

This is a good, bipartisan piece of legislation that would simply allow producers, utility companies, and other nonfinancial entities to continue entering into energy swaps with government-owned utilities, also known as utility special entities, without requiring them to register with the CFTC as a swap dealer solely because of their dealings with government-owned utilities.

As a group, public power utilities deliver electricity to one in seven of every electric customers in the United States, over 47 million people—certainly some in major metropolitan areas such as Los Angeles, San Antonio, Seattle, and Orlando—but the vast majority of public power companies serve communities with populations of 10,000 people or less.

H.R. 1038 will place utility special entities on a level-playing field with everyone else in the marketplace, allowing many of them to keep the same swap counterparties they have used to manage risk for years. Utility special entities should be allowed to keep using swaps to help manage their risk related to the generation of electricity or production of natural gas. To hinder these utilities' ability to manage risk would only increase their costs and possibly lead to higher energy rates for millions of Americans, an unacceptable result during a period of tremendous economic uncertainty.

Madam Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 1038 and urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I have no other speakers, Madam Speaker, so I would like to close by saying that Mr. COSTA, our distinguished Congressman from California, expresses his deep concern and support for this legislation, and I certainly wanted to register that on his behalf.

And certainly to Mr. LAMALFA and to Mr. CRAWFORD, I again commend you for your outstanding work on this. Wherever we can cut costs and save money for the American people, we need to do it and do it quickly. Therefore, I urge very quick passage of this very important and timely piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA Madam Speaker, I appreciate again how we have been able to come together in such a good bipartisan fashion. I greatly appreciate my colleague from Georgia's kind and helpful words in moving this legislation today on the floor.

In closing, again, H.R. 1038 seeks to keep electricity and natural gas bills affordable for over 47 million Americans. Our publicly owned utilities should have access to the risk management tools that they need to keep costs down, a goal we all share, and which prevents utility rates from rising. I ask my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the bi-partisan, H.R. 1038, the Public Power Risk Management Act of 2013.

This bill allows producers, utility companies, and other non-financial entities (swap counterparties) to continue entering into energy swaps with government-owned utilities (aka: utility special entities) without requiring them to register with the CFTC as a "swap dealer" solely because of their dealings with government-owned utilities.

There are over 2,000 municipal, state and locally-owned, not-for-profit electric utilities throughout the United States, which deliver electricity to one in every seven electricity customers in the United States, over 47 million people. Further, the vast majority of public power companies serve communities with populations of 10,000 people or less.

Utility special entities should be allowed to keep using traditional swap counterparties, such as natural gas producers, independent generators, and investor-owned utility companies to help manage their operational risk related to the generation of electricity or production of natural gas.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, bipartisan legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1038.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1960, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1256, SWAP JURISDICTION CERTAINTY ACT

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 256 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 256

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1960) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. After general debate, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1256) to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to jointly adopt rules setting forth the application to cross-border swaps transactions of certain provisions relating to swaps that were enacted as part of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendments recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. The chair of the Committee on Agriculture is authorized, on behalf of the committee, to file a supplemental report to accompany H.R. 1947.

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

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NUGENT. House Resolution 256 provides for House consideration of two separate pieces of legislation. The first of these bills is H.R. 1256, the Swap Jurisdiction Certainty Act, which will be considered for 1 hour, with time divided between the Committees on Financial Services and Agriculture, under a closed rule.

Secondly, and the reason why I am so proud to be the sponsor of this rule, H. Res. 256 provides for 1 hour of general debate for this year's National Defense Authorization Act.

The Rules Committee traditionally receives hundreds of amendments to the NDAA; and with just under 300 submitted by the end of the day yesterday, this year is no different. Therefore, as is the tradition for this bill, this first rule in the NDAA consideration process provides for general debate while a second will provide for consideration of the plethora of amendments we have before us.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have had the

honor of helping craft this legislation for the past few months. As I think anybody can imagine, when you're talking about a bill that authorizes the Department of Defense, there is a lot to discuss and consider. That point was illustrated by our full committee markup in the Armed Services Committee last week, which started first thing Wednesday morning and went through to almost 3 a.m. on Thursday, 16 hours. We worked long and hard, and I'm proud of the product we've presented to this House for consideration.

But for as much time and effort that we on the Committee on Armed Services put into the Defense Authorization Act, I know that other Members who don't serve on our committee will want to make their mark on this bill, too. To ensure that the House has an opportunity to really have a comprehensive, free-flowing debate on such an important topic, we've decided to break the rule for the Defense Authorization Act into two parts.

That's why today's rule provides us with 1 hour of general debate time. It gets us started on the path to consideration. It also allows Members from both sides of the aisle to have a full discussion about the broader themes running through this base legislation. There are important debates, and the sooner we get them started, the better. But with nearly 300 amendments submitted to the National Defense Authorization Act, the truth is we on the Rules Committee couldn't give each and every amendment the full weight and consideration it deserves and produce a comprehensive rule that starts debate on the full bill and all amendments today.

□ 1350

If something's worth doing, it's worth doing it right. Therefore, while the House works on the Swap Jurisdiction Certainty Act and starts general debate on the NDAA, we, on the Rules Committee, will return to the committee room and we'll continue to sift through all the amendments that Members have offered on this bill.

We want to make sure the House has the opportunity to weigh in on each and every important issue in the NDAA. That's why we need to take our time. And once we have a full understanding of the amendments submitted to the committee, we'll come back with a second rule setting the universe of amendments for this legislation.

I know that we all share the same commitment to making this a fair and collaborative process. Quite frankly, it's the spirit of cooperation and the knowledge that we're serving a common purpose that has been one of the most gratifying parts of serving on HASC to date. As Chairman MCKEON said to the Rules Committee yesterday, we may disagree sometimes, but it doesn't mean we have to be disagreeable. We're able to put partisanship aside, and we know that our work directly impacts the life of each and

every servicemember and his or her family in a personal and direct way.

We're providing for the common defense, which is part of the Federal Government's most fundamental roles, part of our core mission, as I like to say. And if you want proof of how collaboratively we worked on this bill as a committee, you only need to look at the fact that we passed this bill out of committee 59-2. And as the father of three sons serving in the Army, I'm heartened to know that politics can be set aside when it comes down to making sure our troops are equipped with the tools that are required, funded at the levels they need, and trained for the mission at hand.

This is an important time for our country and an important time for those members of the military who serve us every day. These young men and women put their lives on the line for us so we could be here today and debate the issues of the day. So they deserve our undivided attention and support when it comes to making sure that they have everything that they need, and there's no more essential role for our Federal Government, in my opinion, as to what we are doing today.

H.R. 1960 fulfills the promise to our warfighters and to their loved ones. I'm proud of this rule, which gets us on the road towards considering and passing this essential bill. For that reason, I support the rule. I support the underlying pieces of legislation and look forward to coming back here tomorrow in the next step of getting the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 passed.

I encourage all my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, this should be a simple rule. Every year, this House considers the annual National Defense Authorization Act. It's a bill that reauthorizes our Nation's defense programs and a place where we should have the opportunity to debate some of the most important issues facing this country and the world.

The process is typically broken up into two parts: a rule providing for general debate on the National Defense Authorization Act and a rule providing for consideration of amendments to that bill. It's generally not a controversial process; although, the decisions made by the Rules Committee in allowing and preventing amendments from being considered can be controversial.

And that's where this rule goes wrong. This is not the normal rule providing for general debate for the de-

fense authorization bill. No, Madam Speaker, this rule is much more than that.

Over the past 3 years, we've seen the Republican leadership in the House fixated on several things:

They want to take health care away from millions of Americans by repealing ObamaCare;

They want to destroy the social safety net through mindless budget cuts; and

They want to weaken our financial system by repealing the Dodd-Frank Act that came out of the greatest fiscal crisis since the Great Depression.

This rule, the rule that should be a simple general debate rule for the Defense Authorization Act, also makes in order H.R. 1256, the Swap Jurisdiction Certainty Act. Not only does this rule cram in this controversial bill, it does not allow one single amendment. That's right. This is a closed rule. That's not an open and transparent process, certainly not the one that Speaker BOEHNER promised.

H.R. 1256 would require the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities Exchange Commission to jointly issue rules on the regulations of swaps transactions between the United States and foreign entities.

H.R. 1256 automatically exempts transactions in countries with the nine largest swaps markets from U.S. regulations unless the CFTC and the SEC jointly determine that the regulations aren't broadly equivalent. Because many large U.S. financial institutions have subsidiaries outside of the United States, there are serious concerns that banks will seek to conduct swap transactions in countries with looser regulations to avoid U.S. oversight. And, Madam Speaker, it is important to note that many countries are far behind the United States in promulgating their rules on swaps.

Why are we looking to allow foreign regulations to govern transactions involving U.S. companies that could ultimately impact our economy?

During the markup in the Financial Services Committee, Ranking Member MAXINE WATERS offered an amendment to strike the presumption that foreign regulatory requirements satisfy U.S. swaps requirements, allowing the CFTC and the SEC to determine whether foreign regulatory requirements are comparable to U.S. requirements. Unfortunately, under this closed rule, the full House will not have the opportunity to consider a similar amendment to strengthen this legislation.

Madam Speaker, this is yet another attempt to slow down the Dodd-Frank rulemaking process, undermine the CFTC's work in regulating derivatives trading, and weaken the financial market regulations needed to protect our economy.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule.

This rule also allows, believe it or not, the Agriculture Committee to file a supplemental report to H.R. 1947, the

farm bill reauthorization. Madam Speaker, this is a bill that cuts \$20.5 billion from SNAP, formerly known as food stamps. While this report is just technical, and fulfills the committee's responsibilities following the markup of H.R. 1497, this rule is not the place for this report. And, more importantly, I want to make it crystal clear that I do not support these egregious cuts. It's a rotten thing to do to poor people during this tough economic time.

Finally, Madam Speaker, let me discuss the least controversial part of this rule, the defense authorization bill. This rule allows the House to begin general debate on H.R. 1660, the FY 2014 National Defense Authorization Act.

There is much to admire and support in this bill, and I commend the chairman and ranking member for working together to ensure the programs that provide benefits and support to our veterans and military retirees are adequately funded and that there will be no increases in TRICARE fees. Regrettably, there's also a great deal in this bill that should make every Member of this Chamber pause and think about our national security priorities:

Should we be spending additional billions on Cold War nuclear weapons rather than on our troops, their families, and our veterans?

Should we really be cutting funds and putting obstacles in the way of implementing the New START Treaty with Russia, limiting both our nations' ability to further reduce and verify our nuclear arsenals?

Should we be committing hundreds of millions this year and billions of dollars in the future to an east coast missile defense site that the Pentagon says it doesn't want and doesn't need?

Should we continue to set up roadblocks and obstruct the President's efforts to resolve the issue of how to effectively and safely close the detention facilities at Guantanamo Naval Station, appropriately release and return to their families those prisoners who have been cleared of all charges, and bring to justice once and for all those few remaining prisoners who were indeed engaged in heinous acts of terrorism?

And once again, Madam Speaker, the committee provides \$85.8 billion for the war in Afghanistan through the Overseas Contingency Operations account. That's \$5 billion more than what the President and the Pentagon asked for.

Now let me just say a couple of words about the OCO account. It is an off-budget account. It is another \$85 billion on the Nation's credit card—deficit spending, pure and simple. It is the lingo of "emergency spending," as if it were an unexpected surprise that we will still be in Afghanistan throughout all of FY 2014.

I have always been concerned that the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the ever more amorphous and hard-to-define global war on terror, have not been included in the Pentagon's base budget but always outside that budget,

with an "emergency" designation so that we don't have to figure out how to pay for it now. We'll just pay for it later and later and later. I'm increasingly concerned that, even after we transition all combat military and security operations over to the Afghan Government by the end of 2014, the OCO will still go on.

It is time to phase out the OCO, put this spending back into the base spending bill, and if we want to make war, then we ought to figure out a way to pay for it or make the appropriate cuts in other Pentagon programs to make room for the funding of these operations.

□ 1400

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say a few words about the strong concerns this Congress has, on both sides of the aisle, about the epidemic of sexual assault in all branches of our military. This bill includes several measures that will strengthen the investigation and prosecution of these heinous crimes inside our military. It also provides new protections for victims of military sexual assault. It reflects the bipartisan work of Representative TURNER, my Massachusetts colleague, Representative TSONGAS, as well as Representatives WALORSKI, NOEM, CASTRO, and LORETTA SANCHEZ. However, Mr. Speaker, there is still much more that should and can be done to ensure these brutal rapes and assaults are fully investigated and prosecuted, the victims treated with respect, and to advance education in our military academies and among our ranks and our officer corps.

Several amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee, and I hope that they will be made in order so that we can more fully debate this critical issue and how to end rape and sexual assault within our Armed Forces.

Let me just add, Mr. Speaker, that while the NDAA looks to strengthen protections and prosecutions inside our military, we here in Congress are also to blame for having failed in our oversight responsibilities. Congress has not given the attention to military sexual assault that it deserves. So I think that we do need to clean up our own House and ensure that Congress does a far better job of oversight to ensure that the Pentagon and all our military members are held accountable for preventing, reducing, and prosecuting cases of sexual assault and abuse in our Armed Forces and providing victims with the services and support that they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I'm always ambivalent about the annual defense authorization bill. I support the programs for our veterans and our retirees, and I support providing for the genuine needs of our servicemen and -women, whether they are based here at home or abroad. But I cannot support the amount of waste, the spending on unnecessary and often ridiculous programs, on more nukes, on outdated weapons, and on wars that never end.

As we begin general debate on the defense bill later today, I ask my colleagues to keep these questions in mind.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, this rule is unnecessarily complicated and misguided. There is no reason to include yet another bill gutting Dodd-Frank in this rule, and there's no reason to cram into this rule a report from the Agriculture Committee about a bill that will make hunger worse in America.

For these reasons, I oppose this rule, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule for these three measures, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, about 5 years ago in my community, we were saddened to hear of the news of the tragic death of Marie Lauterbach. Marie Lauterbach was a marine who came forward to report the sexual assault that she had endured and came forward and reported her belief of a subsequent pregnancy from that sexual assault, only to have the Marines inform her and the accused in the sexual assault, the perpetrator, that they would wait until her baby was born, and when the baby was born, they would do DNA testing. And if the DNA testing showed, in fact, that the baby was the accused's, then they would move forward with the prosecution. Until then, they left the two in close proximity until the accused murdered Marie Lauterbach in her eighth month of pregnancy and burned her in her backyard in a bonfire.

It was at that time that I saw that the issue of sexual assault in the military was not just one of unacceptable numbers, it was an issue of an environment where victims were re-victimized and perpetrators felt safe.

Mr. Speaker, a recent survey in the military indicated that 28,000 servicemembers have indicated that they were sexually assaulted, but less than 3,000 of those were willing to actually report it in a manner that would result in charges against their accused. We think we know why: because 62 percent of the slightly less than 3,000 indicated that they felt that they were persecuted in the workplace for having done so. They were re-victimized.

What we're doing in this NDAA is to ensure that that culture shifts, that the perpetrators are those that fear the system, and the victims are those that will feel embraced. We change the relationship between the commander and the victim, moving the responsibility for both the prosecution and the handling of those cases and diminishing the direct commander's authority over the disposition of sexual assault cases when a conviction has occurred. We expand legal counsel for victims, making certain that victims have beside them someone who can advise them in the legal processes, and we remove the chain of command's authority in the disposition of these cases and establish a mandatory minimum.

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

Mr. NUGENT. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, we include mandatory minimums that say if you commit a sexual assault, you are out of the military, you will be dishonorably discharged, and if you are a trainer and you enter into a trainer-trainee relationship that is inappropriate, you are out. No longer will a victim be forced to salute their predator or their accused. These provisions are incredibly important. They're ones we worked with on a bipartisan basis.

I want to thank my cochair of the Military Sexual Assault Prevention Caucus, NIKI TSONGAS. I also want to thank Ranking Member SMITH and the chairman, BUCK MCKEON, and also the chairs of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel, SUSAN DAVIS and JOE WILSON.

This is a matter on which we've worked together very thoughtfully. At the same time, we know that Chairman Dempsey, Secretary Hagel, and former Secretary Panetta have made this a significant issue to address in the military. What we're trying to do on a legislative basis is to give them the tools to, once again, make perpetrators fear the system and hold them accountable.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York, the ranking member of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises, Mrs. MALONEY.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership. I commend the work of Mr. TURNER and others for strengthening protections for women in the military, but it's not enough. The amendments from JACKIE SPEIER and other women leaders were not included. We need an open rule where all of these ideas can come to the floor to protect our men and women in the military.

The status quo in the military is not a way to solve the problem of sexual abuse. Too often, it is the problem. Every year that I have been in Congress, the military brass has come to us and said that they will stop this abuse. Yet each year, it seems to be getting worse. Women are even afraid to report it. They're then afraid that they'll be punished in some way.

Despite the widespread public and congressional outrage, some top military officers still seem to resist important, fundamental changes to a culture that has clearly failed in one of its single, most important missions: keeping its own people safe. And the casualties are mounting every day.

For example, a U.S. military officer overseeing sexual assault prevention at Fort Hood in Texas is under investigation for his sexual assault of soldiers. The officer in charge of the Air Force's sexual abuse prevention program was

recently arrested for groping women. We need to end the culture of tolerating the abuser and punishing the victims.

We created a database for them to report in, but they won't report because they are afraid of retaliation. Too often they've seen if you're a woman who's been raped and abused, then you're told to be quiet. If you report it, you'll be punished, but if you're the abuser, you might end up in charge of the sexual abuse prevention program and get a promotion.

The strongest military in the world has got to learn how to protect its own soldiers. It's got to keep them from being wounded by rape and sexual assault. We need to stop this, allow an open rule, and allow amendments on this important protection of our soldiers.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make sure that everybody knows that there were almost 300 amendments that have been submitted, and they'll be discussed later today, and Mr. MCGOVERN is a part of that process and will be discussing those amendments today.

But I agree with both of my colleagues as it relates to sexual assault in the military. Having only been on Armed Services now for 6 months, I will tell you that I agree with Mr. MCGOVERN, particularly as it relates to oversight. And I believe that this Congress should exhibit and utilize its oversight capacity to the fullest, especially as it relates to sexual assault within the military.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York, the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, Mrs. LOWEY.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, military cohesion is eroding and trust is disintegrating throughout the ranks as sexual assault infests the services. An Air Force officer charged with sexual assault prevention efforts here in Washington was arrested for sexual battery last month.

□ 1410

West Point and the Naval Academy have made recent headlines about assaults involving athletes. Alarming, the military academies reported 80 cases of sexual assault last year, a 23 percent increase; and too many cases go unreported.

We trust the service academies to mold our sons and daughters for service to our country. Cadets and midshipmen are of an impressionable and often vulnerable age, requiring stronger protections against sexual assault and better support for victims.

The culture that is propelling this epidemic must change. I urge support for the sexual assault provisions in the NDAA.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to yield 3 minutes to the gen-

tleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), the ranking member of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, while I rise in opposition to this rule, I want to express my strong support for the underlying bill, H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act.

This legislation is not perfect; however, it ensures support for our men and women in uniform who sacrifice so much on our behalf, and includes provisions that are crucial to our military's future capabilities in this fiscally constrained environment.

Now, among other things, it fully supports the President's request for the peerless Virginia-class submarines, as well as critical future enablers such as the Ohio Class Replacement and the Virginia Payload Module.

It also includes the Oversight of Sensitive Military Operations Act which, for the first time, requires prompt notification to the defense committees of any overseas lethal or capture operations outside of Afghanistan, including those conducted with unmanned aerial vehicles.

Furthermore, I'm pleased that this measure begins to tackle the epidemic of sexual assault in our military. Our people in uniform need to know that they are protected from and against sexual assault, and God forbid if there is a sexual assault that occurs, that the perpetrator is held accountable.

While far more must be done, there are important first steps in this bill that are worthy of our strong support.

Mr. Speaker, I'm also proud to work closely with Chairman MAC THORNBERY, both in this bill and in numerous other provisions which fall under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities. Together, we have worked hard to increase resources for our Special Operations Forces, who are helping us confront shifting threats and unconventional battlefields, and to support our efforts in the cybersecurity realm.

There are many other positive steps with regard to cyber in this legislation, including incentivizing new cybersecurity standards, ensuring U.S. Cyber Command has the proper authorities and the personnel in coordinating cybersecurity efforts with related disciplines.

However, the reality is that our Nation's cybersecurity challenges cannot simply be handed over to the Department of Defense. With the vast majority of our critical infrastructure in private hands, we absolutely must require minimum standards for their owners and operators. It is way past time for Congress to move aggressively to partner with the private sector and address what I believe is our greatest national security vulnerability.

Meanwhile, though I applaud DHS's efforts to coordinate the various approaches to cybersecurity found across

the Federal Government, I continue to believe that there must be an office within the White House with the policy and budgetary authority to enforce appropriate actions across the whole government. I'm disappointed the procedural and jurisdictional issues precluded offering such an amendment to the NDAA, but I am going to continue to work with my colleagues to enact what I believe to be a crucial provision.

Finally, I want to thank Chairman McKEON and Ranking Member SMITH, as well as Chairman THORNBERRY and all of my colleagues on the committee, but most especially the tireless HASC, for all of their efforts, which have been really Herculean in bringing this bill to the process of where we are today.

I certainly urge my colleagues to support the National Defense Authorization Act.

Mr. NUGENT. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I thank my friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the U.S. detention facility at Guantanamo Bay.

Continued operation of the facility at Guantanamo weakens U.S. national security, wastes resources, damages our relationships with key allies, and reinforces anti-American propaganda led by groups like al Qaeda to recruit new enemies against the United States.

In a time of war, the Commander in Chief must have the flexibility to execute important foreign policy and national security determinations. This includes how to treat detainees captured on the battlefield. The Commander in Chief having this authority is not a new concept to this Congress. In fact, under President Bush, some 530 detainees were transferred from Gitmo with Congress' support. Restrictions placed by Congress to prevent this President from making these decisions are not prudent.

In addition to foreign policy and national security consideration, the facility at Guantanamo is also a waste of scarce resources. DOD estimates that the cost to run Guantanamo Bay is around \$150 million a year. In a time when we're making sequestration cuts to programs here at home, we're spending approximately \$1 million per detainee each year. This makes Guantanamo Bay literally the most expensive detention facility in the world.

I urge my colleagues to give the President the flexibility he needs to operate Guantanamo Bay.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, sexual assault in the military continues to be a serious problem. Given both the headlines and the reality, this is an understatement. It impacts thousands of

servicemen and -women each year. And while Congress has investigated and discussed this problem for more than two decades, the issue remains pervasive. It's time for us to act. Recent reports that assault is happening by individuals who are supposed to protect and command our servicemembers make this all the more concerning.

According to a recent 2012 Pentagon survey, an estimated 26,000 sexual assaults in the military occurred in that year. That's a 35 percent increase since 2010. It means that roughly 70 servicemen and -women are sexually assaulted every single day. And I know from my own long history and experience of working on these issues that where there are 26,000, there are many, many more. And we know that only a fraction of these incidents are reported; fewer than 3,400 reported incidents every year.

Sexual violence has a longstanding impact on servicemen and -women and their families. According to the Service Women's Action Network, while experiences of sexual violence are strongly associated with a wide range of mental health conditions for men and for women veterans, military sexual trauma is the leading cause of PTSD among women. Due to shame, guilt, or fear of not being believed, fewer than 15 percent of these sexual assaults are reported to the proper authorities.

As a former domestic violence and sexual assault advocate, I understand that coming forward is an unimaginably tough thing to do, and I commend every single one of the men and women who had the courage to come forward and name their accused. Their fear of coming forward is not imagined; it's real. Victims of sexual assault face a lack of confidentiality, protection, support, and access to legal counsel once an incident is reported. This is profound in the military and it has profound consequences.

We have to act and stand together as a Congress and as a Nation to declare that the problem can't go on, and we have to work now to stamp out the violence within the military.

We have to ensure that the Guard and Reserve have response coordinators available at all times regardless of their duty status, and to ensure that each service has a robust investigative team, with clarity and consistency among the services.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Ms. EDWARDS. Our hope is to ensure that zero tolerance for sexual assault in the military is the norm.

I want to say that some have pointed to a culture issue within the military that contributes to the problem. You know what, that might be true; but we cannot use culture as an excuse. It has to be a challenge and a commitment to change throughout the chain of command.

Some have pointed as well to say that this is just endemic within the

military. As somebody who grew up in a servicemember family as one of four daughters, I can't lay this blame on the fact of service. I know that in the civilian sector a relatively small number of perpetrators commit the overwhelming number of crimes. So let's root out the criminals within the military. We have to commit ourselves to making sure that we do that and hold them accountable, hold their commanders accountable, punish people for crime, and stop promoting perpetrators and transferring the problem from one installation to the next installation. This enforceability and accountability has to happen throughout the command structure, no excuses and no exceptions.

□ 1420

It's the service that my father sacrificed for and that millions of others do that we have to honor. We do that by protecting the men and women who serve by saying to them: We want you to serve your country, but we want to make sure that you can do it in safety and that those who are criminals are held accountable.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for yielding.

I rise in support of the progress this underlying bill makes in combating military sexual assault. Sexual assault in the military continues to be a serious problem. In 2012, an average of 70 servicemen and -women were sexually assaulted each and every day. This is unacceptable. Moreover, only a fraction of these are reported. Fewer yet are prosecuted.

More needs to be done at every level to establish comprehensive uniform solutions. I am pleased to see that this bill offers a renewed determination to stop these unacceptable crimes that undermine the strength and honor of our military. The included provisions make progress to increase transparency with new victim protections and services, and improved processes to hold offenders accountable.

But we must do more. We must work diligently to put an end to this problem so we can again—with full confidence—encourage our daughters and sons to serve this great country.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me time.

Seventy men and women serving in the military every single day are sexually assaulted and raped. While we sit here and we talk, that's going on.

For over 25 years—for over 25 years—we have known about this problem and

we have done very little. Aberdeen, Tailhook, the military academies, Lackland, all of these are happening under our collective watch, and we have found it acceptable to hold hearings, to bring the brass up here, have them say the right words—"zero tolerance"—and then we would go about our business. That is not good enough. And while the NDAA has some good fixes on the end of the process, we still have much to do on the front end.

There is a reason why there are 26,000 sexual assaults and rapes a year in the military and only 3,300 have the guts to come forward. It's because if you come forward, you're retaliated against. Some 63 percent are retaliated against. And of those 3,300 that report, only 500 of those cases are going to go to court-martial and only 200 will end up in a conviction.

So why would anyone report? Because your odds of getting justice are just not there. That's why it is important for us to have a debate on this House floor about taking these cases out of the chain of command. If it's in the chain of command, then you have the potential of having the assailant be the person making the decision, or the person making the decision—the commander—being the friend of the assailant, or the commander itching for a promotion, who is fearful that if they find out that there was a rape under their watch, that they won't get that promotion.

Other countries have a similar Uniform Code of Military Justice. Ours is based on the British system. And the Brits and the Canadians and the New Zealanders and the Australians and the Israelis have all taken these cases out of the chain of command, and it's working. It's time for us to have that discussion as well.

I urge my colleagues to embrace an amendment that I will take up in Rules Committee that will at least give us the opportunity to have this debate—this healthy debate—on the House floor. Otherwise, I will guarantee you in another 6 months, in another year, we will see yet another scandal, and we will not have changed anything.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York, the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Small Business, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this rule. Our Armed Forces face an epidemic that is tearing away this institution's moral credibility. Millions of patriotic young men and women who are considering donning our Nation's uniform, must contend with the fact that our military has become a safe haven for sexual assault and rape.

According to DOD's own estimate, on average, 70 servicemembers are sexually assaulted every day, with 26,000 of

these incidents occurring last year alone. That represents a 30 percent increase from just 2 years before.

Keep in mind, this is the Department of Defense data. It is likely this problem is even more widespread than these numbers suggest. Equally troubling, only a sliver of about 3 percent of these cases were prosecuted. The horrifying fact is that tolerance of sexual assault has become part of the Armed Forces' culture. In too many cases, victims are further harmed by a system that protects offenders in the name of the chain of command. This is unacceptable. It must change, and it must change now.

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

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. The men and women who serve our Nation sacrifice enough. They should not have to worry about sexual assault at the hands of superiors and colleagues.

It is time for real steps that end this permissive culture, hold sexual offenders accountable, and restore trust in our Armed Forces.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY).

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman of Massachusetts for yielding.

It has already been stated—but it is worth repeating again—in 2012, 26,000 servicemembers were sexually assaulted. If only one servicemember was assaulted, that is one too many.

Sexual assault in the military is intolerable—period. It is a terrible entrenched cultural flaw of our military that allows victims to be abused without accountability or justice.

While there are a number of legislative proposals to address this issue, the consensus is clear: we need a fail-safe solution that increases transparency and accountability so that the military no longer is a place where sexual assault is tolerated.

I am pleased that H.R. 1960 takes steps to improve the military justice system. However, I do believe the bill does not go far enough. We must do a better job.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I am loath to turn attention away from this critical topic, and I agree with all of my colleagues on it. But also part of this rule is H.R. 1256, which is entitled the Swaps Jurisdiction Certainty Act. This is a closed rule—they're not allowing any amendments on it—and it is bad policy. I urge members to vote "no."

This bill reminds me of the old adage that's often said that "the past isn't dead. It isn't even past."

I'm referring to the global crisis—the global financial crisis—that a few years ago had every Member of this body absolutely on razor's edge as we wondered what was going to happen to the American economy, and we ended up seeing the TARP passed and all types of things to try to avert collapse.

\$13 trillion in lost wealth, Mr. Speaker, and still here we are looking at a bill—in a closed rule, mind you—that would allow offshore derivative swap trading to be beyond the jurisdiction of American regulators.

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

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

□ 1430

Mr. ELLISON. Let me just cut straight to the chase.

Congress granted the Commodity Futures Trading Commission explicit authority in the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to oversee all derivatives transactions with a direct and significant connection to the U.S. economy.

That's a good idea—a \$223 trillion industry. I think we need to protect our interests. Vote "no" on this closed rule.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. WATERS. Thank you very much. I rise to oppose the closed rule on H.R. 1256.

H.R. 1256 really has no business being hidden in this bill at all. It is another attempt to keep the debate from taking place so that people will know what is happening when we are trying to have a regulatory regime that will protect us from having to bail out big institutions.

We are simply saying that we can't allow our financial institutions to have subsidiaries overseas that are doing business and trading and putting us at risk. Every time they get involved in a trade in which they don't have comparable rules in that country, what we are doing is putting this country at risk that we are going to have to bail out a big financial institution because the harm will come right back to the parent company.

We, in Dodd-Frank, have said that we must have comparable rules, that we must have regulatory regimes that are comparable to ours in order to do business and to do trading in order to protect against big institutions failing. So now we have this H.R. 1256 that would undo all of that and drag it back into the shadows, this derivatives trading, and put us all at risk. We can't even debate it. We can't even have an amendment because, again, they're trying to kill Dodd-Frank.



Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Florida how many additional speakers he may have.

Mr. NUGENT. I have none.

Mr. MCGOVERN. How much time do I have left, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1 additional minute to the ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Thank you so much. I do appreciate this. This is so important.

I am against this closed rule simply because we have mandated the kind of reform in Dodd-Frank that would keep us from ever being in the position in which we have to bail out these big institutions, and now we have so much organized push back and undermining of Dodd-Frank in which they are attempting to undo the reforms that we have done.

Simply put, we cannot allow the branches and subsidiaries of these big broker dealers—these big banks—to go over and do trading with countries that don't have comparable rules. If we allow that to happen, we will be forced to do what we have seen with AIG, which was to bail them out to the tune of billions of dollars, and supposedly, we'd done reforms to keep from having to be in that position again. We will find that we will again be experiencing what happened with Goldman Sachs and others who ended up being the beneficiaries of our failed regulatory regime.

So I am opposed to the closed rule. Vote against the closed rule, and then vote against the bill.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, I get it. The Republican majority wants to repeal Dodd-Frank, and they're using every possible vehicle they can to undermine Dodd-Frank, which puts consumers at risk by their constant attack on protections that, I think, most people in this country think are reasonable.

As you heard from Ms. WATERS, the ranking member on the Committee on Financial Services, and from Mr. ELLISON, there is controversy around this bill. The thought that you would bring a bill like this to the floor that would weaken Dodd-Frank under a closed rule is really unforgivable, quite frankly. We ought to debate this. This is important stuff. There ought to be debates, and there ought to be amendments.

On the defense authorization bill, I just want to say this for the record: while I have no opposition to your bringing the DOD bill up for general debate, I do want to express my concern that when the Rules Committee

considers the amendments that they be fair-minded about it and that all major issues, including the issues raised by a number of my colleagues on sexual assault, are addressed.

I also want to say that the war in Afghanistan ought to be debated on this floor. A central part of our defense budget right now is going to this war, and last year, we were shut out. I'm hoping that this year we will at least have the opportunity to bring an amendment to the floor, debate what our policy should be, and will let Members on both sides vote up or down.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" because this does allow H.R. 1256 to come to the floor under a closed rule. That is wrong. This should be a more open and transparent process, especially when it comes to an issue that is so important.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I support this rule and encourage my colleagues to support it as well. It allows the House to take action on two different but very important pieces of legislation.

It provides us with an opportunity to force the SEC and the CFTC to finally and jointly promulgate rules governing the U.S. institutions' use of swaps and other financial derivatives while accessing international markets. This action will help ensure that we have a vibrant financial system and that American companies can manage the risks while remaining competitive in an international market. Additionally, it begins our consideration on the National Defense Authorization Act, providing the House with an hour of general debate on programs that make up our Department of Defense.

As a Member of Congress, as a three Blue Star parent, and as an American, I can think of nothing more important than providing our military the tools that they need to carry out their missions. These brave men and women put their lives on the line for our Nation each and every day. This legislation isn't a thank-you to the troops, it's our duty as citizens to acknowledge that we live in the land of the free only because of the service of the brave.

Mr. Speaker, we've heard a lot of discussion here on the floor, particularly as it relates to Dodd-Frank. First of all, this does not repeal Dodd-Frank. If it were a vote for a repeal of Dodd-Frank, I'd vote for it, but it's not a repeal of Dodd-Frank. As a matter of fact, this piece of legislation, the Swap Act, was actually voice voted out of the Agriculture Committee, which has joint jurisdiction over this piece of legislation. It was voice voted. In the Committee on Financial Services, 100 percent of the Republicans and two-thirds of the Democrats voted for its passage, so it isn't exactly as one would hear the other side say.

When we talk about open rules, I think one of the things that distinguishes this Congress versus the 111th Congress is that this is one of the most

open Congresses in the 112th Congress versus the 111th, which had absolutely zero open rules. I will remind my colleagues of that just because, as we talk about this and move forward on both of these issues, it's important to know that we have an open rule coming up in which we have almost 300 amendments that we are going to be considering in the Rules Committee in just a short period of time with the NDAA.

Lastly, I hear my colleagues talk about how for 25 years they have allowed sexual assault to go unabated. I can hardly stomach the fact that this body would allow that to happen over the last 25 years. As a former law enforcement officer, as one who vigorously prosecuted cases of sexual assault and rape, it should be no different for our armed services.

That is where my good friend Mr. MCGOVERN had mentioned the oversight of armed services and of this House to make sure that we hold people accountable; to make sure, as other Members have talked about, that members of our military are kept safe, and that those who would prey upon members of their own military unit will find swift justice so that nobody can say there is not justice in regards to the fact, if you commit a rape or a sexual assault in the military, that you will be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law; that we make sure that we have victim advocates for those who are assaulted, and that we have good investigators who focus on those types of crimes and have the forensics to back it up so you have a strong prosecution. I think that's what this NDAA bill is an attempt to do.

□ 1440

I strongly support the bill and the underlying legislation.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 256 will be followed by 5-minute votes on motions to suspend the rules on H.R. 634 and H.R. 742.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 184, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 214]

YEAS—239

Aderholt	Barton	Brady (TX)
Alexander	Benishek	Bridenstine
Amash	Bentivolio	Brooks (AL)
Amodei	Bilirakis	Brooks (IN)
Bachmann	Bishop (UT)	Brown (GA)
Bachus	Black	Buchanan
Barber	Blackburn	Bucshon
Barletta	Bonner	Burgess
Barr	Boustany	Calvert

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

## NOT VOTING—11

□ 1510

Ms. MCCOLLUM, Messrs. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, PETERSON, THOMPSON of Mississippi, CUMMINGS, and VEASEY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## BUSINESS RISK MITIGATION AND PRICE STABILIZATION ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 634) to provide end user exemptions from certain provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 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 Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 12, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 215]

YEAS—411

Andrews	Clay	Eshoo	Aderholt	Bachmann	Barrow (GA)
Barrow (GA)	Cleaver	Esty	Alexander	Bachus	Barton
Bass	Clyburn	Farr	Amash	Barber	Bass
Beatty	Cohen	Fattah	Amodei	Barletta	Beatty
Becerra	Connolly	Foster	Andrews	Barr	Becerra
Bera (CA)	Conyers	Frankel (FL)			
Bishop (GA)	Cooper	Fudge			
Bishop (NY)	Courtney	Gabbard			
Blumenauer	Crowley	Gallego			
Bonamici	Cuellar	Garamendi			
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Grayson			
Brady (IA)	Davis (CA)	Green, Al			
Brown (FL)	Davis, Danny	Green, Gene			
Brownley (CA)	DeFazio	Grijalva			
Bustos	DeGette	Gutierrez			
Butterfield	Delaney	Hahn			
Capps	DeLauro	Hanabusa			
Capuano	DelBene	Hastings (FL)			
Cárdenas	Dingell	Heck (WA)			
Carney	Doggett	Higgins			
Carson (IN)	Doyle	Himes			
Cartwright	Duckworth	Hinojosa			
Castor (FL)	Edwards	Holt			
Castro (TX)	Ellison	Honda			
Ciavarella	Engel	Horsford			
Clarke	Enyart	Hoyer			