

QUESTIONS OF ORDER

DECIDED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AT THE SECOND SESSION, ONE HUNDREDTH THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER OF OHIO, SPEAKER
KAREN L. HAAS OF MARYLAND, CLERK

QUESTIONS OF ORDER

POINT OF ORDER

(¶13.9)

PURSUANT TO SECTION 426(B)(4) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974, A MEMBER WHO MAKES A POINT OF ORDER UNDER SECTION 426(A) OF THE ACT AND SATISFIES THE THRESHOLD BURDEN SPECIFIED IN SECTION 426(B)(2) OF THE ACT BY CITING LANGUAGE IN THE RESOLUTION THAT WAIVES THE APPLICATION OF SECTION 425 OF THE ACT IS RECOGNIZED TO CONTROL ONE-HALF OF THE 20 MINUTES PROVIDED FOR DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF CONSIDERATION.

PURSUANT TO SECTION 426(B)(3) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974, AS DISPOSITION OF A POINT OF ORDER RAISED UNDER SECTION 426(A) OF THE ACT, THE CHAIR PUTS THE QUESTION OF CONSIDERATION WITH RESPECT TO THE PROPOSITION THAT IS THE OBJECT OF THE POINT OF ORDER.

On January 28, 2014, Mr. MCGOVERN made a point of order against consideration of House Resolution 465, and said: "Madam Speaker, I raise a point of order against H. Res. 465 because the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. The resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against consideration of the bill, except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI, which includes a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, which causes a violation of section 426(a)."

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mrs. BLACK, responded to the point of order, and said:

"The gentleman from Massachusetts makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

"The gentleman has met the threshold burden under the rule and the gentleman from Massachusetts and a Member opposed each will control ten minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order."

Mr. MCGOVERN was further recognized and said:

"Madam Speaker, first of all, let me just say that it is outrageous, absolutely outrageous, that the Republican leadership has combined a major piece of antiabortion legislation with the farm bill conference report into one single rule, restricting our ability to debate both of these important issues.

"There is an \$8.6 billion cut to SNAP in this conference report, a cut that

will only affect poor families, primarily the elderly and the disabled. Besides being cruel and heartless, this cut is also an unfunded mandate. If States, cities, or towns want to prevent hunger from getting worse, they will have to spend more money out of their own budgets.

"Now, I know my Republican friends are in a big hurry to go off to their issues retreat at some luxurious resort, but maybe we could have found another hour somewhere.

"Madam Speaker, I am honored to serve on the Agriculture Committee. I was honored to serve on the conference committee for the farm bill. I want to thank Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member PETERSON and all of my colleagues for their hard work.

"I want a farm bill. I want to support the farm bill conference. But from the beginning of this process, I made my position very clear that I will not vote for a farm bill that makes hunger worse in America. And this farm bill fails that basic test. If this bill passes, hundreds of thousands of vulnerable Americans will have less to eat, period.

"Now, some people will say, well, an \$8 billion cut in SNAP is better than what the House Republicans wanted to do. That is a strange argument, Madam Speaker. It is like saying thank goodness the burglar only took the silver, because he could have taken the jewelry, too.

"The fact of the matter is that any cut to SNAP will be piled on top of the cut that already went into effect last fall. And any cut to SNAP will result in more Americans going hungry. And any cut in SNAP will increase the financial burdens on State and local governments.

"There are those, Madam Speaker, who claim that the Heat and Eat program is some sort of a loophole. It isn't. It is a policy decision. It is a way for States to help some of our neighbors who are struggling through very difficult times. But even if this is a loophole, I ask my friends, of all the loopholes in Federal law, of all of the special interest giveaways, this is the one you are going to target? This is the one that is in your crosshairs, a program that helps poor people get enough food to eat? My goodness.

"There are those who say that States and local governments or food banks or food pantries should pick up the slack. Have any of those people actually ever been to a food bank? Have they ever talked to a director of a food pantry? Because they are already at capacity, Madam Speaker. They can't meet the

needs of the clients that they already have.

"My Republican friends have made their priorities very clear. They want to dismantle the social safety net. They want to get the Federal Government out of the business of helping people get enough to eat.

"But I also want to say that I am disappointed, Madam Speaker, in the people in my own party, here in the Congress and in the White House, who are going along with this.

"Tonight, the President of the United States will stand in this Chamber and deliver the State of the Union; and when he talks about income inequality and helping people get into the middle class, all of us Democrats—and I hope some Republicans—will stand up and cheer. But before that happens, we have an opportunity to put our votes where our cheers are; we have a chance to match our actions with our rhetoric. And the way to do that is to vote 'no' on this conference report.

"So I say to my fellow Democrats, if cutting SNAP or other programs that help poor people is the price of admission to get anything done, any piece of major legislation passed, then we have strayed very, very far from our principles. Madam Speaker, again, I want to remind my colleagues that this is an unfunded mandate because there will be an increased burden on States, cities and towns to deal with this issue of hunger.

"By the way, Madam Speaker, when people are hungry, when kids are hungry, they don't learn in school. When people are hungry, they end up going to the emergency room more often. When children are hungry, when they get a common cold, they end up staying in the hospital for a period of time. That all costs us a great deal in terms of not only Federal money but State and local money. So, in my opinion, this is an unfunded mandate, and this is a burden on the States."

Ms. DELAURO was recognized to speak to the point of order and said:

"Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I thank him for his dedication and his passion on this issue that people in the United States of America should not go hungry.

"I rise in support of my colleague's point of order. This farm bill contains cuts to the food stamp program that will transfer the responsibility to States and cities to provide food to their families. May I remind the Members of this body that food stamps—our

QUESTIONS OF ORDER

Nation's most important anti-hunger program—was just cut 2 months ago in November—in November.

"Because of the recent expiration of the Recovery Act provisions, food stamps have already been cut by \$5 billion for next year and \$11 billion is the cut over 3 years. What does it mean? It means that a family of four lost \$36—or 16 meals—a month in support. That is already the difference between health and hunger.

"Now the savage cuts in this farm bill would push Americans already living on the edge that much closer to the brink. Because of the \$8.5 billion in cuts here, 850,000 households—translates into 1.7 million Americans—will lose an average of \$90 a month or 66 more meals a month. Low-income seniors, working poor with families, individuals with disabilities and veterans would be particularly impacted by these cruel cuts.

"Perhaps some Members have forgotten. That is because we eat well. That is because we eat well every day. Members have forgotten hunger is an abomination. We are talking about men and women experiencing real physical trauma, children who cannot concentrate in school because all they can think about is food, and seniors are forced to decide in what has been a polar vortex, a virulent winter season, whether or not they will go hungry or be cold.

"This is a problem all across the land. In my Connecticut district, nearly one in seven households are not sure they can afford enough food to feed their families. In Mississippi, 24.5 percent suffer food hardship. In West Virginia and Kentucky, 22 percent. In Ohio, nearly 20 percent, and in California, just over 19 percent.

"The continued existence of hunger in America is a disgrace. That is why in the past there has been a strong tradition of bipartisanship on fighting hunger and supporting nutrition. This farm bill flies in the face of that tradition. It takes food from the poor to pay for crop subsidies for the rich.

"Food stamps have one of the lowest error rates of any government program. It is a powerful and positive impact on economic growth because they get resources into the hands of families who are going to spend them right away. The research shows that for every \$5 of Federal food stamp benefits, it generates nearly twice that in economic activity.

"Children's Health Watch, those researchers found that after collecting 14 years of data on over 20,000 low-income families that when families experienced a loss or reduction in food stamp benefits, they are more likely to be food insecure, to be in poor health, and their children experience intensified developmental delays relative to their peers.

"Most importantly, food stamps are the right thing to do. It is the job of a good government to help vulnerable families to get back on their feet, and cutting food stamps will cause more

hunger and health problems for Americans. In the words of Harry Truman:

"Nothing is more important in our national life than the welfare of our children, and proper nourishment comes first in attaining this welfare."

"This bill—this bill—flies in the face of that. It will cut \$8.5 billion. You couple that with the cuts that have already been made in the economic recovery program, and that is almost \$20 billion in a cut to the food stamp program. Some of my colleagues will say, well, we only did 8½ billion in the farm bill. Let me just tell you: it may come from two sources, but the constituency is the same.

"Who are we as a nation? Where are our values? If we can provide crop subsidies for the richest farmers in this Nation and tell them that they can make \$900,000 a year before they will not be able to get a subsidy, or 26 individuals who get a premium subsidy for crop insurance of at least \$1 million a year—those folks are eating, they are high on the hog, they got three squares a day. When we provide \$1.40—it is \$1.40 per meal for food stamp beneficiaries—the people at the top end don't have an income cap. They don't have any asset test, and that is not true for food stamp recipients. We prescribe who can receive them. There are income limitations and asset limitations. Who are we as a nation? What are we about? Let's not take food out of the mouths of families and their children."

Ms. FOXX was recognized to speak to the point of order and said:

"Madam Speaker, the question before the House is, 'Should the House now consider H. Res. 465?' This point of order, Madam Speaker, is a dilatory tactic. I will remind the gentleman that each bill under this rule will be separately considered and debatable on the House floor.

"Madam Speaker, in order to allow the House to continue its scheduled business for the day, I urge Members to vote 'yes' on the question of consideration of the resolution."

After debate,

The question being put, viva voce,

Will the House now consider the resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mrs. BLACK, announced that the ayes had it.

So the House decided to consider said resolution.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the House decided to consider said resolution was, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

POINT OF ORDER

(¶13.10)

PURSUANT TO CLAUSE 9 OF RULE XXI, A MEMBER WHO MAKES A POINT OF ORDER BY CITING LANGUAGE IN A RESOLUTION THAT WAIVES THE APPLICATION OF CLAUSE 9 OF RULE XXI IS RECOGNIZED TO CONTROL ONE-HALF OF THE 20 MINUTES PROVIDED FOR DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF CONSIDERATION.

PURSUANT TO CLAUSE 9 OF RULE XXI, AS DISPOSITION OF A POINT OF ORDER RAISED UNDER CLAUSE 9 OF RULE XXI, THE CHAIR PUTS THE QUESTION OF CONSIDERATION WITH RESPECT TO THE PROPOSITION THAT IS THE OBJECT OF THE POINT OF ORDER.

On January 28, 2014, Mr. MCGOVERN made a point of order against consideration of House Resolution 465, and said:

"Madam Speaker, I raise a point of order against House Resolution 465 under clause 9(c) of rule XXI because the resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against H.R. 7, the abortion bill, and the conference report on H.R. 2642, the farm bill."

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mrs. BLACK, responded to the point of order, and said:

"The gentleman from Massachusetts makes a point of order that the resolution violates clause 9(c) of rule XXI.

"Under clause 9(c) of rule XXI, the gentleman from Massachusetts and a Member opposed each will control ten minutes of debate on the question of consideration.

"Following that debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as follows: 'Will the House now consider the resolution?'"

Mr. MCGOVERN was further recognized and said:

"Madam Speaker, the conference report on the farm bill was made public at around 7:30 last night. With nearly 1,000 pages dumped on us at the last minute, we know that no one has had a chance to read the entire thing. I'm a conferee, and even I had an extra few hours to try to digest this monstrosity of a bill, but who knows what is in this bill? That is why I'm raising this earmarks point of order.

"As I said earlier, Madam Speaker, one of the things that is most troubling to me and a number of my colleagues, again, is this attack on poor people and is this attack on SNAP, a program that does nothing more than provide food to people.

"Madam Speaker, I would like to include for the RECORD a letter that was addressed to Congress from the mayors of Baton Rouge, Boston, Dallas, the District of Columbia, Gary, Hartford, Ithaca, Los Angeles, Madison, Memphis, New York, Providence, Raleigh, Sacramento, Salt Lake City, San Diego, San Francisco, Seattle and Tucson urging us in both the House and the Senate to reject these SNAP cuts. These mayors have made it very clear that it would have an adverse impact on the people that they represent. They have stressed in this letter the importance of SNAP to help people to be able to put food on the table for their children.

"I also would like to reference a statement from the Food Research and Action Center, otherwise known as FRAC. They are urging us to vote against this conference committee report if these SNAP cuts remain in the bill. They have said that SNAP is essential to the nutrition, the health and

QUESTIONS OF ORDER

the well-being of 47 million Americans each month, but every participant suffered a significant cut in benefits beginning last November 1.

“As the gentledady from Connecticut made mention of, on November 1, an \$11 billion cut in SNAP went into effect. All 47 million beneficiaries received a cut. Food prices didn’t go down, but their benefit went down, and now we are going to pile on. There are some who say, well, it doesn’t affect all 47 million. It is only going to be about 1 million or so people that will be adversely impacted, but those people that will be adversely impacted stand a great deal to lose. The November 1 cut for the average family of three resulted in a \$31 a month benefit cut. You add this on top of it, and it is another \$80 to \$90. So that family of three will receive about \$120 to \$130 less per month.

“What are they going to do? Even before these cuts went into effect, they were going to food banks, they were going to charities looking for help because their benefit was so meager to begin with. What are they supposed to do? I think in this House of Representatives, I don’t care what your political party or ideology is, it should never, ever, ever be acceptable that anybody in this country—the United States of America, the richest country in the history of the world—should go hungry.

“The fact that we are moving forward with the farm bill—a deal that contains this \$8.6 billion in cuts—I think is outrageous. I’m all for a deal. I want a farm bill. I’m willing to swallow a lot of things in this bill that I don’t like, but the price of doing that should not be to increase hunger and poverty in this country, and that is what this bill does.

“We talk about deals. Behind these deals are real people. They are our neighbors. They are in every community. There is not a congressional district in our country that is hunger free. These people are everywhere. We have an obligation to not turn our backs on them. SNAP is one of the most efficiently run Federal programs with one of the lowest error rates.

“This is important. SNAP in and of itself is not going to solve the problem of hunger or poverty. The bottom line is by cutting it the way we are doing, we are making things worse for people. I stood on the floor today, and I read the descriptions of individuals in Massachusetts who, if this farm bill passes, will see a significant cut in their benefit, and their question to me is, what do I do? Where do I go? Tell me how to put food on the table for my kids. Tell me how I’m going to survive.

“We should not be making the lives of people who are suffering more miserable. That is not our job.

“I will also insert for the RECORD the entire Food Research and Action Center statement.

“Madam Speaker, in Massachusetts alone there will be 125,000 SNAP households that could suffer up to a \$70 to \$80 a month cut in SNAP benefit if this farm bill goes through as it is. There is

no reason in the world that we should be cutting this program. This is not an ATM machine to pay for big farm subsidies. This is not an ATM machine to make up for the fraud, the waste and the abuse in the crop insurance program.

“Again, I will repeat to my colleagues, tonight we are going to hear the President talk about income inequality, and my criticism here, it is a bipartisan criticism. I’m critical of the Republicans for the cruel cuts that were proposed in the original farm bill—up to \$40 billion—and I’m frustrated that there are people in my own party, including in this White House, who don’t believe this is worth a fight. Well, this is worth a fight. If this is not worth a fight, I don’t know what the hell we are here for. If making sure people in this country don’t go hungry is not a priority, then I don’t know what we are doing here.

“We can explain this away, we can rationalize it and justify it. I have heard all the talking points. My favorite is that nobody will actually lose their benefit.

“What that neglects to tell you is that your benefit will be cut down to almost nothing. Yes, they will still get a little benefit, but it might be \$15 a month instead of \$115 a month. I mean, is that the best we can do, on both sides of the aisle? This never used to be a partisan issue. This never used to be a polarizing issue, and now all of a sudden it has become one. Again, I plea with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, let’s come together and get a farm bill done, but not at this price.

“And I urge the White House to stand up and fight alongside of us on this. They should be taking a greater leadership role on this. It is not enough to just talk about income inequality; you have to fight for it, too.”

Ms. DELAURO was recognized to speak to the point of order and said:

“Madam Speaker, I am proud once again to join my colleague. I, too, want a farm bill. In fact, I had the honor of helping to negotiate the 2008 farm bill, the nutrition portion of it, where we maintained that historic coalition between the safety net for agriculture and the safety net for nutrition.

“I think it is almost unbelievable that we got a thousand-page bill, and I just want to say to the American public here that they should ask Members of Congress whether or not they have read the bill. We went over and over this with regard to the health care bill. Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle kept asking us if we have read the bill. No one has really read this bill. There were four people who negotiated this work. There could well be significant earmarks in this effort.

“Let me point out the reverse Robin Hood legislation here. It steals food from the poor to help pay for handouts to wealthy agribusiness. Let me just give a couple of examples. In violation of the congressional rule that provisions passed by both bodies should not

be changed, the conference, four people, more than doubled the annual primary payments from \$50,000 to \$125,000, or \$250,000 a couple. They reopened the loophole that was closed in the House and in the Senate that allows wealthy farmers to collect far more than the nominal payment limit: \$50,000. They raised it to \$125,000 for an individual; to a couple, \$250,000. House and Senate on a bipartisan basis closed the loophole.

“This allows payments to be collected by multiple people on the farm. What we have today is eight people can collect a \$125,000 payment, leading to a million-dollar subsidy for a farm. Seven of those eight people never have to put their foot on the farm. It is called padding the payroll. ‘Farmers,’ they don’t have to undergo any income means testing to receive a subsidy.

“The Durbin-Coburn amendment in the Senate would reduce the level of Federal premium support for crop insurance participants with an adjusted gross income of \$750,000. The conference report—four people—determined that they would make that cap at \$900,000. Again, the wealthiest people in the Nation.

“Let me tell you about crop insurance. I don’t know that the American public knows that the Federal Government, you, Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer, you pick up 60 percent of the cost of that crop insurance. That doesn’t include administrative fees. There are 26 individuals today who get at least a million dollars in premium subsidy. We can’t find out who they are. They could be Members of Congress, because they are protected: 26 individuals. We have almost 50 million people who are on the food stamp program, 16 million of whom are children. And there is no fraud and abuse in this program, the way there is in the crop insurance program; and yet we want to take food out of the mouths of families and children in this Nation. It is the wrong thing to do. This bill should be rejected.”

Ms. FOXX was recognized to speak to the point of order and said:

“The question before the House is, ‘Should the House now consider H. Res. 465?’ This point of order, Madam Speaker, is a dilatory tactic. None of the provisions contained in the underlying measures meet the definition of an earmark under the rule.

“The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary certified that H.R. 7 contains no congressional earmarks by including the following earmark statement in the report accompanying this bill, which was filed on January 23, 2014:

‘In accordance with clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, H.R. 7 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(e), 9(f) or 9(g) of rule XXI.’

“The following was included in the Joint Explanatory Statement for the farm bill:

‘Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, neither this conference report nor the

QUESTIONS OF ORDER

accompanying joint statement of managers contains any congressional earmarks, congressionally directed spending items, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits, as defined in such rules."

"I also remind the gentleman that this conference agreement is a bipartisan and bicameral measure. Nine of the 10 Democrat conferees from the Agriculture Committee have signed the conference report. The conference report was made available to all Members and the public yesterday, in full compliance of the 3-day availability rule.

"In order to allow the House to continue its scheduled business for the day, Madam Speaker, I urge Members to vote 'yes' on the question of consideration of the resolution."

After debate,

The question being put, *viva voce*,

Will the House now consider the resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mrs. BLACK, announced that the ayes had it.

So the House decided to consider said resolution.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the House decided to consider said resolution was, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

(¶31.21)

A RESOLUTION ALLEGING THAT THE CHAIRMAN OF A COMMITTEE INTENTIONALLY VIOLATED HOUSE RULES DURING A HEARING AND CONDEMNING HIS ACTIONS AS OFFENSIVE AND DISRESPECTFUL PRESENTS A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE UNDER RULE IX.

THE HOUSE LAID ON THE TABLE A RESOLUTION CONSIDERED AS A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE.

On March 6, 2014, Ms. FUDGE, pursuant to rule IX, rose to a question of the privileges of the House and submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 504):

Whereas on March 5, 2014, during a hearing before the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Committee Chairman Darrell E. Issa gave a statement and then posed ten questions to former Internal Revenue Service official Lois Lerner, who stated that she was invoking her Fifth Amendment right not to testify;

Whereas the Committee's Ranking Member, Rep. Elijah E. Cummings, clearly sought recognition to take his turn for questions under Committee and House Rules;

Whereas, Chairman Issa then quickly adjourned the hearing and refused to allow him to make any statement or ask any questions;

Whereas Ranking Member Cummings protested immediately, stating: "Mr. Chairman, you cannot run a Committee like this. You just cannot do this. This is, we are better than that as a country, we are better than that as a Committee."

Whereas, Chairman Issa then returned and allowed Ranking Member Cummings to begin his statement, but when it became clear that Chairman Issa did not want to hear what Ranking Member Cummings was saying, turned off Ranking Member Cum-

mings' microphone, ordered Republican staff to "close it down," and repeatedly signaled to end the hearing with his hand across his neck;

Whereas Ranking Member Cummings objected again, stating: "You cannot have a one-sided investigation. There is absolutely something wrong with that";

Whereas Chairman Issa made a statement of his own and posed questions during the hearing, but refused to allow other members of the Committee, and in particular the Ranking Member who had sought recognition, to make statements under the five-minute rule in violation of House Rule XI;

Whereas Chairman Issa instructed the microphones to be turned off and adjourned the hearing without a vote or a unanimous consent agreement in violation of Rule XVI because he did not want to permit Ranking Member Cummings to speak;

Whereas Chairman Issa's abusive behavior on March 5 is part of a continuing pattern in which he has routinely excluded members of the Committee from investigative meetings, and has routinely provided information to the press before sharing it with Committee members;

Whereas Chairman Issa has violated Clause 1 of Rule XXIII of the Code of Official Conduct which states that "A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer or employee of the House shall behave at all times in a manner that shall reflect creditably on the House"; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives strongly condemns the offensive and disrespectful manner in which Chairman Darrell E. Issa conducted the hearing of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on March 5, 2014, during which he turned off the microphones of the Ranking Member while he was speaking and adjourned the hearing without a vote or a unanimous consent agreement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. WOMACK, ruled that the resolution submitted did present a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX.

Mr. CANTOR moved to lay the resolution on the table.

The question being put, *viva voce*,

Will the House lay the resolution on the table?

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. WOMACK, announced that the noes had it.

Mr. CANTOR demanded that the vote be taken by the yeas and nays, which demand was supported by one-fifth of the Members present, so the yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device.

It was decided in the affirmative

Yeas	211
Nays	186
Answered present	10

¶31.22 [Roll No. 107]

So the motion to lay the resolution on the table was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby said motion was agreed to was, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

CHAIRMAN OF A COMMITTEE INTENTIONALLY VIOLATED HOUSE RULES DURING A HEARING, CONDEMNING HIS ACTIONS AS OFFENSIVE AND DISRESPECTFUL, AND REQUIRING HIM TO APOLOGIZE IN THE WELL OF THE HOUSE PRESENTS A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE UNDER RULE IX.

THE HOUSE LAID ON THE TABLE A RESOLUTION CONSIDERED AS A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE.

On March 13, 2014, Mr. KILDEE, pursuant to rule IX, rose to a question of the privileges of the House and submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 517):

Whereas on March 5, 2014, during a hearing before the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Committee Chairman Darrell E. Issa gave a statement and then posed ten questions to former Internal Revenue Service official Lois Lerner, who stated that she was invoking her Fifth Amendment right not to testify;

Whereas the committee's ranking member, Rep. Elijah E. Cummings, clearly sought recognition to take his turn for questions under committee and House rules;

Whereas, Chairman Issa then unilaterally adjourned the hearing and refused to allow him to make any statement or ask any questions;

Whereas Ranking Member Cummings protested immediately, stating: "Mr. Chairman, you cannot run a committee like this. You just cannot do this. This is, we are better than that as a country, we are better than that as a committee."

Whereas, Chairman Issa then returned and allowed Ranking Member Cummings to begin his statement, but when it became clear that Chairman Issa did not want to hear what Ranking Member Cummings was saying, turned off Ranking Member Cummings' microphone, ordered Republican staff to "close it down," and repeatedly signaled to end the hearing with his hand across his neck;

Whereas Ranking Member Cummings objected again, stating: "You cannot have a one-sided investigation. There is absolutely something wrong with that.";

Whereas Chairman Issa made a statement of his own and posed questions during the hearing, but refused to allow other members of the committee, and in particular, the ranking member, who had sought recognition, to make statements under the 5-minute rule in violation of House rule XI;

Whereas Chairman Issa instructed the microphones be turned off and adjourned the hearing without a vote or a unanimous consent agreement in violation of rule XVI because he did not want to permit Ranking Member Cummings to speak;

Whereas Chairman Issa's abusive behavior on March 5 is part of a continuing pattern in which he has routinely excluded members of the committee from investigative meetings, has turned off Members' microphones while they were questioning a witness, attempted to prevent witnesses from answering questions, and has provided information to the press before sharing it with committee members;

Whereas on July 18, 2003, former Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Bill Thomas asked the United States Capitol Police to remove minority members of the committee from the library where they were having a discussion about a pending committee mark up, and subsequently came to the well of the U.S. House of Representatives to publicly apologize for his belligerent behavior;

Whereas Chairman Issa has violated clause 1 rule XXIII of the Code of Official Conduct

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

(¶35.26)

A RESOLUTION ALLEGING THAT THE

QUESTIONS OF ORDER

which states that "A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer or employee of the House shall behave at all times in a manner that shall reflect creditably on the House": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives strongly condemns the offensive and disrespectful manner in which Chairman Darrell E. Issa conducted the hearing of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on March 5, 2014, and requires that he come to the well of the House to issue a public apology to Members of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. SIMPSON, ruled that the resolution submitted did present a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX.

Mr. CANTOR moved to lay the resolution on the table.

The question being put, *viva voce*,

Will the House lay the resolution on the table?

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. SIMPSON, announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. KILDEE demanded a recorded vote on agreeing to said motion, which demand was supported by one-fifth of a quorum, so a recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device.

It was decided in the affirmative	{	Ayes 217 Noes 173 Answered present 10
---	---	---

¶35.27 [Roll No. 133]

So the motion to lay the resolution on the table was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby said motion was agreed to was, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

POINT OF ORDER

(¶58.10)

PURSUANT TO SECTION 426(B)(4) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974, A MEMBER WHO MAKES A POINT OF ORDER UNDER SECTION 426(A) OF THE ACT AND SATISFIES THE THRESHOLD BURDEN SPECIFIED IN SECTION 426(B)(2) OF THE ACT BY CITING LANGUAGE IN THE RESOLUTION THAT WAIVES THE APPLICATION OF SECTION 425 OF THE ACT IS RECOGNIZED TO CONTROL ONE-HALF OF THE 20 MINUTES PROVIDED FOR DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF CONSIDERATION.

PURSUANT TO SECTION 426(B)(3) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974, AS DISPOSITION OF A POINT OF ORDER RAISED UNDER SECTION 426(A) OF THE ACT, THE CHAIR PUTS THE QUESTION OF CONSIDERATION WITH RESPECT TO THE PROPOSITION THAT IS THE OBJECT OF THE POINT OF ORDER.

On May 7, 2014, Mr. Danny K. DAVIS of Illinois, made a point of order against consideration of House Resolution 569, and said:

"Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against H. Res. 569 because the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. The resolution

contains a waiver of all points of order against consideration of the bill, except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI, which includes a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, which causes a violation of section 426(a)."

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. HULTGREN, responded to the point of order, and said:

"The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

"The gentleman has met the threshold burden under the rule and the gentleman from Illinois and a Member opposed each will control ten minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order."

Mr. Danny K. DAVIS of Illinois, was further recognized and said:

"Mr. Speaker, I raise this point of order not only out of concern for unfunded mandates, but to highlight the failure of Republican House leadership to protect the long-term unemployed, low-income citizens, and others who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own.

"I raise this point of order because the bill before us would add \$156 billion to the deficit to provide permanent tax breaks for businesses while doing nothing for the 2.6 million Americans living with the constant nightmare of having no job, no food, no money, no lights, no gas, no college tuition money, and no unemployment check.

"H.R. 4438 is 15 times the cost of helping the 2.6 million Americans who are looking for jobs that have been shipped overseas, jobs that have been downsized or outsourced, or jobs that simply do not exist. Please tell me, Mr. Speaker: What are they supposed to do?"

"H.R. 4438 would give \$156 billion in tax breaks for businesses but do nothing for the 72,000 additional Americans who lose benefits each and every week. An estimated 74,000 Illinoisans lost benefits on December 28, 2013, with 38,000 of these citizens living in Cook County alone. Forty-two thousand Illinoisans exhausted their benefits in the first 3 months of 2014. H.R. 4438 completely fails these Americans, many of whom stood on the Capitol steps yesterday pleading with Republican leadership to do the right thing. But the heartless response has been and continues to be refusal to help hard-working Americans struggling to provide food, shelter, clothing, and medical care for their families.

"Now is not the time to cut, deny, or delay unemployment benefits. Failure to continue emergency unemployment benefits threatens the continuation of our economic recovery, costing over 200,000 greatly-needed jobs. The expiration has already drained almost \$5 billion from our national economy in the first quarter of this year. In Illinois alone, this loss of Federal aid means

the loss in purchasing power of \$23 million each week—money that could be used to support local businesses, buy gasoline, pay utility bills, provide co-payments at doctors' offices, clinics, hospitals; purchase groceries, and pay children's graduation fees. Every \$1 in unemployment insurance generates \$1.63 in economic activity. I say let us practice good economy, let's be reasonable, and let's have a heart. In my State of Illinois, the unemployment rate remains 8.6 percent, and in much of my district it is more than 20 percent. Finding a job is not easy, but people are still trying.

"Government leaders have a responsibility to protect our citizens and our country, especially during times of national crisis. Instead of helping Americans who already are hardest hit by the economic crisis—including older Americans, low-income Americans, veterans, and members of minority groups—Republicans prioritize \$156 billion in unpaid-for business tax breaks and tell the American people that it is all about fiscal responsibility and deficit reduction.

"Mr. Speaker, extending unemployment assistance is a true demonstration of leadership and our national commitment to all Americans, not just the most secure. Refusal to help these citizens is an unacceptable, abject, and mean-spirited approach to leadership.

"I urge that we reject this rule and the underlying bill by voting 'no' on this motion until the Republican leadership puts people first and provides unemployment insurance to the 2.6 million Americans struggling to keep their lights on and gas in their automobiles, to pay rent and mortgages, and to feed their families. I urge that we vote 'no' on this rule and to the bill."

Mr. COLE was recognized to speak to the point of order and said:

"Mr. Speaker, the question before the House is, 'Should we now proceed and consider House Resolution 569?' While the resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, the Committee on Rules is not aware of any violation. In my view, Mr. Speaker, the point of order is merely a dilatory tactic.

"In fact, the Joint Committee on Taxation states that 'the bill contains no intergovernmental or private sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.'

"This legislation makes permanent a simplified research credit that will help open the door for economic growth and give businesses the certainty they need to thrive. This measure has been routinely extended and supported by both parties for many years. In order to allow the House to continue its scheduled business for the day, I urge members to vote 'yes' on the question of consideration of the resolution."

After debate,

The question being put, *viva voce*,

Will the House now consider the resolution?

QUESTIONS OF ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. HULTGREN, announced that the ayes had it.

So the House decided to consider said resolution.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the House decided to consider said resolution was, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

POINT OF ORDER

(¶65.10)

PURSUANT TO SECTION 426(B)(4) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974, A MEMBER WHO MAKES A POINT OF ORDER UNDER SECTION 426(A) OF THE ACT AND SATISFIES THE THRESHOLD BURDEN SPECIFIED IN SECTION 426(B)(2) OF THE ACT BY CITING LANGUAGE IN THE RESOLUTION THAT WAIVES THE APPLICATION OF SECTION 425 OF THE ACT IS RECOGNIZED TO CONTROL ONE-HALF OF THE 20 MINUTES PROVIDED FOR DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF CONSIDERATION.

PURSUANT TO SECTION 426(B)(3) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974, AS DISPOSITION OF A POINT OF ORDER RAISED UNDER SECTION 426(A) OF THE ACT, THE CHAIR PUTS THE QUESTION OF CONSIDERATION WITH RESPECT TO THE PROPOSITION THAT IS THE OBJECT OF THE POINT OF ORDER.

On May 21, 2014, Mr. MCGOVERN made a point of order against consideration of House Resolution 590, and said:

“Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against H. Res. 590 because the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. The resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against consideration of the bill, except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI, which includes a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, which causes a violation of section 426(a).”

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, responded to the point of order, and said:

“The gentleman from Massachusetts makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

“The gentleman has met the threshold burden under the rule and the gentleman from Massachusetts and a Member opposed each will control ten minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.”

Mr. MCGOVERN was further recognized and said:

“Mr. Speaker, last night, a bipartisan group, Congressman WALTER JONES of North Carolina; Congressman ADAM SMITH, the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee from Washington State; Congressman GARAMENDI; and Congresswoman LEE from California; and I, offered an amendment to be able to have a debate on a vote on our policy in Afghanistan—the longest war in American history.

“It seemed odd to me that a bill like the Department of Defense authorization bill would come to the floor without the ability for Members to have a vote on Afghanistan. We are at war, and you would never know it by the actions of this House.

“I am ashamed of this House that a bill like this would come to the floor and the leadership would block any attempt to be able to have a debate and a vote on what our policy should be in Afghanistan.

“The rule that we are going to debate later today makes in order 162 amendments. There are amendments on everything from deferred retirement for military chaplains to charging admission to air shows to public access to Rattlesnake Mountain. I am sure public access to Rattlesnake Mountain is a big deal, but it is not as big a deal as the war in Afghanistan, where we have brave men and women in harm’s way because we put them there.

“The question is whether or not our policies should remain the same or whether it should change.

“The President of the United States has said that he wants to draw down American forces in 2014. I hope he does. But there are also reports that we may be there for a considerably longer period of time.

“I don’t know what the policy is going to be, but let me read to you what this amendment that the Republican leadership blocked says. This is basically what we are asking here. It says:

‘In the event that the United States Armed Forces remained deployed in Afghanistan after December 31, 2014, then no later than March 31, 2015, the President shall send to Congress a determination describing the purpose and expected duration of such deployment and the projected number of troops to be deployed.’

“Who could possibly object to that? Basically, it is having the White House inform us of what the policy is. Where is the problem?”

“The second part of it goes as follows:

‘No later than 30 days following the receipt of the President’s determination, Congress shall enact a joint resolution to improve the content of the President’s determination.’

‘Should Congress vote against the President’s determination, the President is directed to remove all troops not required to protect United States diplomatic facilities and personnel in a safe, orderly, expeditious redeployment from Afghanistan.’

“Does anybody really object to that? Does anybody object to doing what we are supposed to do—to have a say on issues like war? It astounds me that Members of Congress would want to hide behind the Rules Committee blocking bringing this to the floor as though it is a way to avoid a serious debate and a vote on this policy.

“By the way, the sponsors of this amendment have different opinions on Afghanistan. Some of us believe we should get out of there right now. That is where I am. Some of those who co-sponsored this amendment believe that we should be there and have at least a small force in Afghanistan beyond 2014.

“So this is not about right now saying we want to get out of Afghanistan. What this is saying is that if the President decides to change his promise of keeping us there no later than December 2014, then we ought to have a vote. We ought to be informed of what is going on and we ought to have a vote. Who could object to that?”

Mr. JONES was recognized to speak to the point of order and said:

“I could not agree more. How in the world can the Congress of the United States, which has an obligation to declare war, continue to abdicate its right to debate our young men and women going to Afghanistan to die?”

“We have already spent over \$1.5 trillion in Iraq and Afghanistan. Iraq was an unnecessary war.

“The previous administration intentionally manufactured the justification. It was absolutely unnecessary. And all we are asking—and that is why I will vote against the rule. There is much in this bill that I will vote for.

“But as the gentleman from Massachusetts says, this is a bipartisan amendment.

“I have signed over 11,000 letters to families and extended families who lost loved ones in Iraq and Afghanistan. This past weekend I signed four letters. I am not trying to single myself out, but I feel the pain of my mistake of giving the authority to the previous President to bypass Congress to send our young men and women to die in Iraq and Afghanistan.

“Mr. MCGOVERN is right. If President Obama believes it is necessary in the next couple of years to increase the numbers, then let him come to Congress so that we can meet our constitutional responsibility and vote either ‘yes’ or ‘no,’ and then, with pride, know that we did what the Constitution required.

“Next Wednesday, I will go to Walter Reed at Bethesda to see three marines who were severely injured in Afghanistan in the last month. I don’t know how severely they are. It might be legs are gone. It might be brain injuries.

“Yet, we, in Congress, continue to abdicate our constitutional responsibility to these young men and young women. I will tell you that the marines down at Camp Lejeune and Cherry Point, which is in my district, are sick and tired of this involvement in Afghanistan.

“One last point. The former Commandant of the Marine Corps has been my adviser for the last 5 years on Afghanistan, and he has said: Why doesn’t Congress understand history? You will never change Afghanistan. No matter how much blood or money you send to Afghanistan, you will never change it.

“I am disappointed in the Rules Committee. So many, and every one of them, Republican and Democrat, I have the greatest respect for. But not to allow us to debate whether a young man or young woman from America should die or lose their legs, their arms, or their mind is a disappoint-

QUESTIONS OF ORDER

ment and a failure of this House of Representatives not to follow the Constitution.”.

Mr. NUGENT was recognized to speak to the point of order and said:

“The question before the House is, ‘Should the House now consider H. Res. 590?’.

“While the resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, the committee is not aware of any point of order.

“The Congressional Budget Office has stated that, while the two underlying bills contained in the rule would impose intergovernmental and private sector mandates as defined by the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, the mandates would fall well below the threshold in that act.

“That said, I know my friend is using this point of order to debate a very important issue that he cares passionately about. I am glad he has had the opportunity to bring it forward because we tend to agree on a lot of what he has said, and he knows that. We have talked on numerous occasions.

“But in order to allow this House to continue its scheduled business of the day, I urge our Members to vote ‘yes’ on the question of consideration of the resolution.”.

Mr. MCGOVERN was further recognized and said:

“I want my colleagues to understand one thing. The amendment that we are talking about is germane. I spent a great deal of time working with the Parliamentarian to make sure that the concerns that the Republican majority had about the germaneness of this amendment were addressed. It is a germane amendment. There is absolutely no reason at all for this not to be on the floor.

“Let me just say that it doesn’t take any courage to praise the troops and then hide from the vote. It is an act of cowardice, quite frankly. The fact that we are debating a Defense Department authorization bill, we are at war, and we are not allowed to be able to consider an amendment about what our policy should be in Afghanistan, well, what do you tell the troops? What do you tell their families? This war is on auto-pilot and we will just let it go?

“I mean, we have a responsibility. This Chamber voted to send young men and women into harm’s way. We have a responsibility and we are not living up to it. There is no reason in the world why this amendment should not be made in order. It is germane. It complies with all the rules.

“The only reason why it isn’t made in order is because someone in the Republican leadership said, no, we are not going to have a debate; we are not going to have a vote. Maybe they are afraid they are going to lose. I heard last night that they don’t want to embarrass the President.

“Really?”

“I mean, select committees on Benghazi, 53 votes to overturn the Affordable Care Act. They don’t want to embarrass the President? Well, with

friends like you, the President doesn’t need any enemies.

“The bottom line is this an important issue, and how dare we come to the floor on the defense bill and be silent and indifferent when it comes to Afghanistan.

“I am ashamed of this process. There is no reason in the world why we shouldn’t be debating this issue. We owe it to those young men and women who are over there, those who have sacrificed their lives, those who are at Walter Reed Hospital.

“How dare we bring a bill like this to the floor without addressing this most important issue. We are at war, and no one in this place seems to want to talk about it.

“Well, it is our responsibility just as much as it is the President’s responsibility. To do nothing means we are complicit in continuing this war. I have had enough, and I think Members of this Chamber who agree with us ought to stand with us and vote against this rule.

“This process stinks. We played by the rules, we did everything right, and we got nothing—nothing on this issue.”.

Mr. NUGENT was further recognized and said:

“Mr. Speaker, like I said before, I don’t disagree with a lot of what my friend from Massachusetts said. As we voted last time, we are not going to have the opportunity to do that this time.

“But I urge Members to vote ‘yes’ on the question of consideration of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.”.

After debate,

The question being put, viva voce,

Will the House now consider the resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. POE of Texas, announced that the ayes had it.

So the House decided to consider said resolution.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the House decided to consider said resolution was, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

POINT OF ORDER

(¶65.11)

PURSUANT TO CLAUSE 9 OF RULE XXI, A MEMBER WHO MAKES A POINT OF ORDER BY CITING LANGUAGE IN A RESOLUTION THAT WAIVES THE APPLICATION OF CLAUSE 9 OF RULE XXI IS RECOGNIZED TO CONTROL ONE-HALF OF THE 20 MINUTES PROVIDED FOR DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF CONSIDERATION.

PURSUANT TO CLAUSE 9 OF RULE XXI, AS DISPOSITION OF A POINT OF ORDER RAISED UNDER CLAUSE 9 OF RULE XXI, THE CHAIR PUTS THE QUESTION OF CONSIDERATION WITH RESPECT TO THE PROPOSITION THAT IS THE OBJECT OF THE POINT OF ORDER.

On May 21, 2014, Mr. MCGOVERN made a point of order against consideration of House Resolution 590, and said:

“Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the consideration of the rule, House Resolution 590.

“Clause 9(c) of rule XXI of the rules of the House specifically states that the Rules Committee may not waive the earmark disclosure rule prescribed by paragraphs (a) or (b) of clause 9 of rule XXI. House Resolution 590 waives all points of order against consideration of H.R. 3361.

“Therefore, I make a point of order pursuant to clause 9(c) of rule XXI that this rule may not be considered.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. POE of Texas, responded to the point of order, and said:

“The gentleman from Massachusetts makes a point of order that the resolution violates clause 9(c) of rule XXI.

“Under clause 9(c) of rule XXI, the gentleman from Massachusetts and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration.

“Following that debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as follows: ‘Will the House now consider the resolution?’.”.

Mr. MCGOVERN was further recognized and said:

“What I found interesting about the exchange that we have just had is that nobody can explain to me why we cannot have a vote on the bipartisan amendment that Mr. JONES and Mr. SMITH, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. LEE and myself have brought before the House. Nobody can give us a reason why, other than it is not in order because they have the power to not make it in order.

“I want my colleagues to understand a few facts. 2,320 U.S. troops have been killed in Afghanistan since 2001.

“19,718 U.S. troops have been wounded in Afghanistan since 2001.

“127 soldiers were killed in 2013.

“1,687 have been killed since the surge of 2009.

“An estimated 30,000 Afghan civilians have been killed since 2001.

“The VA estimates that approximately 22 veterans will die by suicide every day. At least 30 percent of veterans have contemplated suicide.

“Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve a say in the future of America’s longest war. We all know that there is no military solution in Afghanistan. The American public is sick and tired of war. American interests are not advanced by another decade of war.

“And yet, what does this House of Representatives do when we consider the Department of Defense authorization bill? We do nothing. We do nothing. The only thing that happens is we bring germane amendments to the Rules Committee to be able to debate this issue so the Members will have a say when the President outlines his policy for Afghanistan beyond 2014.

“But it seems that the leadership of this House is perfectly satisfied just sitting back and just being okay with whatever happens.

“All we are asking for is that if we are going to stay beyond 2014, the

QUESTIONS OF ORDER

President has to tell us what his plan is. That is not radical. That is not out there. He needs to tell us what his plan is, and we need to vote on it. That is our job. And if you don't want to take responsibility for issues like this, maybe you ought to think about retiring because it is an insult to the men and women who are serving our country for us to be silent and indifferent, to not do the proper oversight, to not debate these issues.

"It is an insult to the American taxpayer that we are letting the most corrupt government in the world—that is how the Karzai government has been rated, the most corrupt government in the world—continue to steal our money.

"We cut food stamps for poor people. We don't have enough money to take care of our veterans in the VA facilities. We are cutting back on moneys for roads and bridges. We can't extend Unemployment Compensation for people who have lost their jobs, and yet we just hand over millions and millions and millions of dollars.

"Let me just tell you this, Mr. Speaker. Right now, we authorized in FY13 spending \$87.2 billion for Afghanistan. We authorized in FY14 spending \$85.2 billion. Proposed FY15 spending, \$79.4 billion. Total since 2001, \$778 billion. And when you add in the cost of the veterans care that will be needed and all the other associated costs, the total cost of the war in Afghanistan and Iraq are about \$4- to \$6 trillion. And we are not even paying for most of it. We are borrowing it. It is going on our credit card.

"My friends wail about the deficit and the debt, but when it comes to just dumping money into this money pit called Afghanistan, they say nothing."

Mr. JONES was recognized to speak to the point of order and said:

"You know, it is kind of amazing that many of us on my side are considered conservatives. I hope that I am considered a conservative.

"Pat Buchanan has written so many articles about the new war party. The new war party is the Republican Party. It is the Republican Party because of the reason that Mr. MCGOVERN is talking about today.

"We sit here and we allow all these other spending issues involving our military, and much of it they deserve: pay increases, taking care of their families, doing the good things for our military.

"But when it comes to sending our young men and women to give their life and limbs, we don't debate it. We just don't debate it.

"I don't know if the military industrial complex that Eisenhower warned the Congress about—do they control Congress? I don't know. I haven't checked the campaign finance donations from the military industrial complexes.

"But something has changed my party from understanding our constitutional responsibilities. Nothing is more important—nothing in the House of

Representatives is more important than sending a young man or woman to die for this country. If this amendment allows us to have a debate on whether that young man or young woman should give their life, then we owe it to the families of America.

"This amendment that Mr. MCGOVERN and myself and Ms. LEE and Mr. SMITH and Mr. GARAMENDI offered is very simple. It just says that after 2014, if the President decides that he needs to increase the number of troops in Afghanistan, then we will vote on it.

"Do you know how pathetic this is that we are asking for this?"

"A few years ago, President Obama proposed to the Afghan Government—President Karzai, who is a crook—that we will have an agreement, that we will stay there 10 more years, and that we will send them \$2 billion or \$3 billion a month just to take care of their needs in Afghanistan. This, when we are cutting food programs for children, senior citizens, and we can't even fix the potholes and can't fix the bridges in America.

"And then you will not allow us to have a debate on our responsibility, based on the Constitution, that a young man or a young woman who would die for this country or lose a leg, an arm, or their mind, that we can't have a debate? What a pathetic time for the House of Representatives."

Mr. NUGENT was recognized to speak to the point of order and said:

"Mr. Speaker, the question before the House is: 'Should the House now consider H. Res. 590?'"

"While the resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, the committee is not aware of any points of order. All of the relevant committees have included earmark statements in their reports filed with the House, so there is no violation of the House earmark rule.

"That said, I know my friend is using this point of order to debate an important issue—and I have said this earlier—that he passionately cares about. So I am glad that he has had that opportunity.

"But in order to allow this House to continue with the scheduled business for the day, I urge Members to vote 'yes' on the question of consideration, and I reserve the balance of my time."

Mr. MCGOVERN was further recognized and said:

"Mr. Speaker, when Speaker BOEHNER became the Speaker of the House, he made a pledge that he would allow the House to work its will on major issues.

"This is a major issue. This is a major issue. If my friends want to know why the majority of the American people think that this place is dysfunctional, this is the reason: we can't get a vote on an issue as important as the war in Afghanistan.

"Now, there is really no excuse. It is germane. We spent a lot of time working with the Parliamentarian to make sure it is germane to satisfy the concerns of the majority. We did that. It is

bipartisan. It is bipartisan. And of people who are cosponsors of the amendment, some want to end the war now and some believe that we need to keep troops there for a period beyond 2014. I mean, we have jumped through every hoop. What else can we possibly do?"

"And for some reason, somebody in the leadership here said, no, the House of Representatives will not be able to work its will when it comes to Afghanistan.

"Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD an article entitled 'CNN Poll: Afghanistan war arguably most unpopular in U.S. history'.

"The American people deserve better than what is on display here.

"Mr. Speaker, I want to appeal not just to Democrats but to Republicans. I want to appeal to the fairness of Members in this Chamber. I want to appeal to their sense of making sure that what we do here is right.

"On this issue, we ought to have a vote, and the only way to get a vote is if you vote down the rule so we can go back to the Rules Committee and insert this amendment, that is totally germane, into the Department of Defense authorization bill.

"Mr. Speaker, I am going to close by simply saying, it is moments like this where I feel a great sadness for this institution. Again, there are a lot of things in this Defense Department bill that we are going to debate that really, I think, one would fairly characterize as somewhat trivial, and I mentioned some of them earlier.

"The fact that we are at war and we can't vote on this war—we are being told that we can't have a say on what the future of our policy is—that is shameful. I am ashamed of this place for running such a closed system on the war.

"This is the defense bill. We are not talking about the education bill. We are not talking about the small business bill. This is the Department of Defense authorization bill. This is where we should have the debate. It is germane, and it should be made in order.

"I will just finish, Mr. Speaker, by saying that we are approaching Memorial Day. We are all going to go home and give great speeches. When people ask, What are you doing for our troops in Afghanistan, what are you doing to try to get them home, you will be able to say, nothing, because that is exactly what we are going to do if we can't consider this amendment. Nothing. What a shame. What a tragedy. What an insult to those men and women who are serving. What an insult to their families. What an insult to the American people.

"When you are in charge, you can do whatever you want, but I would urge my colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, to reject this rule."

Mr. NUGENT was further recognized and said:

"Mr. Speaker, so much has been said. As I said earlier, I agree with a lot of what has been said.

"I will be honest with you, I am disappointed. I have sons that have been

QUESTIONS OF ORDER

sent off to war for this Nation: two of them in Iraq at the same time and one in Afghanistan. They didn't ask to go. They went because, long before I got here, a majority of the Members here voted for it.

"Now, you can have disagreements about whether or not we should have been involved in Iraq. I have some serious reservations. Or about what our continued involvement in Afghanistan should be. I actually voted for an amendment that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) put up last year in regards to getting out of Afghanistan.

"Listen, what I say is not hallowed words. I have had blood and flesh of my own in those countries. And I agree, there is nothing we can do to change where Afghanistan is going to go in the future. You can't change history, as has been brought up here.

"But I will tell you that if you don't vote for the underlying rule, then we won't have the opportunity to support our troops. We won't have an opportunity to override what the President is doing in regards to cutting the COLA for our troops and adding additional costs to our troops that they have to bear out of their own pockets.

"So you want to make a statement. Let's not forget about what the NDAA is all about. It is about supporting our troops and giving our warfighters the equipment and the training and the compensation that they and their families richly deserve for what that 1 percent gives to this Nation, the freedom to stand down here and have a difference of opinion.

"But, Mr. Speaker, in order to allow this House to continue with its scheduled business for the day, I urge all Members to vote 'yes' on the question of consideration of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time."

After debate,

The question being put, viva voce,

Will the House now consider the resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. POE of Texas, announced that the ayes had it.

So the House decided to consider said resolution.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the House decided to consider said resolution was, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

POINT OF ORDER

(¶93.4)

A POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF A MEASURE UNDER SECTION 311 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974 IS UNTIMELY AFTER CONSIDERATION OF THE MEASURE HAS BEGUN.

On July 11, 2014, Mr. VAN HOLLEN made a point of order against consideration of the bill, as amended, (H.R. 4718), and said:

"Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order against the bill.

"Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a copy of the Budget Act of 1974. If you look at section 311, it is entitled, 'Enforcement of Budget Aggregates'.

"The bill before us, Mr. Speaker, violates that section of the Budget Act because it cuts the revenues below the levels that were set forth in the Republican budget that was passed on this House floor with much fanfare on May 15. The bill before us does not keep the revenues at those levels.

"I would like, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of this point of order, to point out that on May 15 of this year Chairman RYAN, chairman of the Budget Committee, filed a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reporting the current revenue level for fiscal year 2015 and the remainder of the budget window.

"And this is what he said when he filed that. This is, Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of May 15, page H4428. This is what Mr. RYAN said:

'This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels.'

"This piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, as you can see, clearly violates that provision of the statute of section 311(a) of the Budget Act because it increases the deficit to the taxpayer by \$287 billion above what was cited in the budget resolution adopted by this House. It is a clear breach of the rule.

"So, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the point of order be sustained and that the House Republicans have to live up to their own budget resolution which, as I say, they passed with much fanfare not that long ago."

Mr. CAMP was recognized to speak to the point of order and said:

"Mr. Speaker, I would just say that the gentleman's position has absolutely no merit after the failures of this administration to grow the economy and create jobs. We have an economy that is contracting. We have more kids living at home than ever before. We have real wages declining.

"After the failure of the policies of this administration to get the economy moving—"

Mr. VAN HOLLEN was further recognized and said:

"Mr. Speaker, further on the point of order, the gentleman from Michigan clearly wasn't addressing any of the issues raised in the point of order.

"I would ask the gentleman about section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which is what this point of order is based on. Let's talk about the point of order.

"The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee voted for the House Budget Act. He voted for it, and now he is bringing to the floor of the House a provision that violates the same Budget Act that that budget was passed pursuant to.

"So, Mr. Speaker, let's continue to focus on this point of order because what we have here is a situation where Republicans came to this House floor not long ago, passed that budget, and

are now here on the floor today with another bill that violates the Budget Act's section 311(a).

"So I would like a ruling on the point of order."

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. YODER, overruled the point of order, and said:

"The gentleman from Maryland makes a point of order against consideration of the bill. Any such point of order is untimely at this point. The gentleman from Maryland is free to engage in debate on the bill."

SUBPOENAS RECEIVED PURSUANT TO RULE VIII

On January 7, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Ms. FOXX, laid before the House a communication, which was read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 9, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the State of Georgia Superior Court, County of Walker, for witness testimony.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

TRAVIS LOUDERMILK,
Field Representative.

On February 26, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. TIPTON, laid before the House a communication, which was read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
February 25, 2014

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have received a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, purporting to require that I produce certain documents, at least some of which relate to official functions, and appear to testify at a deposition on similar matters in a particular civil case.

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

ROSA L. DELAURO,
Member of Congress.

On March 11, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, laid before the House a communication, which was read as follows:

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker,
Washington, DC.

MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of

QUESTIONS OF ORDER

the House of Representatives, that I have received a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, for certain documents from my Congressional Offices.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined under Rule VIII that the subpoena seeks some information that is not material and relevant, and that is not "consistent with the privileges and rights of the House." Accordingly, I intend to move to quash the subpoena to that extent, but to otherwise comply with the subpoena to the extent that it is material and relevant, and to the extent that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

CHAKA FATTAH,
Member of Congress.

On March 21, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. MESSER, laid before the House a communication, which was read as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 13, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, County of Luzerne, for testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

CHRISTA MECADON,
Constituent Caseworker.

On April 7, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Ms. FOXX, laid before the House a communication, which was read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 26, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I, as custodian of records for Congressman Joe Pitts, have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, requesting documents in a third-party civil case.

As I have determined that there are no documents responsive to the subpoena, it is not necessary for me to determine whether compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

THOMAS TILLET,
District Chief of Staff,
Congressman Joe Pitts.

On April 28, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. PETRI, laid before the House a communication, which was read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 17, 2014.
Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the Superior Court for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, for both documents and testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will determine whether compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN,
Member of Congress.

On April 28, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. PETRI, laid before the House a communication, which was read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 21, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, for testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will determine whether compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

MICHELLE ANDERSON-LEE,
Director of Appropriations.

On May 2, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. WOMACK, laid before the House a communication, which was read as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 30, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for both documents and testimony in a civil case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will determine whether compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

SANFORD D. BISHOP, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

On May 2, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. WOMACK, laid before the House a communication, which was read as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 30, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for both documents and testimony in a civil case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will determine whether compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

JAMES E. CLYBURN,
Member of Congress.

On May 9, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. HOLDING, laid before the House a communication, which was read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, May 9, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that the "House Office of Payroll and Benefits, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer of the United States House of Representatives" has received a subpoena, issued by the Office of Compliance, for documents.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel regarding the subpoena, I have determined under Rule VIII that the subpoena appears (i) not to be "a proper exercise of jurisdiction," (ii) to seek information that is not "material and relevant," and/or (iii) not to be "consistent with the privileges and rights of the House."

Sincerely,

ED CASSIDY,
Chief Administrative Officer.

On May 9, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. HOLDING, laid before the House a communication, which was read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that the Committee on Ways and Means has received an administrative subpoena, issued by the United States Securities and Exchange Commission, for documents.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel regarding the subpoena, I will make the determinations required under Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

On May 9, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. HOLDING, laid before the

QUESTIONS OF ORDER

House a communication, which was read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have received (i) an administrative subpoena, issued by the United States Securities and Exchange Commission, for documents and testimony, and (ii) a grand jury subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, for testimony.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel regarding the subpoenas, I will make the determinations required under Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

BRIAN SUTTER,
Staff Director,
Subcommittee on Health.

On May 15, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. PETRI, laid before the House a communication, which was read as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 8, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the Twelfth Judicial Circuit in and for Sarasota County, State of Florida, for documents in a civil case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

VERN G. BUCHANAN,
Member of Congress.

On June 2, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. THORNBERRY, laid before the House a communication, which was read as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 30, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, for both documents and testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will determine whether compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

JIM RENACCI,
Member of Congress.

On June 24, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. JOLLY, laid before the

House a communication, which was read as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 24, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, for my testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will determine whether compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

JIM JORDAN,
Member of Congress.

On September 15, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. HULTGREN, laid before the House a communication, which was read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, for documents in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

ED CASSIDY,
Chief Administrative Officer.

On November 12, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. WOMACK, laid before the House a communication, which was read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 25, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for documents issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in connection with a matter now pending before the grand jury.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

ED CASSIDY,
Chief Administrative Officer.

On November 12, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. WOMACK, laid before

the House a communication, which was read as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 29, 2014.

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the Department of the Army, Office of Staff Judge Advocate, for documents in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ,
Member of Congress.

On November 12, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. WOMACK, laid before the House a communication, which was read as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Omaha, NE, October 29, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have received a deposition subpoena for documents issued by the District Court of Douglas County, Nebraska, in connection with a civil matter now pending before that court.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is not consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

LEE TERRY,
Member of Congress.

On November 12, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. WOMACK, laid before the House a communication, which was read as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 6, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have received a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

I am consulting with counsel to determine whether, and to what extent, compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN E. STOCKMAN,
Member of Congress.

On November 12, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. WOMACK, laid before the House a communication, which was read as follows:

QUESTIONS OF ORDER

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 6, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for testimony and documents in a criminal investigation.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

DONNY FERGUSON,
Senior Communications & Policy Adviser.

On November 12, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. WOMACK, laid before the House a communication, which was read as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 6, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena,

issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for testimony and documents in a criminal investigation.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

KRISTINE O. BRAKSTAD,
Executive Assistant & Scheduler.

On November 12, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. WOMACK, laid before the House a communication, which was read as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 8, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for testimony and documents in a criminal investigation.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

PRINTUS LEBLANC,
Legislative Assistant.

On December 3, 2014, the SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. PERRY, laid before the House a communication, which was read as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
December 1, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States Army, seeking documents for use by the prosecution in a court-martial. The subpoena seeks documents in my custody and control that relate to various communications, dated in 2008, between a constituent and the office of former U.S. Representative Todd Platts.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

SCOTT PERRY,
Member of Congress.