.

Is that life? That is no life at all. But here in the United States, our Founders wisely understood that all of humanity's happiness springs from the right to life.

Number two, liberty, freedom. That is the hallmark and the emblem of the United States of America. If there is any ideal and any value, Mr. Speaker, that our Constitution champions it is this: it is liberty—freedom—from an oppressive government that would force its will on an individual human's life, because the Holy Scriptures teach that life is precious. We are but a flower that quickly fades. We are but a puff of smoke, the Old Testament teaches in the Proverbs. Therefore, this life that God has given to us, that He has breathed into every human being, as He created every human being in His image and His likeness, this is it. This is no dress rehearsal. This is the main event.

Our Founders wisely understood that it is for freedom that we have been set free so that we can then aspire to do whatever it is that we choose to do, the way that we take our finger and write the poetry of each of our lives.

Then, in the Declaration of Independence, our Founders rightly said, through the pen of Thomas Jefferson's, that we are also endowed by our Creator—again, not by a government, not by any government. Only a God who created us, gave us the unalienable right to pursue happiness, which means we can pursue whatever employment, whatever labor that we so desire, and then we have the right, the unfettered right, to keep the fruit of our labor—to build a home, to marry, to start a family, to be able to go out and further and help our community. Oh, what a Nation we have today, Mr. Speaker, the economic powerhouse of the world, the military engine of the world. This is such a great and wonderful gift that was given to us.

That is why it is right and fitting and proper for us to honor and recognize this Constitution Day. I am so grateful and so honored and privileged that we can do exactly that and honor that day. That is why we have to stand for this liberty, something that people in other countries cannot do.

We must therefore observe, and it is why we have to make sure, when there is a great totalitarianism like the Islamic State, which has declared war against the United States, we have a decision to make. Anyone can declare war on you. It is another thing to bring about warlike acts against you in an attempt to defeat you. That is exactly what the Islamic State has done. That is exactly what they have stated their intention is. I believe, if there is anything, Mr. Speaker, that history has taught us it is this: when a madman speaks, we should listen. Baghdadi, most certainly, is rational from his point of view, but his ideas are mad, and, even further, they are immoral and they are evil to deprive life, liberty, and happiness to people.

If I could just pause and ask the Speaker if there is a time limitation that we are looking at. How much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Minnesota has 27 minutes remaining.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I appreciate that update.

Mr. Speaker, we look at the threats that the United States is looking at from the Islamic State: the fact that they have declared war against the United States; the fact that they have already killed intentionally, in a cruel and barbaric manner, American citizens; the fact that they are recruiting American citizens to come and join them in their evil deed; the fact that American citizens have left the Islamic State as terrorists under the creed of the Islamic State. Their creed says that those who join the Islamic State abandon any allegiance to any other government, including the American Government. They then become part of the Islamic State, and their duty and allegiance is to the Islamic State. Once they leave the Islamic State and return to the United States, then they have the ability to come in and be terrorists in the United States. This is nonsensical to me.

You see, Mr. Speaker, earlier this summer, I asked the FBI for a classified briefing. I did so because my home State of Minnesota has a tragic, very unfortunate, nexus to terrorism. We have the distinction of having the only convicted terrorist of 9/11 being from the State of Minnesota. His name is Moussaoui.

We also have a high number of Minnesotans who left Minnesota and abandoned the United States to go and fight on behalf of another al Qaeda organization, known as al-Shabaab. That is an al Qaeda affiliate in Somalia. Well over 50 Minnesotans traveled to join al-Shabaab and fight in the cause of Islamic jihad.

We also had terrorist financing cases, which were successfully prosecuted in Minnesota. Two women were convicted of terrorist financing cases in the Minneapolis Federal district court. Two women were convicted of terrorist financing in Rochester, Minnesota, in Federal district court.

Then we had the Westgate shopping mall terror act in Kenya, and from the terrorists who were involved and claimed sponsorship of this horrific act of the shooting at the Westgate mall in Kenya, the report was that two Minnesotans were a part of that effort. Then we saw, although it hasn't been confirmed by our government, that the terrorists have named two Minnesotans.

Then we saw that very sophisticated recruitment videos were put forth to recruit individuals to come and join al Qaeda. When this occurred, three of them were featured from Minnesota. They were called the ''Minnesota martyrs,'' three young men. One was a

Caucasian American. His name was Troy Kastigar. He had been converted to Islam at a mosque called the Al Farooq mosque in Bloomington, Minnesota, where many of the individuals who have gone to fight on behalf of the Islamic State made their religious home.

Troy Kastigar said that he was honored to be a traitor to America. That was a part of his conviction to the Islamic State. He turned on his country; so, when I asked the FBI earlier this summer—and then, of course we have had, according to the FBI, at minimum, another 20 Minnesotans who have left Minnesota to join the Islamic State, including the first two Americans who were killed fighting on behalf of the Islamic State, both of whom were from the State of Minnesota.

Just as recently as several weeks ago, three young Somali American girls left Minnesota, abandoned their families, and joined the Islamic State. We have a very unfortunate nexus.

It is with that background, Mr. Speaker, that I asked the FBI if I could come in and sit with them and if they would answer my questions in a classified setting.

I wanted to know, number one, had Minnesotans left the United States and joined to fight with the Islamic State. Unfortunately, I was told there were two. It was classified information at the beginning of the summer. Now, tragically, it has been reported worldwide that the very first two Americans were Minnesotans who were fighting for the Islamic State.

I asked the question: If these terrorists choose not to blow themselves up as suicide bombers, or if they are not killed fighting on behalf of the Islamic State, and they choose to fly back to the United States or gain entry to the United States legally through some other means with a U.S.-held passport, would they be given entry into the United States?

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you, I was completely floored when the FBI said to me, ''Well, yes, of course, these terrorists would be allowed to come into the United States.''

I asked, ''Why? And how?'' They told me, ''We track them, and we put their names on a watch list.'' It isn't perfect, but the FBI puts the names of Americans on a watch list. I asked, ''What happens when they are on a watch list?''

I was told that the Americans with a U.S. passport, who have relinquished U.S. citizenship and have joined the Islamic State, have become terrorists and fought on behalf of the Islamic State then were returning to the United States, would be asked additional questions at screening at an airport before they come into the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am asked additional questions, sometimes, at the airport. How could this be possible?

I was told by the FBI that the terrorists then would be given entry, and they would be allowed to go, unmolested, to return to their life here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that is pure madness for us to do that. If there was one thing we should do, it is follow our Constitution, follow the way of all nations, which is to secure the safety and security and sovereignty of that Nation.

To do that, Mr. Speaker, we must take the passports of anyone who has joined up with the Islamic State and do everything that we can to prevent terrorists from reentering the United States.

These terrorists would have had battlefield experience, they would have had established relationships with a terror network, and they potentially may have a plan for terrorist activity in the United States. That should and must be done.

What we also must do—and I agree with the President of the United States—we must defeat this enemy. The Islamic State has declared war against the United States. I believe that we must declare war against the Islamic State, but that is not what President Obama proposed.

You see, President Obama, from his rhetoric, has essentially made clear that he believes that war is obsolete in the 21st century, but that isn't the view of the Islamic State. That isn't the view of the totalitarian regime that has declared war against the United States. War isn't obsolete for their mind; yet the President of the United States is not choosing to engage the United States in war.

It is this odd hybrid where the President wants to say that he is going to try to defeat the Islamic State; yet he is not willing to do what it takes to defeat the Islamic State.

Why do I say that? Because the United States military is the greatest military—Army, Navy, and Air Force—in the world. There is nothing that can even remotely compare to the United States military; yet our President stated—both last week in his address to the Nation, as well as today at MacDill Air Force Base in his remarks—that there will be no U.S. boots on the ground. There will not be a U.S. military presence.

He is willing to use the American Air Force to fly missions and have airstrikes, but not boots on the ground.

You see, it doesn't work that way, Mr. Speaker. A military is a cohesive unit, and this is going up 50,000 feet, we have to understand: Do we have a problem? Yes, we have a problem.

Americans are being killed and beheaded by the Islamic jihadist state. They have declared war against the United States. They are using all possible means to advance themselves to their goal.

They are gaining in strength every day—huge swaths of economic territory, huge swaths of geographic territory. They are increasing the size of their armies. They are making threats against the United States.

What is our response? The President of the United States, number one, is unwilling to declare war against this enemy. He is unwilling to use our United States military to defeat this enemy.

He has asked partners across the world—whether it is Muslim, Arab nations, whether it is our traditional allies—to join him. He received some rhetoric, some nods of the head, that some allies would help him; yet there isn't one word that one country is actually going to supply troops or supply armament or supply training.

We don't know what it is that the President has put together; yet, somehow, some way, he believes that this enemy is going to be defeated. His plan is what he was doing before. It was some advisers in an Embassy in Baghdad, U.S. advisers, but not boots on the ground.

His other avenue of defeat is to have United States tax dollars vet Syrians and, supposedly, Iraqis and train them to be a part of a military effort and give them American armament after 3 and a half weeks of arming.

You see, I really don't understand this methodology, when we already have the best military in the world and the President has decided to put the best option that we have on the sidelines and then he wants to create an ad hoc army on the ground with, at best, thin loyalties to our ultimate objective.

How thin, Mr. Speaker? Well, the RAND Corporation took a look at those who were trained, vetted, and on the ground and fighting in the Free Syrian Army, and the RAND Corporation found that about half—50 percent of those that the United States had vetted, the so-called moderates trained and given American armaments to—about half had been not only sympathetic but had cooperated and joined up with the enemy, the Islamic State and the al-Nusra front.

Well, if, in fact, the RAND Corporation is accurate and we have lost about 50 percent of those that we trained, I would say we don't have a very good success ratio.

As a mater of fact, what I would say is that the Islamic State has an incredible success ratio because we will have—at taxpayer expense—identified, vetted, trained, and armed a whole new level of army for the Islamic State, the enemy.

Who is this working for? Not us. Who is this defeating? Not them. Because the Islamic State continues to grow and we are paying for part of their military training and armaments.

In fact, this same story that came out last week said that the Islamic State had raided our United States weapons depots that we had set up for arming the Free Syrian Army.

What does the President want us to do? The President wanted the United States Congress to get behind his effort to increase the amount of training and arming of the Islamic State.

You see, these moderates have been more than a mirage, more than a charade for quite a bit of time. As a matter of fact, one of my colleagues from Minnesota gave me an article today before we took the vote.

Again, I am not trouncing anyone's vote in this chamber. I want to make it very clear. Both sides of the aisle—Republican and Democrat, individual Members of Congress—wrestled with their vote. Everyone struggled with what to do. Should we back the President in what he is choosing to do? Should we not back the President?

I give all goodwill to every Member of Congress. I castigate no one for the vote that they cast today because this was truly a vote of conscience that every Member made, and every Member needs to speak for themselves.

I only speak for myself tonight, Mr. Speaker, but this came out yesterday. The leader of the Free Syrian Army, the army that the President wants us to spend $500 million to train even more individuals, under this commander, this is what the article says: ''The Free Syrian Army announced they will not sign up to the U.S.-led coalition to destroy the Islamic State militants in Iraq and Syria.''

I just want to repeat that again.

''The Free Syrian Army announced it will not sign up to the U.S.-led coalition to destroy ISIS in Iraq and Syria. The group's founder, Colonel Riad al-Asaad, stressed that toppling Syrian President Bashar al-Assad is their priority and that they will not join forces that U.S.-led efforts without a guarantee that the United States is committed to his overthrow.

'' 'If they want to see the Free Syrian Army on their side' ''—our side—'' 'they should give assurances on toppling the Assad regime and on a plan including revolutionary principles.' ''

This is the army that we are entrusting to win this effort against ISIS, and this army is more interested in toppling Assad. They are not interested in toppling ISIS.

''The announcement appears to be reversing an earlier statement on Thursday by the National Coalition opposition, the Free Syrian Army's political wing, which said it was ready to work with the coalition against IS.''

The political arm said yes, but the guys who are actually going to have the boots on the ground say, ''No, we are not going to be there. We are not going to be fighting IS.''

''Saying they had 'long called for this action,' the coalition called on U.S. politicians to authorize the training and equipping of the Free Syrian Army 'as soon as possible.' ''

This is from the Middle East Eye. This is in an article that came out yesterday.

At best, we have got a very, very weak case—a very weak case. There are articles, which I agree with, that put the choice before us. It says: Do we have an enemy? Yes. What do we need to do? Defeat the enemy. I get that, but we have been unwilling to declare a war against this enemy. We have been unwilling to put the United States' military against this enemy.

What the President of the United States wants the United States to do is train some Syrians for 3 and a half weeks. We have already spent how many billion training the Iraqis, and the Iraqi Army could not stand up against the Islamic State army.

We had trained them for a very extensive period of time, with the finest training that we possibly could. They were well-equipped. Because United States residual forces were pulled by the President of the United States, the Iraqi Army could not stand up against the Islamic State, and they ran.

We think that 3 and a half weeks of training is going to do the job of the Syrians? I don't think so.

I think what the President of the United States asked us to do, Mr. Speaker, is to be a scapegoat in his failed strategy. He wants to be able to point to the Congress and say, ''The Congress gave me the authority to do it.''

I don't want to do that. I didn't do that today. I chose to vote ''no.'' I am not being self-righteous when I say that.

My thinking on this is that I am willing to vote for a World War II strategy, meaning I am all in. I believe that we need to declare war against this evil empire of the Islamic State. We need to put all resources with the full plan, with an exit strategy in fully defeating the Islamic State, which we can. They are an army of 12,000.

This can be done, but I won't agree to a Vietnam war style strategy which is exactly, in my opinion, what President Obama chooses—chose to engage, with dribs and drabs, increasing a little here, increasing a little there.

□ 1900

The President, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, would have been well-served if he also would have demonstrated even more humbleness regarding our strategy—meaning, for the President to be absolutely adamant last night, as well as today, for Secretary of State Kerry to be absolutely adamant today that there will be no U.S. boots on the ground sends a signal. It sends a signal that we are not serious about defeating this evil known as the Islamic State, which we must be.

I ask the question, Mr. Speaker: Who on the ground will be calling for the airstrikes against the Islamic State? Someone on the ground needs to do it. That is how war works. Someone who is on the ground needs to call for those airstrikes.

You cannot win a war when you only have overhead architecture and overhead surveillance. You need people on the ground who can go and gather the intelligence that you need so you know, effectively, how to defeat this enemy.

I ask this: Do we want to defeat this enemy decisively, quickly, and completely so that this enemy understands that, if they ever rear their head again, they had better think twice because we are going to so decimate their evil plan? Are we going to do that? Or are we going to do what happened in Vietnam, drib, drab, a little here, a little there, never quite getting up what it takes to actually defeat that enemy?

What happened in the end in Vietnam? Ultimately, the Communists came in, and that country fell. It was a very sad conclusion because, you see, the postscript to the story of Vietnam was the slaughter of innocents under the evil Pol Pot and the killing fields, and we know the history was an ugly history.

This isn't good, this is awful, but we need to see what has happened. You see, this Arab Spring has been nothing but Islamic bloodletting across the Middle East. In their own words, it is religious-based. In their own words, it is religious, shari'a inspired. In their own words, they are doing the bidding of their god to spill the blood of the infidel. This is an evil, this is a moral wrong, and this must be defeated.

The good news is it can be. We can defeat it. When we are the greatest military powerhouse in the world, when we have the capability to defeat this enemy, I don't understand it. I don't understand, Mr. Speaker, our President who just this week said that he needed to commit 3,000 American troops to the African continent for Ebola—to defeat Ebola.

Now, Ebola is a virus that has a health impact against the American people. I can understand dispatching medical personnel. I can understand dispatching people for humanitarian purposes, but the very weird thing about the President's strategy is it has been changing our military so that its purpose is to bring about humanitarian relief in the form of dispatching them for boots on the ground to deal with Ebola. That is not the purpose of a military.

The President needs to dispatch 3,000 troops—or whatever it takes—into the Islamic State to defeat the Islamic State. We don't go in willy-nilly. We go in with a very good plan, with the most brilliant military minds—and we have them—with the bravest military heroes—and we have them—and with the greatest military equipment that has ever been devised by man, and we have it. We have got it all. We have got the means for defeating this evil enemy.

To not do it, Mr. Speaker, in my mind, that is a moral wrong. That is an evil. To allow that evil to grow, thrive, and continue to slit the throats of men, women, and children; to rob them of their lives; and, yes, to see tragedy borne potentially across this land because, even today, as we are in this Chamber tonight, absolutely nothing has been done to secure America's southern border, absolutely nothing against entry by the Islamic State into

this country, despite the fact that the Islamic State, through their social media, has been declaring their intent to do exactly that.

Why in the world aren't we closing our southern border and every other border and every other port of entry? Why aren't we pulling the passports of Americans who have become terrorists under the Islamic State and who seek to return to the United States?

Why would any sane country choose to take effective, commonsense answers to secure the safety of the American people? That is what a nation that wants to survive would do. That is the better way. That is what I hope the President of the United States will do because, you see, everything is at stake

On this, our Constitution Day, let us recognize the first duty of any nation, especially the greatest Nation, is to secure the safety, sovereignty, and security of the American people. That, we must do, and I am so proud that we have the means to do it.

I believe that we will acquire the judgment to do what needs to be done. It is within the hearts of the American people. It is within our military. Now, it is up to the politicians. Listen to wisdom. Listen to the people, and do what needs to be done.

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

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1214. An act to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on September 17, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 4197. To amend title 5, United States Code, to extend the period of certain authority with respect to judicial review of Merit Systems Protection Board decisions relating to whistleblowers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5134. To extend the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity and the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance for one year.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 18, 2014, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7185. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Guidelines for Designating Biobased Products for Federal Procurement (RIN: 0599-AA18) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7186. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Beef Promotion and Research; Reapportionment [No.: AMS-LPS-13-0079] received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7187. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a notification of the President's intent to exempt all military personnel accounts from any discretionary cap sequester in FY 2015, if a sequester is necessary; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7188. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Brigadier General Lawrence M. Martin, Jr., United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of major general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7189. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the semi-annual status report of the U.S. Chemical Demilitarization Program for August 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7190. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Burton M. Field, United States Air Force, and his advancement on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7191. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Brigadier General Mark A. Brown, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of major general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7192. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the fiscal year 2013 report entitled, ''Operation and Financial Support of Military Museums''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7193. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Peter M. Vangjel, United States Army, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7194. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7195. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Regulatory Capital Rules: Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule, Revisions to the Definition of Eligible Guarantee (RIN: 3064-AE13) received August 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7196. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority. Rehabilitation Services Administration--Assistive Technology Alternative Financing Program [CFDA Number: 84.224D.] received August 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

7197. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Devices; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FDA-2014-N-0011] received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7198. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Florida; Infrastructure Requirement (Visibility) for the 1997 and 2006 PM, and 2008 8-Hour Ozone NAAQS [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0814 and EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0692; FRL-9915-65-Region 4] received August 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7199. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — C.I. Pigment Red 112; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0757; FRL-9914-14] received August 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7200. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alaska [EPA-R10-OAR-2011-0916; FRL-9916-14-Region 10] received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7201. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri, Control of Gasoline Reid Vapor Pressure [EPA-R07-OAR-2014-0595; FRL-9916-10-Region 7] received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7202. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revision to Control Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Storage Tanks [EPA-R06-OAR-2012-0096; FRL-9916-32-Region 6] received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7203. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: New Hampshire; 111(d)/129 Revised State Plan for Large and Small Municipal Waste Combustors [EPA-R01-OAR-2012-0260; A-1-FRL-9915-71-Region 1] received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7204. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of Arizona; Pinal County and Gila County; Pb [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0266; FRL-9916-11-Region 9] received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7205. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Flazasulfuron; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0445; FRL-

9915-32] received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7206. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Saflufenacil; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0622; and EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0124; FRL-9912-91] received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7207. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rule on Certain Chemical Substances; Withdrawal of Significant New Use Rules [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2014-0277 and EPA-HQ-OPPT-2014-0166; FRL-9915-69] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7208. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sulfuric Acid; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0073; FRL-9914-18] received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7209. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Texas: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [EPA-R06-RCRA-2013-0624; FRL-9915-99-Region 6] received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7210. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Trifloxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0504; FRL-9915-46] received September 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7211. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report entitled, ''National Air Toxics Program: The Second Integrated Urban Air Toxics Report to Congress''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7212. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 14-36, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7213. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a memorandum of Justification for Action Under Section 1244(d)(1) of the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7214. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the persons undermining democratic processes or institutions in Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7215. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Ukraine that was declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7216. A letter from the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, White House, transmitting a letter regarding H. Con. Res. 105; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7217. A letter from the General Manager and Director of Equal Employment Opportunity, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting the Board's annual report for FY 2013 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7218. A letter from the Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7219. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Legal Process for the Enforcement of a Tax Levy or Criminal Restitution Order Against a Participant Account received September 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7220. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2014 through 2018; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7221. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Management and Administration, and Designated Reporting Official, Office of the National Drug Control Policy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7222. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's fifth annual report on activities regarding civil rights era homicides, as required by the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crimes Act of 2007; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7223. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's quarterly report from the Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2013, July 1, 2013 — September 30, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7224. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the status of the Tribal Law and Order Act Pilot Program Report to Congress, November 29, 2010 to November 29, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7225. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court, transmitting notification that the Supreme Court will open the October 2014 Term on Monday, October 6, 2014 at 10:00 a.m. and will continue until all matters before the Court ready for argument have been disposed of or decided; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7226. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Marine Events in Captain of the Port Long Island Zone [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0329] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7227. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0251; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-179-AD; Amendment 39-17946; AD 2014-16-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7228. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell ASCa Inc. Emergency Locator Transmitters Installed on Various Transport Category Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0573; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-091-AD; Amendment 39-17955; AD 2014-17-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7229. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0490; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-133-AD; Amendment 39-17926; AD 2014-16-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7230. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30969; Amdt. No. 3600] received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7231. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30968; Amdt. No. 3599] received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7232. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30970; Amdt. No. 3601] received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7233. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0124; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-197-AD; Amendment 39-17944; AD 2014-16-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7234. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30971; Amdt. No. 3602] received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7235. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0060; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-194-AD; Amendment 39-17943; AD 2014-16-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7236. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule —

Amendment and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Tuskegee, AL [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0082; Airspace Docket No. 14-ASO-3] received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7237. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airspace Designations; Incorporation by Reference Amendments [Docket No.: 2013-0709; Amendment No. 71-45] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7238. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (Embraer) [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0234; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-220-AD; Amendment 39-17952; AD 2014-16-28] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7239. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0258; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-065-AD; Amendment 39-17950; AD 2014-16-26] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7240. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0252; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-213-AD; Amendment 39-17933; AD 2014-16-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7241. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the 2013 annual report on the operation of the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative and the Tropical Forest Conservation Act; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Agriculture.

7242. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting fiscal year 2016 Budget for the Office of Inspector General; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means.

7243. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2016 budget request, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 437d(d)(1); jointly to the Committees on House Administration, Appropriations, and Oversight and Government Reform.

7244. A letter from the Chairman and Vice Chairman, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, transmitting a notification of a public hearing held on May 15, 2014 on ''Stability in China: Lessons from Tiananmen and Implications for the United States''; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 5500. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to protect employment and training services for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Ms. WATERS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 5501. A bill to establish a grant program to enhance existing secondary education programs for the purpose of teaching high school students about the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of the individual States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 5502. A bill to restore the integrity of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIMM, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MENG, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. NEAL, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 5503. A bill to reauthorize the World Trade Center Health Program and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. KIND, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 5504. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve and make permanent the above-the-line deduction for certain expenses of elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HALL, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. JONES, Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. HARPER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. LONG, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 5505. A bill to improve the establishment of any lower ground-level ozone standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H.R. 5506. A bill to amend title I of the National Housing Act to, for financing alterations, repairs, and improvements to, or conversion of, existing structures, modify premium charges and the dollar amount limitation on loans, including energy efficiency home improvements; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 5507. A bill to provide for a study by the Institute of Medicine on health disparities, to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop guidelines on reducing health disparities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 5508. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the marriage penalty in the dollar limitation on the student loan interest deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 5509. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and extend the American Opportunity Tax Credit and to increase the student loan interest deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 5510. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for more effective online education verification metrics; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 5511. A bill to require that certain Federal lands be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 5512. A bill to require that certain Federal lands be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 5513. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the tax credit for electric vehicle recharging property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 5514. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to establish a loan program to assist and provide incentives for manufacturers to reinvest in making products in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 5515. A bill to reauthorize the Elder Justice Act of 2009; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 5516. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to prohibit the discharge of dredged material into the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 5517. A bill to redesignate the Martin Luther King, Junior, National Historic Site in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5518. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the continuing professional education reimbursement provided

to health professionals employed by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Ms. ESTY):

H.R. 5519. A bill to authorize funding for, and increase accessibility to, the National Missing and Unidentified Persons System, to facilitate data sharing between such system and the National Crime Information Center database of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to provide incentive grants to help facilitate reporting to such systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 5520. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the diversity immigrant program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 5521. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to enter into an agreement with the National Research Council to conduct a study on urban flooding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.R. 5522. A bill to abolish the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, transfer its functions relating to the Federal firearms, explosives, and arson laws, violent crime, and domestic terrorism to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and transfer its functions relating to the Federal alcohol and tobacco smuggling laws to the Drug Enforcement Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 5523. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the National Labor Relations Act to protect the health benefits of retirees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. MOORE, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HONDA, Mr. POCAN, Ms. CHU, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. KILMER, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. ESTY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. TITUS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 5524. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that women members of the Armed Forces and their families have access to the contraception they need in order to promote the health and readiness of all members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself and Mrs. BEATTY):

H. Res. 729. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 19, 2014 as National Service Coordinator Day to recognize the value of service coordinators in subsidized and other affordable housing communities for their work to promote and support economic self-sufficiency and independence for low-income families, older Americans, and persons with disabilities; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. POLIS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. PETRI, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BARBER, Mr. KEATING, Ms. CHU, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LANCE, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. KING of New York):

H. Res. 730. A resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Wilderness Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H. Res. 731. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of September 15, 2014, through September 21, 2014, as ''Balance Awareness Week''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H. Res. 732. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that mandates imposed on manufacturers requiring inclusion of unproven and unreliable technology in firearms is costly and punitive, and the prohibition of firearms without such features is an infringement on the rights of citizens under the Second Amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS of California (for himself, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. BASS):

H. Res. 733. A resolution expressing support for designation of the month of September as ''Clinical Research Innovation Month''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 5500.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12,13,14,18

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 5501.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 5502.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Recognizing that numerous federal criminal law statutes (through which federal civil asset forfeiture is enacted) have dubious constitutional justifications, this reform bill embeds and advances constitutional principles found in the Fourth, Fifth and Tenth Amendment. The bill also derives it's authority from Congress' Article 1, Section 8, Clause 9 authority to ''constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court.'' This authority includes the rules and procedures used by inferior federal courts.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 5503.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 5504.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''Amendment XVI to the Constitution of the United States: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.''

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 5505.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 5506.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 5507.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5508.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 5509.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 5510.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United

States, or in any Department or Officer thereof . . .

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 5511.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 5512.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 5513.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 5514.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I. Section 8, Clauses 3 and 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 5515.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 5516.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 5517.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5518.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 5519.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Necessary and Proper Clause of Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 5520.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that Congress has the power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 5521.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 5522.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 5523.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 5524.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 164: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 292: Mr. SARBANES and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 303: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 445: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 477: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.

H.R. 485: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MEEKS, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 533: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 640: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 1070: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. BARBER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1173: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1250: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 1331: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1339: Mr. MORAN, Mr. BARBER, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 1507: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1597: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1620: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1652: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 1755: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 1761: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1827: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1852: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 2028: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 2143: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 2156: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 2330: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 2426: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 2468: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 2482: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 2500: Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 2506: Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 2706: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 2794: Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 2918: Mr. RIBBLE and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 2985: Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 2994: Mr. GALLEGO and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 3150: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 3462: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 3485: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 3505: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 3556: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 3560: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3680: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. REED, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WALDEN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 3708: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 3717: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 3726: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 3833: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 3877: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3991: Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 3992: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 4188: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 4190: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 4221: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 4223: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4324: Mr. POSEY and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4351: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 4432: Mr. PETRI and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4510: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. COOPER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 4526: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 4567: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 4611: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 4612: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 4625: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 4634: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 4727: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 4740: Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 4824: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4833: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 4852: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 4879: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 4886: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 4930: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 4934: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 4960: Mr. COSTA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 4969: Ms. ESTY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 4972: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 4978: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 4985: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 5069: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 5071: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 5083: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 5109: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 5130: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 5183: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 5212: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 5213: Mr. REED.

H.R. 5233: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 5241: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 5252: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 5263: Mr. SCHIFF and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 5283: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 5291: Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 5295: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 5300: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 5304: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 5327: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 5336: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LATTA, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 5343: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.R. 5364: Ms. MOORE and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5395: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5398: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 5403: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 5430: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 5431: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 5439: Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 5441: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HOLT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 5449: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 5451: Mr. KIND, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5470: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 5475: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 5478: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HOLT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. CLAY, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 5483: Mr. PEARCE and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 5488: Mr. VELA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.J. Res. 44: Mr. TAKANO.
H. Con. Res. 114: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H. Res. 30: Mr. MATHESON.
H. Res. 190: Mr. GARCIA.
H. Res. 281: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. GARCIA.
H. Res. 356: Mr. GARCIA.
H. Res. 422: Mrs. BEATTY.
H. Res. 489: Mr. GARCIA.
H. Res. 619: Mr. DELANEY.
H. Res. 620: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. DUFFY.
H. Res. 707: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. GARRETT.
H. Res. 709: Mr. PETERS of California.
H. Res. 718: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H. Res. 726: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. QUIGLEY.