

been very bipartisan in the way that we have approached this. Our committee has in fact worked in a very bipartisan way in trying to get to the bottom of the issue that lays out there.

I would like to say that it has been said on the floor that there were no hearings on this bill. In fact, it has been heard in subcommittee. It has also been said that the Secretary has the tools that he needs in order to hold people accountable.

Folks, here is where we are.

Back in January, I went to Augusta, Georgia, and Columbia, South Carolina, at the request of Congressman JOE WILSON and Congressman JOHN BARROW. We know—and VA has said—that there were deaths that occurred. There were some 5,000 veterans that were on waiting lists for colonoscopies. I talked about one of those veterans who testified before our committee today.

Shortly after that, I wrote a letter to the Secretary and I asked him to please provide me the names of the people, what their positions were, and what type of accountability, what disciplinary actions have you taken.

We are now in the closing weeks of the month of May, and I have heard absolutely nothing out of the Department of Veterans Affairs. He may have the tools, but he won't use the tools that he has at his disposal to get rid of or to discipline the very people who are at the crux of the problem that we are talking about all across this Nation today.

Let me tell you something else.

The very director of the Phoenix hospital that is now on administrative leave, according to the Department of Veterans Affairs today, got an \$8,500 bonus in April of this year, even though they knew that there was an open Office of Inspector General investigation ongoing at the time. He got a bonus while there was an ongoing investigation.

In Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, where the director of the health care system up there knew that there was Legionella inside the water system that led to the death of at least six veterans—they knew it for a year—that person got a \$63,000 Presidential bonus.

It is easier to get rewarded at VA than it is to be disciplined.

That is why I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 4031, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4031.

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. MILLER of Florida. 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, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4435, HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3361, USA FREEDOM ACT

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 590 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 590

Resolved, That at any time after 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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4435) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 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.

SEC. 2. (a) No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

(b) Each further amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(c) All points of order against the further amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 4. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3361) to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are

waived. In lieu of the amendments in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence now printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution 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 the Judiciary and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 6. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Tuesday, May 27, 2014, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I make a point of order against consideration of the rule, House Resolution 590.

Section 426 of the Budget Act specifically states that the Rules Committee may not waive the point of order prescribed by section 425 of that same act. House Resolution 590 waives all points of order against further amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules.

Therefore, I make a point of order, pursuant to section 426, that this rule may not be considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 10 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.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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.

□ 1400

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 disappointment and a failure of this House of

Representatives not to follow the Constitution.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for the time.

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

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the point of order and in favor of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

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. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2¾ minutes remaining.

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

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

Mr. NUGENT. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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. 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?"

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

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 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. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

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.

□ 1415

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. MCGOVERN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the point of order and in favor of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. NUGENT. 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. 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 work-

ing 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.”

[From CNN Political Ticker]

CNN POLL: AFGHANISTAN WAR ARGUABLY MOST UNPOPULAR IN U.S. HISTORY

[Posted by CNN Political Unit]

WASHINGTON (CNN).—Support for the war in Afghanistan has dipped below 20%, according to a new national poll, making the country's longest military conflict arguably its most unpopular one as well. The CNN/ORC International survey released Monday also indicates that a majority of Americans would like to see U.S. troops pull out of Afghanistan before the December 2014 deadline.

Just 17% of those questioned say they support the 12-year-long war, down from 52% in December 2008. Opposition to the conflict now stands at 82%, up from 46% five years ago. “Those numbers show the war in Afghanistan with far less support than other conflicts,” CNN Polling Director Keating Holland said. “Opposition to the Iraq war never got higher than 69% in CNN polling while U.S. troops were in that country, and while the Vietnam War was in progress, no more than six in 10 ever told Gallup's interviewers that war was a mistake.”

The U.S. timetable for Afghanistan calls for the removal of nearly all troops by roughly this time next year, and that can't come fast enough for the vast majority of Americans. Just over half would rather see U.S. troops withdrawn earlier than December 2014. Only a quarter say that America should still have boots on the ground in Afghanistan after that deadline.

Fifty-seven percent say the conflict is going badly for the U.S. and only a third say America is winning the war in Afghanistan.

“Independents have a much gloomier view of the war in Afghanistan than Republicans or Democrats,” Holland said. “That may be because a Republican president started the war and a Democratic president has continued it, so there may be some residual support among people who identify with either party.” Some 2,300 U.S. troops have been killed in Afghanistan since the war began in the autumn of 2001. The U.S. is quickly drawing down its forces in Afghanistan. If a bilateral security agreement that would keep up to 10,000 U.S. troops in Afghanistan after the end of 2014 isn't signed in the near future, the U.S. could withdrawal all forces from Afghanistan at the end of next year.

The poll was conducted for CNN by ORC International between December 16 and 19, with 1,035 adults nationwide questioned by telephone. The survey's overall sampling error is plus or minus three percentage points.

The discontent evident in the CNN poll is also seen in two other national surveys conducted earlier this month.

Two-thirds of those questioned in an ABC News/Washington Post poll said the war has

not been worth fighting, and an Associated Press/GfK survey showed 57% saying the U.S. did the wrong thing in going to war in Afghanistan.

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. 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 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), 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. Mr. 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. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 590 provides for House consideration of two separate pieces of legislation. The first of these bills, H.R. 3361, the USA FREEDOM Act, will be considered for 1 hour under a closed rule. This legislation will prohibit the bulk collection of all tangible things, not just telephone records. It will end a practice that, in my sincere belief and in the belief of so many other Americans, violated our privacy and our con-

stitutional rights. This isn't the end of the issue for me and, I suspect, for a lot of our Members as well.

And secondly, the reason I am proud to be here to sponsor this particular rule is because it provides further consideration of this year's National Defense Authorization Act. The NDAA passed for 52 consecutive years, and I am confident that this will be the 53rd consecutive year that it passes.

Mr. Speaker, this is the very definition of a bipartisan effort. This year's NDAA was reported out of the House Armed Services Committee with unanimous support, 61-0.

For all the infighting that exists in Congress, it is nice to know that we can unite around the common cause of supporting our troops and fulfilling our constitutional responsibility of providing for the common defense of our homeland.

Part of the reason this legislation received so much support is that so many Members have had input into the process, from the committee to the floor. The committee alone, this bill was amended 155 times in committee. And the rule will allow for the consideration of over 160 more amendments, with over 70 of those amendments coming from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Of course, no piece of legislation is perfect to each Member. Even as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I didn't get everything I wanted in this legislation. But I am extremely proud of the work that we have done and the product that we have put forward.

One of the things I would like to highlight in this bill is the 1.8 percent pay raise for our troops. It is definitely more modest than I had hoped, but it is still a good step. And I think we all know our brave men and women have earned it.

We have also rejected, for 4 years in a row now, the President's proposed benefit cuts to our warfighters and their families. In the President's FY12 budget request, he proposed cuts to TRICARE. In the NDAA that year, the committee fully restored those cuts. In the President's FY13 budget proposal, he proposed compensation cuts once again. And, once again, our NDAA restored much of the funding and required the President to find other sources for the remaining funds.

Fiscal year '14 was no different. This President proposed TRICARE cuts and actually reduced the military's pay raise from 1.8 to just 1 percent. Congress again rejected those TRICARE cuts and worked to restore the program with other resources.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed to say the President's proposed cuts this year were the most sweeping to date. Those cuts would have included TRICARE, housing allowances, and commissary benefits. These cuts add costly out-of-pocket expenses to those military families, that 1 percent who protect our freedoms, and he was will-

ing to cut that. Our warfighters deserve better, and the NDAA before us ensures that those damaging cuts will not happen.

This NDAA also rejects the administration's insistence on one or more rounds of base closure to conserve resources. It is our opinion that Base Realignment and Closure, BRAC, is an ineffective way to produce true savings. Instead, they add large up-front costs. And so in this year's NDAA, we have prohibited another round of BRAC.

We have also expanded sexual assault prevention by reviewing the discharge status for victims who separate from the military. And this is so important to all of us. What we want to do is to ensure that no servicemembers were prosecuted for reporting a crime, and we want to make sure that we hold those responsible for the crime to the highest level that we can.

Finally, the underlying bill ensures the preservation of the National Guard. In every State and territory in this Union, guardsmen are exceptionally well trained and must retain equipment to respond to disasters in their States.

□ 1430

These brave men and women are critical to the operational Reserve of this country—ready to deploy to combat zones in defense of the entire Nation, as they have proudly done over the last 12 years. These are active members of our community who risk their own safety to come to our rescue when we are in need the most.

The Guard also provides for some of the most effective and efficient dollars spent, and that is why it is always frustrating to see proposals that could dramatically cut from their budget.

The NDAA recognizes the importance of the National Guard and the Reserves and preserves their capability to protect us here at home and abroad.

I support the rule and the underlying legislation, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I agree completely with my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). How can we possibly be having a meaningful debate about our national defense policy when we are not even allowed to have a vote or a debate on the war that this country happens to be engaged in at this given time? It is a pretense for a discussion that while still important is omitting the single largest public policy issue that our constituents are interested in and that men and women are putting their lives at risk for related to defense.

There were 131 germane amendments, including the amendment offered by my colleagues, Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. JONES, relating to the war in Afghanistan, and 130 others that are rejected

under this rule—not even allowed a minute of discussion on the floor, no less a vote. What would it take to allow a full discussion of those issues? Well, 131 amendments, and customarily, even if we gave each 10 minutes, that is just 2 or 3 days of legislative time about our entire national defense policy. Isn't that what we owe this country as our Nation's deliberative body here, as Representatives of the United States Congress, to discuss for 2 or 3 days all the issues that Members on both sides of the aisle have brought forward relating to defense? I am including, first and foremost, the obvious issue of the war that we are currently engaged in and the demands from our constituents that whatever side prevails in that vote—and in the past, I have joined my colleagues, Mr. McGOVERN and Mr. JONES, on that issue—at least we should be able to debate and discuss whether an ongoing American presence in Afghanistan is in our national security interests.

The process under which these bills have come to the floor prevents open dialogue and debate, and, frankly, continues to undermine the reputation of this body, the United States Congress, as a deliberative and representative body. One need not wonder why congressional approval ratings are so low. Here we are having a debate for a day on national defense, and we are prohibited from debating and voting on the single largest issue relating to national defense.

In addition, this bill brings up a very weakened form of the USA FREEDOM Act. Not only was this bill weakened in the Judiciary Committee, but, in addition, it was weakened just 24 hours ago before the Rules Committee. Nonetheless, Members from both sides of the aisle submitted amendments to improve the bill, but, unfortunately, every single one of those 20 amendments are blocked under this rule. So we block 131 amendments by Members on both sides of the aisle from debate and from a vote, and we blocked 20 amendments for Members on both sides of the aisle with regard to the USA FREEDOM Act.

Look, this underlying rule also blocked amendments relating to military preparedness. It blocked a widely popular amendment that I think would have more than enough votes on the floor of the House, according to its chief sponsor, Mr. DENHAM, that would allow our aspiring Americans to enlist in the military to ensure that we have the very best and most capable aspiring men and women to defend our country. Absent that amendment, the military will have to essentially go to the next best person on their list, have a harder time meeting their recruitment goals, and have to accept something less than the very best to defend our country and protect our national security. The majority blocked this important bipartisan amendment that would allow aspiring Americans who seek to serve our country and know no

other country and owe no other allegiance to any other country to earn their legal status through military service.

The majority also blocked an amendment by Mr. CASTRO that would have allowed aspiring Americans who are DACA-qualified to become eligible to attend, train, and serve at U.S. service academies. I have had the deep honor of having been appointed by then-Speaker and now-leader Pelosi to serve on the board of governors along with my colleague, Mr. LAMBORN of Colorado, of the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs.

Members from across the country undergo—like we do in our office—a selection process where we interview the very best and brightest young men and women from across our districts for appointment to that academy, and one of the greatest honors I have as a Representative is being able to make the phone calls to the talented young individuals that our panelists have chosen to say, yes, we are providing you an appointment to one of our officer universities, and you will be able to serve as an officer in the United States military, one of the U.S. service academies. However, again, as a result of the failure of this rule to allow for even a debate or a vote on the Castro amendment, once again, our military academies are being forced to accept the next best, the less prepared student, rather than the most prepared and the very best officer that we need in today's and tomorrow's military to keep our Nation's national security interests safe.

Both the Denham and Castro amendments would strengthen our service morale, our national defense, and our military preparedness. And those are an example of the 131 amendments to this bill that are blocked from discussion or votes under this restrictive rule.

In addition, this rule makes in order H.R. 3361, the USA FREEDOM Act. Now, this bill was supposed to rein in the NSA's illegal and far-reaching wiretapping programs. Though I have never in my time here supported the PATRIOT Act, even many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have believe that the interpretation of that act was overly broad, and therefore, it is desirable for Congress to assert itself on behalf of the American people and rein in some of the worst excesses. But I am dismayed to find that the final text on the floor was not only weakened in the committee process but was weakened just 24 hours ago behind closed doors with less than just about 24 hours for Members of this body to even read the new version of the weakened USA FREEDOM Act.

Mr. Speaker, last year's revelations that the NSA had been collecting detailed information about our communication patterns have undermined the trust that my constituents and Americans across the country have in our government. It has created conflicts

with our allies abroad, threatening jobs in our country by sully the reputation of American companies and rifling our international trade waters. The NSA collection of metadata is a clear violation of our constitutional guarantee against unreasonable search and seizure, and it simply can't continue.

Now, while I am pleased that the Chamber is finally taking up legislation that is aimed at reining in the NSA's activities, however, while this bill does take baby steps towards restoring some of Americans' freedoms that are so inherently part of our constitutional system, I am very disappointed that it doesn't require the government to fully meet the standard, nor does it resolve this issue in any way, shape, or form to the American people.

The USA FREEDOM Act curtails the NSA's ability to monitor Americans' private communications under section 215 of the PATRIOT Act. And the legislative intent is clear: to prohibit the collection of bulk data such as the type that was occurring under the secret program revealed by Edward Snowden. However, the language in the bill falls short of accomplishing that, and none of the amendments that were designed to improve this bill and make it work to secure our privacy rights were even allowed to be discussed under this rule here on the floor of the House, which is another reason that this rule simply must be brought down.

This legislation amended the definition of "specific selection term," which is required to conduct surveillance under FISA in a way that creates the possibility that the NSA could misuse the bill. Now, again, a secret government agency that we have acknowledged has had oversight problems in the past, having overly broad discretion, has shown and demonstrated that it has been unable to provide the proper oversight.

So the bill's new definition of "specific selection term" can be read to create a loophole permitting intelligence agencies to use selection terms that could permit the collection of large segments of data associated with the particular email domain or IP address.

The American people have seen how broadly in the past the intelligence community has interpreted their authority under surveillance law. Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me. The new definitions provided in the underlying bill provide a potential loophole almost as wide as the initial loophole in the PATRIOT bill itself and fails to address the privacy concerns of the American people.

In addition, the new language eliminated provisions that strengthened and clarified the ban on reverse targeting in 702 and the minimization provisions for both the 215-based CDR program and the FISA pen register statute.

The language is a major departure from the bill that passed out of two committees. So you might hear Members on both sides of the aisle say, oh,

the bill passed by voice on committee. To be clear, this is not the bill that passed in committee. This bill was changed 24 hours ago and severely weakened. Were the proponents of these changes hesitant to bring these changes forward in committee because they knew they would engender bipartisan opposition? Perhaps. But let it not be said without refutation that these bills have passed committee by a voice vote unanimously. The bill has changed significantly since it passed committee.

Again, while I am encouraged that this Congress is finally taking up a bill designed with the intent of reining in the excesses of the NSA, this process is flawed. Twenty amendments were offered; none are allowed under this rule. If we can defeat this rule, Members from both sides of the aisle will be able to move forward to improve upon the USA FREEDOM Act to ensure that it can be examined and that Congress can engage in their proper oversight role with regard to this bill.

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

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) whom I serve with on the Armed Services Committee, but he also serves on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, if you listen to some of the debate on this rule, you would not realize that both the underlying pieces of legislation here were enormously bipartisan.

I want to thank my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee—Chairman GOODLATTE, Ranking Member CONYERS, Congressman NADLER, Congressman SCOTT, and Congressman SENSENBRENNER, the original author—for their hard work in bringing this bipartisan bill to the floor.

The bill passed out of the Judiciary Committee by a vote of 32-0 and as amended passed the Intel Committee by a voice vote.

The underlying bill takes important steps toward reforming our Nation's intelligence-gathering programs by banning the bulk collection of data. The bill enhances civil liberty protections for all Americans while at the same time preserving our ability to protect the national security of this country.

National security and international terrorism investigation will now be conducted on a case-by-case basis, using specific selection terms and with permission from the FISA court, thereby ending the vacuuming up of data by the NSA.

Finally, the bill creates more transparency and provides more information to the American people. Companies will now be able to publicly report on the requests for information they re-

ceive from the government. The bill also requires new comprehensive reviews and extensive public disclosure.

The act includes legislation that I offered with my colleagues, the Intelligence Oversight and Accountability Act, which requires the government to provide to Congress, within 45 days, a copy of each FISA court decision, order, or opinion that includes a significant construction or interpretation of FISA.

The Federal Government has the responsibility to ensure that the intelligence community is taking appropriate action to root out threats to the security of the American people within the boundaries of the U.S. Constitution.

Today, we are striking this balance between safeguarding privacy and protecting Americans from terrorist threats in today's post-9/11 world.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we have heard talk about the NDAA bill and amendments that weren't allowed. What you did not hear is that from 10 o'clock in the morning until 12:30 the next morning, the amendments were offered—over 155—and the chairman of that committee was so gracious he continued to ask, "Are there any additional amendments?" until there were none, when we finally passed on a bipartisan basis the NDAA bill.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that is a good bill that strengthens and supports our men and women in uniform. I hope that my colleagues will support the rule and support the underlying bills.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my distinguished colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I, once again, rise in strong opposition to this rule, which fails to make in order the bipartisan McGovern-Jones-Smith-Garamendi-Lee amendment on Afghanistan, and I will include the text of my amendment following my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, ours is a very straightforward amendment. We worked very hard to make it thoughtful, bipartisan, and germane. It reiterates the President's commitment to complete the transition of U.S. combat, military, and security operations to Afghan authorities by the end of this year.

□ 1445

It requires the President to send to Congress by the end of March next year a determination that describes the mission, duration, and level of troops of any post-2014 deployment of U.S. troops in Afghanistan, and the Congress then has 30 days to enact a joint resolution to approve the President's determination.

In the event that Congress votes against the President's determination, then the remaining U.S. troops in Afghanistan would be withdrawn in a safe, orderly, and expeditious manner,

taking into consideration the security of U.S. diplomatic facilities and personnel.

Last year, 305 Members of this House voted in support of an amendment calling for just such a vote, but under this rule, those same Members will be denied the opportunity to make sure that the President presents clearly to Congress what he intends our troops to do in Afghanistan after the end of this year and for how long. Under this rule, Congress is denied the opportunity to vote on whether they approve the President's plan or not.

I don't know how a vote on our amendment would turn out, and I certainly have no idea how a vote next year on keeping our troops in Afghanistan would turn out, but here is what I do know: I know that the men and women who will be asked to serve and perhaps to die in Afghanistan deserve a debate and a vote. I know their families deserve a debate and a vote.

I know that the American people, who have spent billions and billions and billions of dollars on this war, deserve a debate and a vote; and I know that this Congress has not only the right but the responsibility to make our views known on this important issue.

We are at war, Mr. Speaker. I know that some of my colleagues would rather not think about that. They would rather the issue of Afghanistan just go away, but wishing and hoping doesn't make it so.

This is already the longest war in American history. The American people are tired of it. Our troops and their families have been stretched to their very limits. We have lost over 2,000 servicemembers and spent over \$700 billion.

What in the world is the Republican leadership afraid of, Mr. Speaker?

Last night, some of my Republican colleagues told me that they were refusing to make this amendment in order because they didn't want to upset the President. Are you kidding me? Since when does this leadership care one iota about upsetting the President?

We can vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act over 50 times. We can have investigation after investigation after investigation about Benghazi, but we can't take 10 minutes to debate the war in Afghanistan? Give me a break.

Besides, this amendment doesn't upset any plans or negotiations the President is currently carrying out on Afghanistan—not a one. It doesn't interfere with funding for the war, and it doesn't interrupt the deployment of our troops.

I know, in their hearts, that many of my Republican colleagues agree with me, so I am going to give them one more chance to do the right thing. I urge you to support the McGovern-Jones-Smith-Garamendi-Lee amendment on Afghanistan.

Strike section 1217 and insert the following:

SEC. 1217. COMPLETION OF ACCELERATED TRANSITION OF UNITED STATES COMBAT AND MILITARY AND SECURITY OPERATIONS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF AFGHANISTAN; REQUIREMENTS TO CONTINUE DEPLOYMENT OF ARMED FORCES IN AFGHANISTAN TO CARRY OUT MISSIONS AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2014.

(a) COMPLETION OF ACCELERATED TRANSITION OF UNITED STATES COMBAT AND MILITARY AND SECURITY OPERATIONS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF AFGHANISTAN.—In coordination with the Government of Afghanistan, North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) member countries, and other allies in Afghanistan, the President shall—

(1) complete the accelerated transition of United States combat operations to the Government of Afghanistan by not later than December 31, 2014;

(2) complete the accelerated transition of United States military and security operations to the Government of Afghanistan and redeploy United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan (including operations involving military and security-related contractors) by not later than December 31, 2014; and

(3) pursue robust negotiations leading to a political settlement and reconciliation of the internal conflict in Afghanistan, to include the Government of Afghanistan, all interested parties within Afghanistan and with the observance and support of representatives of donor nations active in Afghanistan and regional governments and partners in order to secure a secure and independent Afghanistan and regional security and stability.

(b) REQUIREMENTS OF PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION AND CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORIZATION TO CONTINUE DEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN AFGHANISTAN TO CARRY OUT MISSIONS AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2014.—

(1) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION.—In the event that United States Armed Forces remain 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.

(2) CONGRESSIONAL ACTION.—No later than 30 days following the receipt of the President's determination, Congress shall enact a joint resolution to approve 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 and expeditious redeployment from Afghanistan.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to include my amendment calling for a vote on keeping troops in Afghanistan after 2014, and that this amendment receive 10 minutes total debate like every other germane amendment made in order under the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has been yielded for the purpose of debate by the gentleman from Florida. Does the gentleman from Florida yield for this unanimous consent request?

Mr. NUGENT. I do not.

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

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 23, nays 361, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

YEAS—23

Castor (FL)	Israel	Moore
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Nadler
Clarke (NY)	Jones	O'Rourke
Dingell	Kelly (IL)	Pallone
Fudge	Lee (CA)	Pingree (ME)
Hastings (FL)	McGovern	Pocan
Hinojosa	Meeks	Velázquez
Honda	Miller, George	

NAYS—361

Aderholt	Cotton	Graves (GA)
Amash	Courtney	Graves (MO)
Amodei	Cramer	Grayson
Bachus	Crawford	Green, Al
Barber	Crenshaw	Green, Gene
Barletta	Crowley	Griffin (AR)
Barr	Cuellar	Griffith (VA)
Barrow (GA)	Culberson	Grijalva
Barton	Cummings	Grimm
Beatty	Daines	Guthrie
Benish	Davis (CA)	Gutiérrez
Bentivolio	Davis, Danny	Hahn
Bera (CA)	Davis, Rodney	Hall
Bilirakis	DeFazio	Hanabusa
Bishop (NY)	DeGette	Harper
Bishop (UT)	Delaney	Harris
Black	DeLauro	Hartzler
Blackburn	Dent	Hastings (WA)
Blumenauer	DeSantis	Heck (NV)
Bonamici	DesJarlais	Hensarling
Boustany	Deutch	Higgins
Brady (PA)	Diaz-Balart	Himes
Braley (IA)	Doggett	Holding
Bridenstine	Doyle	Horsford
Brooks (AL)	Duckworth	Huffman
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Huelskamp
Broun (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Hultgren
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Hunter
Brownley (CA)	Ellison	Hurt
Buchanan	Ellmers	Issa
Bucshon	Enyart	Jackson Lee
Burgess	Eshoo	Jeffries
Bustos	Esty	Jenkins
Butterfield	Farenthold	Johnson (OH)
Byrne	Farr	Johnson, Sam
Calvert	Fattah	Jolly
Campbell	Fincher	Jordan
Capito	Fitzpatrick	Kaptur
Capps	Fleischmann	Keating
Capuano	Fleming	Kelly (PA)
Cárdenas	Flores	Kennedy
Carney	Forbes	Kildee
Carson (IN)	Fortenberry	Kilmer
Cartwright	Foster	Kind
Castro (TX)	Fox	King (IA)
Chabot	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Chaffetz	Frelinghuysen	Kinzingler (IL)
Cicilline	Gabbard	Kirkpatrick
Clark (MA)	Galleo	Kline
Cleaver	Garamendi	Kuster
Clyburn	Garcia	Labrador
Coble	Gardner	LaMalfa
Coffman	Garrett	Lamborn
Cohen	Gerlach	Lance
Cole	Gibbs	Langevin
Collins (NY)	Gibson	Larson (CT)
Connolly	Gohmert	Latham
Conyers	Goodlatte	Latta
Cook	Gosar	Levin
Cooper	Gowdy	Lewis
Costa	Granger	Lipinski

LoBiondo	Pearce	Sessions
Loeb	Pelosi	Sewell (AL)
Lofgren	Perlmutter	Shea-Porter
Long	Perry	Sherman
Lowenthal	Peters (CA)	Shimkus
Lowey	Peters (MI)	Shuster
Lucas	Peterson	Sinema
Luetkemeyer	Petri	Sires
Lujan, Ben Ray	Pittenger	Smith (MO)
(NM)	Pitts	Smith (NE)
Lummis	Poe (TX)	Smith (NJ)
Lynch	Polis	Smith (TX)
Maffei	Pompeo	Smith (WA)
Maloney,	Posey	Southerland
Carolyn	Price (GA)	Speier
Maloney, Sean	Price (NC)	Stewart
Marchant	Quigley	Stivers
Marino	Rahall	Stockman
Massie	Rangel	Stutzman
Matheson	Reed	Swalwell (CA)
Matsui	Reichert	Takano
McAllister	Renacci	Terry
McCarthy (CA)	Ribble	Thompson (CA)
McCarthy (NY)	Rice (SC)	Thompson (MS)
McCaul	Richmond	Thompson (PA)
McClintock	Rigell	Thornberry
McCollum	Roby	Tiberi
McHenry	Roe (TN)	Tierney
McIntyre	Rogers (AL)	Tipton
McKeon	Rogers (KY)	Titus
McKinley	Rogers (MI)	Tonko
McMorris	Rohrabacher	Tsongas
Rodgers	Rokita	Turner
McNerney	Rooney	Upton
Meadows	Ros-Lehtinen	Valadao
Meehan	Roskam	Van Hollen
Mica	Ross	Veasey
Michaud	Rothfus	Vela
Miller (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
Miller (MI)	Royce	Wagner
Moran	Ruiz	Walberg
Mullin	Runyan	Walden
Mulvaney	Ruppersberger	Walorski
Murphy (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Walz
Murphy (PA)	Salmon	Wasserman
Napolitano	Sánchez, Linda	Schultz
Neal	T.	Weber (TX)
Negrete McLeod	Sanchez, Loretta	Webster (FL)
Neugebauer	Sanford	Welch
Noem	Sarbanes	Wenstrup
Nolan	Scalise	Westmoreland
Nugent	Schiff	Whitfield
Nunes	Schneider	Williams
Nunnelee	Schock	Wilson (SC)
Olson	Schrader	Wittman
Owens	Schweikert	Wolf
Palazzo	Scott (VA)	Womack
Pascarella	Scott, Austin	Yarmuth
Pastor (AZ)	Scott, David	Yoder
Paulsen	Sensenbrenner	Yoho
Payne	Serrano	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—47

Bachmann	Frankel (FL)	McDermott
Bass	Gingrey (GA)	Meng
Becerra	Hanna	Messer
Bishop (GA)	Heck (WA)	Miller, Gary
Brady (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Camp	Holt	Ryan (OH)
Cantor	Hoyer	Schakowsky
Carter	Hudson	Schwartz
Cassidy	Huelskamp	Simpson
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Slaughter
Collins (GA)	Joyce	Vargas
Conaway	Kingston	Waters
DelBene	Lankford	Waxman
Denham	Larsen (WA)	Wilson (FL)
Duffy	Lujan Grisham	Woodall
Engel	(NM)	Young (AK)

□ 1511

Mses. MCCOLLUM, BROWN of Florida, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Messrs. BARTON, STIVERS, GARCIA, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. CHU and Mr. PALLONE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against: