

everything else, but they seem to be absent in observing these proceedings. We are so proud to report to you that we didn't just beat them, but we beat them badly—10–5.

We were able to raise the most that we have ever raised for the Young Survival Coalition. In total, over the last 6 years, we have raised just over \$500,000 for the Young Survival Coalition, which helps raise awareness and takes care of young women who are facing breast cancer. I know all of you know by now that I am a breast cancer survivor myself. I was diagnosed at 41, and so this is so personal for me.

I want to thank all of my teammates who have become my sisters and friends. The best thing about this game, besides that we were able to raise awareness for young women all across this country, are the friendships that we all formed and that many of us know would not ever have been made without our playing together on this team. It was so much fun for such a good cause.

Actually, what we would like to do before I turn it over to my cocaptain, Mrs. MOORE CAPITO, is we would like to ask Coach Nat to come join us at the front because she never gets the recognition that she deserves. We love her so much. Natalie gave us such incredible skill-building drills this year that it really made a difference. Our bats were hot, and our fielding was great. We had very few errors, and we jelled as a team.

If I can just say one thing before I turn it over to Mrs. MOORE CAPITO, it is that we are really so proud of the fact that this is a bipartisan team, and, hopefully, we set an example for how it really is possible to set aside politics and work together. We are very proud of being able to do that. Many of us work together in the Chamber now that we have played together on the field, so we hope that we can continue to set an example and make sure that we can, as much as possible, put aside politics so we can do things together for the country.

With that, I yield to the gentlelady from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), my cocaptain.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my cocaptain, and I would like to thank the Members of the Senate who played with us as well. It was wonderful.

You all will be happy to know that we did not exploit the youth and inexperience of the press too much, because we had several grandmothers on the team, and for the poor folks who aren't grandmothers, I felt a little sorry for them.

I would like to call down our other coach, Mr. ED PERLMUTTER, who helped us every morning when we got up.

I would also like to give special recognition to two new members of the team this year—Katherine and Jaime. They did great.

To our Members who did not play with us this year, they were dressed

and cheering right by the sidelines, so thank you all for coming.

Thanks to all of you who came out and supported us. Thanks to all of you for supporting such a great cause.

Sorry we beat you—not really.

We are on to next year because we do enjoy it. It is a labor of love because we are up early in the morning in the wind and in the rain. Thanks so much for all of the support that you give us.

Thanks, everybody.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 4870, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 628 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4870.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1708

##### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4870) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 18, 2014, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 141, line 4.

##### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mr. GOHMERT of Texas.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

An amendment by Mr. NADLER of New York.

An amendment by Mrs. WALORSKI of Indiana.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote in this series.

##### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOHMERT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

##### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 130, noes 292, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 318]

##### AYES—130

Amodei	Green, Gene	Miller (FL)
Bachmann	Griffith (VA)	Miller (MI)
Barber	Hall	Neugebauer
Barletta	Hanna	Olson
Barr	Harper	Palazzo
Barrow (GA)	Hensarling	Paulsen
Barton	Herrera Beutler	Perry
Benishek	Holding	Peters (MI)
Bentivolio	Hudson	Petri
Bilirakis	Huelskamp	Pitts
Blackburn	Huizenga (MI)	Poe (TX)
Brady (TX)	Hurt	Pompeo
Braley (IA)	Jenkins	Price (GA)
Bridenstine	Johnson, Sam	Rahall
Broun (GA)	Jolly	Rogers (KY)
Brownley (CA)	Jones	Rooney
Buchanan	Jordan	Roskam
Burgess	King (IA)	Rothfus
Campbell	Kingston	Royce
Carter	Kinzinger (IL)	Rush
Chabot	Kiame	Ryan (WI)
Coble	Labrador	Salmon
Conaway	LaMalfa	Scalise
Costa	Lamborn	Schweikert
Crenshaw	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Daines	Latta	Sessions
Denham	Loebback	Sinema
Dent	Lummis	Smith (NE)
DeSantis	Maffei	Smith (TX)
DesJarlais	Marchant	Southerland
Duffy	Masse	Stockman
Duncan (SC)	Matheson	Takano
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Enyart	McCarthy (NY)	Tiberti
Farenthold	McCaul	Tipton
Fincher	McClintock	Walberg
Fleischmann	McHenry	Weber (TX)
Garrett	McIntyre	Webster (FL)
Gibson	McKinley	Welch
Gingrey (GA)	McMorris	Westmoreland
Gohmert	Rodgers	Wolf
Goodlatte	McNerney	Yoder
Gosar	Meadows	Yoho
Gowdy	Messer	

##### NOES—292

Aderholt	Capps	Courtney
Amash	Cárdenas	Cramer
Bachus	Carney	Crawford
Bass	Carson (IN)	Crowley
Beatty	Cartwright	Cuellar
Becerra	Cassidy	Culberson
Bera (CA)	Castor (FL)	Cummings
Bishop (GA)	Castro (TX)	Davis (CA)
Bishop (NY)	Chaffetz	Davis, Danny
Bishop (UT)	Chu	Davis, Rodney
Black	Cicilline	DeFazio
Blumenauer	Clark (MA)	DeGette
Bonamici	Clarke (NY)	Delaney
Boustany	Clay	DeLauro
Brady (PA)	Cleaver	DeBene
Brooks (AL)	Clyburn	Deutch
Brooks (IN)	Coffman	Diaz-Balart
Brown (FL)	Cohen	Dingell
Bucshon	Cole	Doggett
Bustos	Collins (GA)	Doyle
Butterfield	Collins (NY)	Duckworth
Byrne	Connolly	Edwards
Calvert	Conyers	Ellison
Camp	Cook	Ellmers
Cantor	Cooper	Engel
Capito	Cotton	Eshoo

Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Fox  
Frankel (FL)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Gardner  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Griffin (AR)  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Joyce  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (NY)  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
Lee (CA)  
Levin

Lewis  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Long  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lynch  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Marino  
Matsui  
McAllister  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McKeon  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Mullin  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Negrete McLeod  
Noem  
Nolan  
Nugent  
Nunes  
O'Rourke  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters (CA)  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Pittenger  
Pocan  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita

Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schock  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Swalwell (CA)  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walden  
Walorski  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Waxman  
Wenstrup  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Capuano  
Kirkpatrick  
Lankford

Mulvaney  
Nunnelee  
Polis  
Rangel  
Richmond  
Ryan (OH)

□ 1713

Mr. ELLISON changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MARCHANT). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 179, noes 242, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 319]

AYES—179

Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera (CA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DeBene  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duncan (TN)  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Gibson  
Grayson

NOES—242

Aderholt  
Amash  
Amodei  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barber  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barrow (GA)  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bentivoglio  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black

Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Daines  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duckworth  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Ellmers  
Engel  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallego  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Pocan  
Price (NC)  
Israel  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latham  
Latta  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Lummis  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McAllister  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meadows  
Gosar  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mullin  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peters (CA)  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Huizenga (MI)  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby

NOT VOTING—10

Capuano  
Kirkpatrick  
Lankford  
Mulvaney  
Nunnelee  
Polis  
Rangel  
Richmond  
Ryan (OH)  
Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1718

So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 233, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 320]

AYES—187

Amash	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Barber	Grijalva	Owens
Bass	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Beatty	Hahn	Pascrell
Becerra	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Bera (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Bishop (NY)	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Higgins	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Himes	Peters (CA)
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Peters (MI)
Braley (IA)	Holt	Petri
Brown (FL)	Honda	Pingree (ME)
Brownley (CA)	Horsford	Pocan
Bustos	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Huffman	Quigley
Capps	Israel	Rahall
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Rohrabacher
Carney	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Castor (FL)	Jones	Sánchez, Linda T.
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Chu	Keating	Sanford
Ciçilline	Kelly (IL)	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schiff
Clay	Kilmer	Schneider
Cleaver	Kind	Schrader
Clyburn	Kuster	Huelskamp
Cohen	Langevin	Huizenga (MI)
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Hultgren
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Hunter
Costa	Lee (CA)	Pitts
Courtney	Levin	Poe (TX)
Crowley	Lewis	Pompeo
Cummings	Lipinski	Possey
Davis (CA)	Loeb	Price (GA)
Davis, Danny	Loftis	Reed
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Reichert
DeGette	Lowey	Renacci
DeLauro	Lynch	Ribble
DelBene	Maffei	Rice (SC)
Deutch	Maloney,	Rigell
Dingell	Carolyn	Roby
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Roe (TN)
Doyle	Massie	
Duckworth	Matheson	
Edwards	Matsui	
Ellison	McCarthy (NY)	
Engel	McCollum	
Enyart	McDermott	
Eshoo	McGovern	
Esty	McNerney	
Farr	Meeks	
Fattah	Meng	
Foster	Michaud	
Frankel (FL)	Miller, George	
Fudge	Moore	
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	
Galleo	Nadler	
Garamendi	Napolitano	
Garcia	Neal	
Gibson	Negrete McLeod	
Grayson	Nolan	

NOES—233

Aderholt	Brooks (AL)	Cole
Amodei	Brooks (IN)	Collins (GA)
Bachmann	Broun (GA)	Collins (NY)
Bachus	Buchanan	Conaway
Barletta	Bucshon	Cook
Barr	Burgess	Cooper
Barrow (GA)	Byrne	Cotton
Barton	Calvert	Cramer
Benishek	Camp	Crawford
Bentivolio	Campbell	Crenshaw
Bilirakis	Cantor	Cuellar
Bishop (GA)	Capito	Culberson
Bishop (UT)	Carter	Daines
Black	Cassidy	Davis, Rodney
Blackburn	Chabot	Delaney
Boustany	Chaffetz	Denham
Brady (TX)	Coble	Dent
Bridenstine	Coffman	DeSantis

DesJarlais	Kline	Rogers (AL)
Diaz-Balart	Labrador	Rogers (KY)
Duffy	LaMalfa	Rogers (MI)
Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Rokita
Duncan (TN)	Lance	Rooney
Ellmers	Latham	Ros-Lehtinen
Farenthold	Latta	Roskam
Fincher	LoBiondo	Ross
Fitzpatrick	Long	Rothfus
Fleischmann	Lucas	Royce
Fleming	Luetkemeyer	Ruiz
Flores	Lujan Grisham	Runyan
Forbes	(NM)	Ryan (WI)
Fortenberry	Lujan, Ben Ray	Salmon
Fox	(NM)	Scalise
Franks (AZ)	Lummis	Schock
Frelinghuysen	Marchant	Schweikert
Gardner	Marino	Scott, Austin
Garrett	McAllister	Scott, David
Gerlach	McCarthy (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Gerlach	McCaul	Sessions
Gibbs	McClintock	Shimkus
Gingrey (GA)	McHenry	Shuster
Gohmert	McIntyre	Simpson
Goodlatte	McKeon	Smith (MO)
Gosar	McKinley	Smith (NE)
Govdy	McMorris	Smith (NJ)
Granger	(Rodgers)	Smith (TX)
Graves (GA)	Meadows	Southerland
Graves (MO)	Meehan	Stewart
Green, Gene	Messer	Stivers
Griffin (AR)	Mica	Stockman
Griffith (VA)	Miller (FL)	Stutzman
Grimm	Miller (MI)	Terry
Guthrie	Miller, Gary	Thompson (PA)
Hall	Mullin	Thornberry
Hanna	Murphy (PA)	Tiberi
Harper	Neugebauer	Tipton
Harris	Noem	Turner
Hartzler	Nugent	Upton
Hastings (WA)	Nunes	Valadao
Heck (NV)	Olson	Wagner
Herrera	Palazzo	Walberg
Herrera-Beutler	Paulsen	Walden
Holding	Pearce	Walorski
Hudson	Perry	Weber (TX)
Huelskamp	Peterson	Webster (FL)
Huizenga (MI)	Pittenger	Wenstrup
Hultgren	Pitts	Westmoreland
Hunter	Poe (TX)	Whitfield
Hurt	Pompeo	Williams
Issa	Possey	Wilson (SC)
Jenkins	Price (GA)	Wittman
Johnson (OH)	Reed	Wolf
Johnson, Sam	Reichert	Womack
Jolly	Renacci	Woodall
Jordan	Ribble	Yoder
Joyce	Rice (SC)	Yoho
Kelly (PA)	Rigell	Young (AK)
King (NY)	Roby	Young (IN)
Kingston	Roe (TN)	
Kinzinger (IL)		

NOT VOTING—11

Capuano	Moran	Rangel
King (IA)	Mulvaney	Richmond
Kirkpatrick	Nunnelee	Ryan (OH)
Lankford	Polis	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1722

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. WALORSKI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 179, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 321]

AYES—238

Aderholt	Gowdy	Paulsen
Amodei	Granger	Pearce
Bachmann	Graves (GA)	Perry
Bachus	Graves (MO)	Peters (MI)
Barber	Green, Gene	Peterson
Barletta	Griffin (AR)	Petri
Barr	Griffith (VA)	Pittenger
Barrow (GA)	Grimm	Pitts
Barton	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Benishek	Hall	Pompeo
Bentivolio	Hanna	Possey
Bilirakis	Harper	Price (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Reed
Black	Hartzler	Reichert
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Renacci
Boustany	Heck (NV)	Ribble
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
Bridenstine	Herrera Beutler	Rigell
Brooks (AL)	Holding	Roby
Brooks (IN)	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Brown (GA)	Huelskamp	Rogers (AL)
Brown (FL)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Hultgren	Rogers (MI)
Bucshon	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Hurt	Rokita
Byrne	Issa	Rooney
Calvert	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Camp	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Cantor	Jolly	Rothfus
Capito	Jones	Royce
Carter	Jordan	Ruiz
Cassidy	Joyce	Runyan
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Ryan (WI)
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Salmon
Coble	Kingston	Scalise
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Schock
Cole	Kline	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Scott, David
Collins (NY)	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Lance	Sessions
Cook	Latham	Shimkus
Cotton	Latta	Shuster
Cramer	Lipinski	Simpson
Crawford	LoBiondo	Sinema
Crenshaw	Long	Smith (MO)
Cuellar	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Daines	Lummis	Smith (TX)
Davis, Rodney	Maloney, Sean	Southerland
Denham	Marchant	Stewart
Dent	Marino	Stivers
DeSantis	Matheson	Stockman
DesJarlais	McAllister	Stutzman
Diaz-Balart	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Duffy	McCaul	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Turner
Ellmers	McIntyre	Upton
Farenthold	McKeon	Valadao
Fincher	McKinley	Wagner
Fitzpatrick	McMorris	Walberg
Fleischmann	Rodgers	Walden
Fleming	McNerney	Walorski
Flores	Meadows	Weber (TX)
Forbes	Meehan	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	Messer	Wenstrup
Fox	Mica	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)	Williams
Garcia	Miller, Gary	Wilson (SC)
Gardner	Mullin	Wolf
Garrett	Murphy (FL)	Womack
Gerlach	Murphy (PA)	Woodall
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Yoder
Gibson	Noem	Yoho
Gingrey (GA)	Nugent	Young (AK)
Gohmert	Nunes	Young (IN)
Goodlatte	Olson	
Gosar	Palazzo	

NOES—179

Amash	Braley (IA)	Castro (TX)
Bass	Brownley (CA)	Chu
Beatty	Bustos	Ciçilline
Becerra	Butterfield	Clark (MA)
Bera (CA)	Capps	Clarke (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Bishop (GA)	Clay
Bishop (NY)	Carney	Cleaver
Blumenauer	Carson (IN)	Clyburn
Bonamici	Cartwright	Cohen
Brady (PA)	Castor (FL)	Connolly

Conyers	Kaptur	Pingree (ME)
Cooper	Keating	Pocan
Costa	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Courtney	Kennedy	Quigley
Crowley	Kildee	Rahall
Cummings	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Davis (CA)	Kind	Ruppersberger
Davis, Danny	Kuster	Rush
DeFazio	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	T.
Delaney	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Sanford
DelBene	Levin	Sarbanes
Deutch	Lewis	Schakowsky
Dingell	Loeb	Schiff
Doggett	Loeb	Schneider
Doyle	Lofgren	Schrader
Duckworth	Lowenthal	Schwartz
Edwards	Lowe	Scott (VA)
Engel	Lujan Grisham	Serrano
Enyart	(NM)	Sewell (AL)
Eshoo	Luján, Ben Ray	Shea-Porter
Esty	(NM)	Sherman
Farr	Lynch	Sires
Fattah	Maffei	Slaughter
Foster	Maloney,	Smith (WA)
Frankel (FL)	Carolyn	Speier
Fudge	Massie	Swalwell (CA)
Gabbard	Matsui	Takano
Gallo	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Garamendi	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Grayson	McDermott	Thompson (PA)
Green, Al	McGovern	Meng
Grijalva	Meeks	Michaud
Gutiérrez	Meng	Miller, George
Hahn	Michaud	Moore
Hanabusa	Miller, George	Moran
Hastings (FL)	Moore	Nadler
Heck (WA)	Moran	Napolitano
Higgins	Nadler	Neal
Himes	Napolitano	Negrete McLeod
Hinojosa	Neal	Nolan
Holt	Negrete McLeod	O'Rourke
Honda	Nolan	Owens
Horsford	O'Rourke	Pallone
Hoyer	Owens	Pascarell
Huffman	Pallone	Pastor (AZ)
Israel	Pascarell	Payne
Jackson Lee	Pastor (AZ)	Pelosi
Jeffries	Payne	Perlmutter
Johnson (GA)	Pelosi	Peters (CA)
Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter	
	Peters (CA)	

NOT VOTING—14

Capuano	Lankford	Richmond
Ellison	Mulvaney	Ryan (OH)
King (IA)	Nunnelee	Schweikert
Kirkpatrick	Polis	Wittman
Labrador	Rangel	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1726

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1730

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. COTTON

Mr. COTTON. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to transfer or release any individual detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba to the individual's country of origin or to any other foreign country.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Arkansas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would very simply prohibit the use of funds in this legislation from being used to transfer detainees at Guantanamo Bay to their country of origin or any foreign country.

There are two main reasons why this amendment is necessary, both related to the President's action in trading five senior Taliban commanders for Private Bowe Bergdahl.

First, he has proven that section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act is inadequate; and, second, we need to review conditions of the release of the Taliban Five.

On the first point, this Congress granted the President, last year, expanded authority to release detainees from Guantanamo Bay, conditioned on 30 days' notice to the Congress, as well as certain conditions.

The President abused that authority by releasing the Taliban Five without notification, even to the so-called Gang of Eight, the senior leaders of both parties in both Chambers, the senior leaders of both Intelligence Committees in both Chambers.

The President, having duly signed the National Defense Authorization Act into law with those restrictions, but then did not obey those restrictions, did not claim his core article II constitutional powers to override them. Therefore, it is imperative on our institution to reclaim, on principle, our constitutional authority.

Second, the Taliban Five have been released into the country of Qatar. We need to take a year to review the conditions of those released. As many of you have seen, they appear to be moving about freely in the country of Qatar without any restrictions on their movement, absent the requirement that they remain in Qatar.

This would allow them—senior commanders, mind you—to communicate freely with Taliban on the battlefield against our troops in Afghanistan. We should be able to take at least 1 year to see if such conditions are adequate to support the release of such hardened terrorist commanders.

What does this amendment not do? This is not a permanent ban on transfers of detainees from Guantanamo Bay, nor does it authorize indefinite detention. It simply says we will take a 1-year pause to evaluate the conditions under which five senior Taliban commanders were released and to reassert our constitutional prerogatives.

Who are these detainees? They are not goat herders who were innocently swept up by the American military, nor are they foot soldiers or couriers. These are the worst of the worst, 149 hardened terrorists, which Joint Task Force Guantanamo Bay says 120 of are high risk to return to the battle.

In fact, just this week, a former Guantanamo Bay detainee was arrested in Spain, recruiting for the Islamic States of Iraq and Syria, the terrorist

group that is currently rampaging through both Syria and Iraq.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, stand up for your honor as a coequal branch, stand up for our national security, and stand up for the safety of your constituents.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman would have a restriction, and I would point out, after today's vote, this would now be the fifth restriction relative to the detainees at Guantanamo Bay. While the gentleman suggests that it is not a permanent ban, it is a mantra of let's do nothing.

These are human beings, whether we want to admit that or not, and to simply continue, after 13 years, to do nothing is wrong. We are a Nation of laws.

I believe the continued operation of Guantanamo Bay reduces our Nation's credibility and weakens our national security by providing terrorist organizations with recruitment material.

Also, we are debating an appropriation bill, and people ought to understand that we are spending \$2.7 million annually per inmate at Guantanamo Bay, which is about 35 times more than the cost of an inmate at a supermaximum Federal prison in the United States.

I would also point out that the United States has transferred 620 detainees from Guantanamo since May of 2002, with 532 transfers occurring during the Bush administration and 88 transfers occurring during the Obama administration.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleague for yielding.

I rise today in support of the gentleman from Arkansas, TOM COTTON's amendment, which would prohibit any funds from being used to transfer or release any of the prisoners held at Guantanamo Bay.

We are a Nation of laws, and we need to make sure we follow those laws. I support this amendment for a litany of reasons, chief among them is that it sends a clear message to the President that he cannot circumvent Congress and that he, the President, cannot override the law of the land.

He should have notified Congress 30 days prior to releasing the five prisoners in exchange for Sergeant Bergdahl. The implications of this release will have a far-reaching impact on the national security of the United States.

Just recently, as the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) pointed out, Spanish authorities arrested a former

Guantanamo Bay detainee on suspicions of running a terrorist recruitment network.

The Director of National Intelligence has said that, by January of 2014, about 29 percent of the 614 detainees released from the prison at Guantanamo Bay had returned to violence.

Our brave men and women in uniform have fought too hard and have sacrificed too much to have the President release these detainees who will likely return straight to the battlefield. We understand this, and our constituents understand this. I support this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support this strongly, too.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would point out, relative to the gentleman's suggestion that we need to make sure the laws of the land are followed, that that is exactly what we do in this bill.

Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN had an amendment in the full committee, which I supported and spoke on behalf of, given the recent transfer of Taliban prisoners by the administration, and the fact is, in section 9015 of the bill, as printed and pending, it says:

No more than 15 percent of the funds made available may be obligated until the Secretary of Defense provides the congressional Defense and Intelligence Committees with a detailed spend plan for the funds provided.

Essentially, the chairman's initiative that I supported—and the committee voted for—fences that money off to make sure the law is followed. This amendment is unnecessary.

I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, with due respect to the gentleman from Indiana on numerous points, this is the fifth restriction that this Congress has undertaken.

If it were to pass, it simply shows the judgment of this Congress, the people's representatives, that these remaining 149 detainees are too dangerous to be cavalierly released into a country without adequate constraints or without notification to Congress, as the law that the President signed demanded.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. There are some facts that need to be put on the table that are inconsistent with what has been suggested by the gentleman from Arkansas. 18.6 percent of the people that were released by the Bush administration were "confirmed" recidivism cases, but it needs to be made clear that the Obama administration has released 95 people, and five of them have gone back to the battlefield.

Now, we don't want anyone to go back to the battlefield. There are 149 detainees still at Guantanamo. Fifteen are clearly the worst of the worst. Nobody is talking about transferring them, ever; but among them are a number of Muslim men who are inno-

cent of any act against this country or our allies who were in the wrong place at the wrong time and were kidnapped by bounty hunters.

Only 5 percent of the prisoners held at Guantanamo were actually apprehended by U.S. forces, and as many as 86 percent were delivered to coalition forces in exchange for a bounty of millions of dollars per head.

There are 78 people who have been cleared for release by the Department of Defense, and they are still under detention. That is a travesty. That is not right. That is inconsistent with everything we believe and stand for in terms of American jurisprudence.

I think the gentleman has made it sufficiently clear by now that many of us know that the political and legal expediency of this detention center at Guantanamo has not been worth the cost to America's reputation around the world, nor to the erosion of our legal and ethical standards here at home.

For far too long, over the course of this war, we have let our fear and anger triumph over our commitment to the rule of law, and every day that we continue to hold these men without charge, we diminish ourselves and cede our moral authority in the world.

So, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is wrong. We need to exercise our judgment. Not all are the same. Not all should be there. Some should be tried in our courts, and this country has the ability to try and prosecute them.

□ 1745

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, Mr. COTTON says that by this amendment, Congress recognizes the danger presented by these detainees. But legislative bodies have no right to make such judgments about individuals. Ever since Magna Carta, we have denied the government the power to imprison or punish people on mere accusations. Just because the government or Congress labels someone a terrorist doesn't make him one. The government must be required to prove the accusation in court. That has always been a bedrock American principle until we opened Guantanamo. Now we imprison people indefinitely without trial. By what claim of right do we do this?

How can we be sure we are punishing actual terrorists and not innocent people when we hold no trials? Guantanamo should be closed and its inmates either tried or released. It is beyond time to close Guantanamo to end this shame on American justice.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would simply say that the 149 terrorists left at Guantanamo Bay are not goat herders, they are not couriers, and they are not even foot soldiers.

They are bomb-makers, they are commanders, and they are intelligence experts who have killed American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines around the world.

Yes, there have been releases in the past, but many of those release were of less dangerous terrorists. The Joint Task Force Guantanamo Bay says 120 out of 149 of the remaining detainees are at high risk to return to the battlefield. That is over 80 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote to put a pause on the President's lawless release of the Taliban Five from Guantanamo Bay.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas will be postponed.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support this bill and provisions therein which underscore that a free, independent, and democratic Ukraine is in the interests of liberty everywhere, most especially the European continent, which largely shares America's constitutional values and respect for the rule of law.

The road ahead will not be easy. Ukraine faces enormous challenges in transitioning to a democratic society as Russia eats away at her eastern provinces and now begins to sabotage her internal assets. The incomes of ordinary people in Ukraine have dropped significantly. Consumer inflation for the year is up 16 percent at the same time the Hryvnia has depreciated sharply, forcing private consumption to drop precipitously and further pushing GDP to decline. Life for ordinary citizens has become increasingly unsympathetic. Liberty hangs in the balance. With winter's approach, economic pressures will further mount as Russia restricts gas supplies to Ukraine.

This is a time for attention to Ukraine, which holds enormous potential to be the world's breadbasket in this 21st century, if only political conditions are stabilized to allow a better future to be built for all.

One powerful dimension of Ukrainian society most often ignored by Ukraine's former leaders and by the world community is Ukraine's village women. Despite all obstacles, they continue to produce nearly half the food

that that nation's citizens eat. In village after village, on plots that are small and open pastures, these stalwart women—many of them grandmothers—toil, using simple hand tools, worn out handcarts, wearing old boots, and planting seed and plants whose germ-plasma is nearly worn out. Their time-worn, horse-drawn wagons need tires to navigate the rough back roads. Their dwellings often lack water and indoor plumbing. Life is survival, and it is hard.

Empowering Ukraine's women to lighten their load and make their task a bit easier would be one important step our country and world leaders could take to allow Ukraine to transition through these delicate years to a better future.

For these reasons, the Appropriations Committee included language in the Defense bill directing the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 60 days after the enactment of this act describing additional assistance that the Department may provide to Ukraine, including out of its surplus warehouses.

The goal of our humanitarian efforts is to empower the women of Ukraine, who, despite enormous obstacles, literally hold their families and that nation together. It is to use humanitarian shipments from our country, from government surplus—anywhere in the world we can acquire it—to simply provide items to help them with their food production and preservation. Give to these village women: good seed, buckets, wheelbarrows, gloves, boots, shovels, scythes, hoes, rakes, plastic on rolls, fencing, carts, used tires that will fit their horse-drawn wagons, simple canning equipment for putting up fruits and vegetables, drying equipment, scissors, hand shovels, grass clippers, pruners, loppers, saws, hammers, small hoop houses, hose, rope, and string. And while we are at it, how about some shortwave radios so they can connect to the world beyond their meager circumstances?

We anticipate with other provisions in this legislation States with lift capacity, such as Ohio, can arrange Department of Defense humanitarian shipments through their National Guard Partnership for Peace programs to transport the above-mentioned agricultural tools and supplies to the Ukrainian women in their villages through charitable networks in that country.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to recognize this important inclusion in this bill. I thank the chairman of our committee, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, the ranking member, Mr. VISLOSKEY, and all freedom-loving people everywhere for understanding the vital consequence of these provisions at this moment of history. I would like to include for the RECORD an article entitled "Ukraine Faces Hurdles in Restoring Its Farming Legacy."

[From the New York Times, May 27, 2014]  
UKRAINE FACES HURDLES IN RESTORING ITS FARMING LEGACY  
(By Danny Hakim)

ZIBOLKY, UKRAINE.—Like many of her neighbors in this old Soviet collective farm, Maria Onysko prefers to be paid in grain instead of cash for the modest plot of land she rents out.

"I have two cows and four pigs, many chickens," said Ms. Onysko, 62. "So we use it for them."

After the breakup of the Soviet Union, farmland in newly independent Ukraine was divided among villagers, acre by acre, creating a patchwork of agricultural endeavors that are often inefficient or unprofitable. Some land is rented to fruit growers, grain operators or large-scale farming businesses. Some locals work small plots on their own. Some acreage sits fallow, stuck in legal limbo after the owner has died.

Ukraine was once the breadbasket of the Soviet Union, known for its rich soil where grain, sunflowers and livestock flourished. But farming production dropped sharply in the chaotic decade after the collapse of communism, and recovery has come in fits and starts. Production is only now returning to peak levels of the 1990s, stymied by the corruption, red tape and inefficiencies that have plagued the broader Ukrainian economy for years and left the villagers living humble existences.

Restoring Ukraine's farming legacy will be crucial to the success of the country's newly elected president, the billionaire businessman Petro O. Poroshenko. Such efforts would go a long way toward fixing Ukraine's economy and reducing its dependence on Russia. Agriculture once accounted for nearly 20 percent of the gross domestic product; it is now roughly 10 percent.

The potential became clear last year when a strong harvest helped Ukraine avoid a drop in output. "It was just because of agriculture," said Pavlo Sheremeta, Ukraine's minister of economic development. "Otherwise, it would have been a decline."

Against the backdrop of the crisis with Russia, Western interests are pressing for change. The European Union is moving forward with a plan to bolster trade by lifting custom duties on Ukrainian agriculture. As part of a deal with the International Monetary Fund for up to \$18 billion in loans, the country's government must push through business reforms that would help alleviate the problems with farming and other businesses.

The hope is that such initiatives will also bolster the confidence of foreign investors as the crisis abates. Big multinationals have expressed tentative interest in Ukrainian agriculture, but they have largely remained on the sidelines, unwilling to invest in an industry hampered by structural deficiencies and, more recently, the uncertainty with its eastern neighbor.

"If cheap capital comes in along with foreign investment, and you have a good government without roadblocks, Ukraine can close to double its production in the future," said Roman Fedorowycz, a Ukrainian-American who returned here years ago and now runs a farming company that grows mainly corn, sunflowers and soybeans.

Even small improvements would make a big difference in a highly inefficient industry starved for money. While roughly 70 percent of Ukraine's land is considered suitable for agriculture, it has not been fully cultivated. The country's yield per hectare of grain is about half that of the United States, according to the World Bank.

Change won't come easy, given the challenges. Previous governments have tried to

restrict what crops farmers grow and when they rotate crops, as well as limiting exports. Some state inspectors lack cars to conduct on-site inspections, so farmers must bring grain to them before shipping.

Selling farmland is also forbidden in Ukraine, a legacy of its communist past. So fields remain cut up "like chessboards," said Georgiy Vaydanych, land manager for Agrokultura, a Stockholm-based agricultural company that rents 173,000 acres in many such villages. "For the moment we have 40,000 active landlords," Mr. Vaydanych said. "Forty thousand!"

Making matters worse, paperwork is costly and many villagers never officially inherit the farmland after their parents die. "There is uncertainty on how to farm this land, because we have the dead souls in the middle of our fields," Mr. Vaydanych said, in a reference to Nikolai Gogol, whose 19th-century classic, "Dead Souls," is required school reading here.

Even as the crisis in the east intensifies, life in the agricultural west remains much the same.

A dirt road straddling tilled fields leads into this village, with potholes so deep that drivers zigzag past each other. There are horse-drawn carts, roosters crowing, elderly women in kerchiefs and a church painted pale green topped by bulbous spires.

Few in this pro-European area of Ukraine are nostalgic for Moscow. Still, Oleg Gusak, head of the village council, said life had not improved.

"When it was a collective, the level of life was better," he said, explaining that it was once a larger operation that harvested crops, had livestock and made clothing, furniture and jams.

"People even came from other regions, because we had so much work," he said, adding, "Now, it's not the same."

Trouble raising capital at reasonable prices makes it difficult to start or expand farms.

"I have to pay up to 12 percent if I borrow in euros," said Taras Barshchovsky, an entrepreneur who founded T.B. Fruit, which makes fruit juices and whose rented orchards cover thousands of acres. He has expanded into Poland, where he said he could borrow for less than 3 percent.

"Those who work with Ukrainian banks in hryvnias," the national currency, "they pay up to 20 percent or more. I don't believe you can profit and return money on that percentage," he added.

And while other former Soviet bloc neighbors like Hungary, Romania and Poland began easing their land sale restrictions after joining the European Union, Ukraine has repeatedly delayed lifting its moratorium, considering the move politically risky in its agrarian society. In 2013, the government of Viktor Yanukovich, the deposed Ukrainian leader, extended the moratorium until 2016, after he expected to stand for reelection.

"I'm afraid if I sell my land in the future my children will say their old grandfather drank away all their money," Hrynychshyn Myroslaw, 62, said as he cleared a willow field near another village.

With a laugh, he added: "It depends how much you will pay me. If there are enough zeros, you can pay me."

Volodymyr Baran, 43, a tractor mechanic, said he would never sell his six acres: "The land is our bread."

Such dynamics deter foreign investment, which has been tepid for years. Despite some interest from China and multinationals, large agricultural enterprises tend to be Ukrainian owned, and recent prominent deals have been less than they seemed. For example, Cargill paid a reported \$200 million

for a stake in UkrLandFarming, an agricultural holding company. But a Cargill spokeswoman emphasized that the shares were collateral for a loan rather than a long-term investment.

The rules make "it so much more difficult to understand, and to bring in investment," said David Sedik, a senior official at the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. "It's not that a foreigner or a company has to buy the land, but it breeds opaqueness in the sector. You need transparent land laws."

At his office, Mr. Vaydanych pulled out a village map and showed how its 2,500 acres were divided up among 507 villagers.

"Every field is split, by little, little plots," he explained.

Being a land manager requires a political touch. Mr. Vaydanych goes from village to village handing out favors, fending off competitors trying to outbid his rental contracts.

A village chief, he said, "may call us and tell us, it's the wintertime, we have a lot of snowfall, so give us a forklift to clean the road. O.K., well, we do that."

"He may say this electricity substation is broken so we need urgently to repair it, or he's calling because the water pump at school broke, so we replace it," he said. "That's the commitment that comes with the land."

"I wouldn't be surprised by any request," Mr. Vaydanych said. "It is about keeping everyone happy. That's my work."

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), the chairman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to join with the ranking member in commending you for this colloquy and for the purpose of the colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, we share, love, and represent a number of Ukrainian Americans, and we know their plight, and we salute your efforts. This is an important focus that you have brought to our attention.

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you so very much for your openness to this, Mr. Chairman. And Mr. Ranking Member, thank you for allotting me the time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I want to thank the gentlewoman for her service and for her commitment to her constituents, to her country, and to the Ukrainian people.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RUNYAN

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to retire, divest, or transfer, or to prepare or plan for the retirement, divestment, or transfer of, the entire KC-10 fleet during fiscal year 2015.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply states that none of

the funds made available by this act may be used to retire, divest, or transfer—or to prepare to retire, divest or transfer—the KC-10.

During my time in Congress, I have been a strong supporter of the Air Force's new tanker, the KC-46A. We must bring a new tanker online, but during the transition, it is critical that we are able to meet all mission requirements.

This is why I am strongly concerned by the Air Force's proposal to do a possible vertical cut of the KC-10 tanker and retire it. Having a mission capability shortfall by eliminating the newest tanker currently in our inventory while the KC-46A comes online is simply unacceptable.

As many of you are aware, I am proud to have Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst in my district, and my colleague Mr. GARAMENDI has Travis Air Force Base in California, which are both home to the KC-10. This is not parochial. It is an air refueling and air mobility mission readiness issue.

The KC-10 platform has more than proved itself as a workhorse in support of air refueling and air mobility in Iraq, Afghanistan, our homeland defense, and other missions as called upon.

Unlike other tankers in our inventory, it can refuel Air Force, Navy, and international military aircraft with its dual boom and hose-and-drogue systems. The KC-10 itself can also be refueled while in flight, helping extend our global reach.

Most importantly, this aircraft is critical to providing an air bridge across the Arctic, Atlantic, and Pacific routes to support our combatant commanders.

This amendment sends a message to the Air Force and the DOD that Congress remains committed to active oversight of our air refueling mission platforms and sufficient capacity to support our warfighters.

I want to thank the chairman, the members of the subcommittee, and the staff for working with me on this important amendment. I would particularly highlight our appreciation for the strong support Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN has shown for the KC-10 platform, and his concern for ensuring there is no mission gap for our military's air refueling needs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUNYAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let me thank my colleague from New Jersey for raising this important issue. We believe this proposal to be an extremely risky proposition because the KC-10 provides a particularly vital link in the air bridge that enables global operations of our Armed Forces.

We could not have done what we did in Afghanistan and Iraq without this vital link, and to retire the entire fleet

would be a huge mistake. This is the only tanker that currently uses the boom to fuel Air Force aircraft and the basket to refuel the Navy and Marine Corps fleet. So it is darn important.

I appreciate the work the gentleman has done to bring this to our attention. We have included, of course, language in our bill which reemphasizes the importance of the KC-10 to national security.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for those kind words, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the recognition and would certainly at the outset compliment the gentleman for his concern about the KC-10 and also for his remarks about the performance of the aircraft as well as the value to our country. That is not in dispute, and that certainly is not the reason I am on my feet now.

But the amendment, I believe, would reserve a specific element in the Department of Defense force structure. The practice of the committee and in our bill has been to avoid protection of specific weapons systems or bases and to leave the Department flexibility as far as a path going forward, particularly as far as restructuring units, as well as retirement of programs. This language does not comport with the general concepts of this bill.

I would also point out an issue similar to this relative to a transfer of an airlift wing that was in one State of this great country, and the Department proposal that it be transferred to a different State in this country was debated in committee relative to the reporting of this bill, and we had a vote on that issue, and the committee voted against interfering with the decision that the Department had made relative to their military judgment. Therefore, I would urge the rejection of the gentleman's amendment with all due respect to the capabilities of the KC-10.

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

Mr. RUNYAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments on that. And I will just tell the committee that I have had many conversations with the Air Force about this exact issue, and to be able to take a capability away from what we can do in our global reach and not have a legitimate answer in the near future I think would be devastating to what we can do and how we can project power globally.

So the readiness issue has not been answered, and I think this is a step in the right direction to make sure that our national security is at the forefront. So, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RUNYAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out sections 8107 and 8108.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

□ 1800

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes to explain that my amendment would allow the U.S. military to transfer to their home countries the 77 detainees who have been cleared for release by the intelligence community and the Joint Chiefs of Staff and to bring those not cleared for release to the United States to be charged, tried, and sentenced.

The Sergeant Bergdahl exchange has brought this issue again to center stage, but the fact is that, if we had dealt with these individuals in a responsible and legal way, we would not be in this situation discussing the merits of the decision to release five of them.

For 12 years now, Guantanamo has operated outside of a legal checks of the American judicial system, serving a physical reminder of the gap between the principles that define us as Americans and our willingness to abandon those principles in the name of national security.

With the final withdrawal of American troops from Afghanistan this year, the continued indefinite detention at Guantanamo enters a new stage. We will no longer be at war, and the current Authorization for the Use of Military Force will expire.

So we have to ask ourselves: Do we have the legal authority to hold these enemy combatants indefinitely? Now is the time to either transfer or bring these men to trial—now—while we can still do so on our own terms, while we can give the Defense Department the legal authority it needs to make the right decisions about these prisoners.

It is costing us \$2.7 million per detainee, per year, versus \$34,000 at a maximum security prison in the United States. More than 300 individuals convicted of crimes related to international terrorism are currently incarcerated in 98 Federal prisons in the United States, with no escapes or attacks in attempts to free them.

The indictment and capture of Ahmed Abu Khattala for his role in the Benghazi attack is a great example of our ability to deal with high-profile terrorists swiftly and safely.

Mr. Khattala will not be brought to Guantanamo to become yet another

symbol of U.S. hypocrisy. He will be brought to the United States to answer for his crimes in a Federal court and punished in accordance with the laws of this Nation. I have every confidence in our legal institutions to bring Mr. Khattala to justice.

General Michael Lehnert, who oversaw the opening of Gitmo has said that its continued operation “has helped our enemies” and makes “a mockery of our values.”

It is time to put an end to this by supporting this amendment, and let me just use one more quote. In the words of the family members of the 9/11 victims, the current system is “immoral, unlawful, expensive, counter-productive, unnecessary, and has failed to deliver justice for the 9/11 attacks.”

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I seek time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. BLACK). The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I would first like to recognize Mr. MORAN’s service on our committee. As just exhibited, in the full committee, he is truly a passionate man, and I must say he has been consistently passionate on this issue, but despite his passion and his reasoning, I stand in opposition to his amendment.

The provisions contained in our bill are the same as current law, and they have been carried in some form since fiscal year 2010, in both the appropriations bill and in the Defense authorization bill. Quite honestly, they need to remain there.

The provisions we carry ensure that the remaining Gitmo detainees who are judged to be the most dangerous will never be brought into our homeland, where U.S. citizens could be threatened. There is a pretty strong and enduring consensus—bipartisan consensus—in Congress that Guantanamo Bay should remain open, that the detainees should not be transferred to the United States for any reason, and that no facility should be built in the United States to house them.

As everyone here is aware and as it has been mentioned in earlier debate, a number of detainees who have been released from Guantanamo have gone back to the fight and killed and wounded Americans. The threat is real. We haven’t quite left Afghanistan. The threats there are real.

I strongly oppose the gentleman’s amendment, and I ask the House to give it a strong negative vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, we are holding 154 people at Guantanamo, 77

of whom have been cleared for release. That is to say they have been found guilty of nothing, are thought to be guilty of nothing, and have been judged not to pose any danger, but nonetheless, they are not released.

There is no reason and no right for us to hold them further. The others should be brought to the United States and tried in a secure facility, tried for their offenses.

Madam Chair, I wonder which of our colleagues doesn’t believe in the American system of justice. I wonder which of us does not trust our own American courts. I wonder who among us does not believe in the Bill of Rights, who does not believe in the right to counsel or that people should have an opportunity to have their guilt or innocence established in court.

What we have at Guantanamo is a system that is an affront to those beliefs and to the United States. In the last decade, we have begun to let go of our freedoms bit by bit, with each new executive order, each new court decision, and each new act of Congress.

We have begun giving away our right to privacy, our right to our day in court when the government harms us, and with this legislation, we are continuing down the path of destroying the right to be free from imprisonment without due process of law.

The language in this bill, without this amendment, prohibits moving any detainees into the United States or releasing any at all and guarantees that we will continue holding people indefinitely, people who may not be terrorists, who may not be enemy combatants, some of whom we may suspect to be terrorists, none of whom have been proven to be terrorists, none of whom have had a day in court.

We will continue to hold them indefinitely without charge, contrary to every tradition this country stands for, contrary to any notion of due process.

Mr. COTTON says that this Congress has judged that these people are dangerous people. This Congress has no right, under the Constitution, to make such a judgment. That is called the bill of attainder and is specifically prohibited.

People to be found guilty must be found guilty in a court, not by a legislative body. Because of this momentous challenge to the founding principles of the United States that no person may be deprived of liberty without due process of law and certainly may not be deprived of liberty indefinitely without due process of law, we must close the detention facility at Guantanamo now, in order to restore our national honor.

This will afford the detainees no additional constitutional rights. The Supreme Court has already ruled that detainees at Guantanamo have the same constitutional rights at Guantanamo as they would if they were brought here.

They should be brought here. They should be tried in a Federal court,



where they can be convicted if guilty and acquitted if innocent and not wait for years for military tribunals which have succeeded in convicting nobody at trial at all.

We must restore the honor of the United States and eliminate this exception to our traditions and to our rule of law and to our rule of justice.

Just because we think or somebody in the government thinks that somebody is the terrorist does not mean that that person is a terrorist—he may or may not be—and it does not mean that he does not have the right to his day in court.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, what about justice for the victims of those who died on September 11, 2001? What about justice for those five detainees that were released the other day in the prisoner exchange, how is there justice there?

They were among the worst of the worst. We need to keep the provisions in this bill. I urge a strong “no” vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Chair, I rise to engage in a colloquy regarding the Navy’s littoral combat ship. The Navy’s littoral combat ship represents the future small surface combatant for the United States Navy. This program is in its infancy, but has, so far, cleared many hurdles and is well on its way to becoming an integral part of the fleet.

The Navy reduced the budget request from four ships in fiscal year 2015, as they projected last year, to three ships. Mr. Chairman, your bill has further reduced the program to a recommended level of two ships.

Mr. Chairman, wouldn’t you agree that the LCS is an important part of the Navy’s future fleet?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let me first salute the gentleman from Alabama for his strong advocacy on behalf of the littoral combat ship, and let me say that the littoral combat ship plays an extremely important role in the future of the Navy’s fleet.

In fact, the ship represents nearly one-sixth of the 306-ship fleet the Navy

has expressed as its stated fleet requirement.

During markup of the bill, the committee spent as much time, if not more, on this issue than any other. In the end, we were extremely concerned with the strong words expressed by the Secretary of Defense with respect to the small surface combat requirements that these ships must have.

Since the littoral combat ship does play a vital role, we want to make sure we are buying the correct version. That is why we slowed the production.

However, we recognize the importance of the industrial base—very much so—and we certainly don’t want to let that in any way stagnate, so we have provided funding for two ships to bridge the gap until the Navy can verify the requirements and incorporate them into the production line.

I do recognize that this is an important program for your community, and you have been a remarkable advocate. You have been on my case for quite a long time, and I am hugely admiring of your passion and determination.

I want to assure you that we will continue to work with you to address your concerns. We will continue to monitor, as we proceed to conference with the Senate, and we will work with the gentleman to ensure we adopt the right policy for our national security and the industrial base, including a very important shipyard in the gentleman’s district in Mobile, Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your attention to this matter. I look forward to working with you and Ranking Member VISCLOSKEY, as well as Chairman ROGERS, as we move toward conference.

The Navy has been unequivocal in its support for the LCS, and as you say, the LCS plays an extremely important role in the future of the Navy’s fleet. It is vitally important the Congress not lose sight of that and that I not lose sight of the importance of this shipyard to my district.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I have amendment No. 31 at the desk, preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the purposes of conducting combat operations in Iraq.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I rise today, remembering 12 years ago when I stood on this floor and offered an amendment with the same purpose as the amendments I offer this evening: to prevent a war with Iraq; to keep our young men and women—our troops—out of harm’s way; and to be prudent with taxpayers’ hard-earned dollars, as well as ensuring our national security.

We are all familiar with the reports coming out of Iraq about the horrific sectarian violence taking place. We must not let history repeat itself. Calls to be dragged back into a war in Iraq must be rejected because the reality is there is no military solution in Iraq.

I want to applaud the President for reiterating that again today and for making it clear that he does not want combat troops on the ground in Iraq.

This amendment would not allow funding for combat operations. This is a sectarian war with longstanding roots that were inflamed, unfortunately, when we invaded Iraq in 2003. Any lasting solution must be political and take into account respect for the entire Iraqi population.

□ 1815

The change Iraq needs must come from Iraqis, rejecting violence in favor of a peaceful democracy that represents all and respects the rights of all.

Our job is to continue to promote and support regional and international engagement, recognition of human rights and political reforms, support for women and children, and religious freedom.

Madam Chair, after more than a decade of war, thousands of American lives, and hundreds of billions of dollars, the American people are rightfully war weary. The American people are not interested in repeating the mistakes of the past. A recent poll found that 74 percent of the public is opposed to sending combat troops into Iraq.

This amendment would not impact the President’s ability to protect U.S. personnel or our Embassy. We must do that. It does not impact the President’s ability to act if there is a direct or imminent threat to our national security. As the President cited in his recent notification to Congress, doing so would be consistent with his responsibilities to protect U.S. citizens both at home and abroad.

Finally, it does not impact the President’s ability to send assistance to gather intelligence or advisers and trainers.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I withdraw my reservation, and I seek the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, what is occurring in Iraq is complicated and dangerous and violent.

This is a complicated issue that the gentlewoman seeks to address with multifaceted policy ramifications that really cannot be fully debated in an amendment in this short period of time.

The situation in Iraq remains highly complicated, very dangerous, and does, I believe, and many believe, pose an imminent threat to U.S. and allied interests, particularly regional security; witness the fact that the President has sent over a number of advisers to either protect the Embassy or work with the Iraqi military.

This amendment, in my judgment, goes too far as it attempts to tie the U.S. Government's hands, i.e., the Commander in Chief's hands, in navigating the complicated situation we face related to threats emanating from Iraq, recognizing that half of the country is now in the hands of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria.

We have to be realistic. What this amendment would do is to remove any possibility of the U.S. engaging under any circumstance, even if such engagement would be in the best interest of our own country or allies. For example, this would preclude the U.S. from providing any assistance to the Iraqi Government to defeat a terrorist group inside Iraq, and it appears we may be on the verge of doing exactly that.

Given the ever-changing dynamics in Iraq and the rising terrorist threats coming from within Iraq—and again, almost half the country is in the hands of terrorists—this is a very ill-advised amendment, and I strongly oppose it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, just to clarify, all this amendment does is it would not fund the combat operations in Iraq.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the Lee amendment. The American people have invested 10 years of precious blood and treasure into this conflict. The simple truth is that the Iraqi Government and the Iraqi Army have failed to win the confidence of their own people. The fact is, the army has cut and run, leaving behind valuable equipment, and the fact is we have no friends in this conflict. It is time to get out and to stay out.

Thank you, Representative LEE, for your amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, this amendment sends, I think, the wrong message to the Iraqi people, who have suffered a great deal, and of course I recognize the loss of our soldiers and the sacrifice of our soldiers and their families.

I think this is a very ill-advised amendment and I strongly oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. LEE of California. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I am here to support the amendment to prohibit the use of ground troops in Iraq.

What the American people are seeking is an end to 10, 12, 11 years of a war without end. What the American people are seeking is attention to the needs in this country. What the veterans that have fought in that war are seeking are jobs and the proper care for the visible and invisible wounds of that war.

The only thing we need to protect—and it is not about us going into a conflict and picking sides in what is fundamentally a religious war where there will be no end for us. We must avoid and prevent combat troops being in Iraq. We do that because the American people are against it; we do that because it is the moral imperative; and we do that because we have learned a lesson from history. And history has taught us that this is a war that will not end. We have an opportunity to end it. We have an opportunity to demand of the international community that they use diplomacy to solve the problem in the region.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute now to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, it is as simple as this: the al-Maliki government has abused and excluded huge portions of his population. Because of that, there is a conflict in that country of al-Maliki's own making. Now, what we are going to do if we send combat troops there is literally be his air force, be his ground troops. We shouldn't do that. That is not the right thing for the United States to do.

If we want to help, what we should do is engage the regional community, the countries around Iraq and Iraqi leaders, in a diplomatic solution that hopefully includes them having a more inclusive, less abusive government. That is the proper role of the United States. Trying to stop us from being combat troops is the right thing to do. I urge everybody to support this.

I think the gentleman is incorrect; we are right to stay out of this thing. What, after all, have we learned if 11 years has not taught us? Training? We have given plenty of training. We have trained these people up the wazoo. They abandoned their post. It is not a training problem.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, in closing, let me just underscore the fact that combat operations will not solve the problems in Iraq. This amendment would not fund combat operations. We should not repeat these terrible mistakes of the past.

Let me once again clarify. This amendment would not impact the ability of the United States personnel and our Embassy. We want to protect the United States personnel and Embassy.

Secondly, it would not impact the President's ability to provide unmanned intelligence gathering and assistance. It would not impact the President's constitutional authority to

protect U.S. citizens both at home and abroad.

I urge for a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of her time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to promulgate Directive 293, issued December 16, 2010, by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment that would reiterate Congress' objection to a proposed policy change by the Department of Labor Office of Federal Contract Compliance Program. That would treat health care providers as Federal contractors.

In December 2010, OFCCP quietly issued directive 293 asserting that contractual arrangements under Medicare, TRICARE, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program will trigger OFCCP jurisdiction. This directive would reclassify a majority of hospitals in the United States as Federal contractors, subjecting hospitals in your district and mine to OFCCP's often crushing regulatory burden.

With respect to TRICARE, the agency aggressively asserted in its jurisdiction in the 2009 administrative case OFCCP v. Florida Hospital of Orlando, OFCCP argued the hospital was a Federal subcontractor by virtue of its participation as a provider in a TRICARE network of providers.

The agency took this troubling position despite the fact that the Department of Defense, which regulates TRICARE, previously included: "It would be impossible to achieve the TRICARE mission of providing affordable health care for our Nation's Active Duty and retired military members and their families if onerous Federal contracting rules were applied to the more than 500,000 TRICARE providers in the United States."

Unfortunately, Madam Chair, the administrative law judge in the case did not heed DOD's warning and failed to

see this policy change for what it is: an expansion of government power over the health care sector. As such, Congress acted to oppose this overreach, and the 2012 National Defense Authorization Act clarified that a TRICARE network health care provider is not a Federal contractor or subcontractor.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, I am deeply concerned by this attempt by OFCCP to expand its jurisdiction through executive fiat. In response, I introduced the Protecting Health Care Providers from Increased Administrative Burdens Act, which would clarify that health care providers are not Federal contractors subject to the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor's OFCCP.

Our actions on the committee in bringing attention to this issue have been successful in prompting OFCCP to place a moratorium on the policy. However, as OFCCP has previously defied Congress and the Department of Defense, I believe this amendment is necessary. Therefore, Madam Chair, I ask the House to support my amendment that would prohibit funds to be used under this act for implementing this overreach and affirmatively show the House will not support such actions by the Department of Labor and OFCCP.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I appreciate the recognition.

I appreciate the thrust of the gentleman's amendment. I rise in opposition to it, however, because I think it is overly broad.

One of the concerns I have is, if it is adopted, I am concerned about whether or not technical assistance could continue to be given to contractors and subcontractors; and, obviously, given the complexity of the law, it would be helpful for them to have it, and I would not want it to be prohibited.

Additionally, the amendment would appear to interfere with the OFCCP's ability to connect outreach and, again, technical assistance under the current moratorium to help contractors and subcontractors understand their obligations under the law.

So again, I appreciate where the gentleman is coming from. I am concerned that, given the broadness of the amendment, it may inhibit the type of information and assistance that these contractors and subcontractors really do need. So, for that reason, I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's concern; however, as DOD has recommended in the past and stood on the fact that, for purposes of TRICARE and the like, hospitals are not contractors, they do not contract with the Federal Government, with the Department of Defense.

□ 1830

So I don't see the reason for continuing to address this issue any further for these contractors, at least as defined by OFCCP.

In closing, again, this is an issue that DOD has spoken on strongly, this is an issue that Congress has spoken on, this is an issue that OFCCP continues to push. I believe we would be remiss if we allowed this to happen and allowed the concept that hospitals would be considered government contractors simply for providing health care under TRICARE and the like to our veterans, to our military, and certainly to any of our Federal employees.

I would appreciate support for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into any contract with an incorporated entity if such entity's sealed bid or competitive proposal shows that such entity is incorporated or chartered in Bermuda or the Cayman Islands, and such entity's sealed bid or competitive proposal shows that such entity was previously incorporated in the United States.

Ms. DELAURO (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentlewoman from Connecticut and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

My amendment would prohibit Federal contracts issued by the Department of Defense from going to entities incorporated in Bermuda and the Cayman Islands, two nations most often abused as tax havens.

This body accepted a similar provision for the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development earlier this month.

According to a joint study by the U.S. Public Interest Research Group and Citizens for Tax Justice, 70 percent of the companies in the Fortune 500 used tax havens last year. These com-

panies stashed nearly \$2 trillion offshore for tax purposes, with almost two-thirds of that total, 62 percent, being hidden away by just 30 companies.

We just saw the medical device manufacturer Medtronic, a company founded in a Minnesota garage with deep roots throughout the State, announce it was effectively moving operations to Ireland to escape its tax obligations. This is a persistent and a growing problem, and we need to start taking action to rein it in.

We can start with this amendment. Of the companies who have established subsidies in tax havens, nearly two-thirds have registered at least one in Bermuda or in the Cayman Islands. The profits these companies claim were earned in these two island nations in 2010 totaled over 1,600 percent of these countries' entire yearly economic output.

These companies take advantage of our education system, our research and development incentives, our skilled workforce, and our infrastructure, all supported by U.S. taxpayers. They should not be allowed to pretend that they are an American company when it is time to get a defense contract, then claim to be an offshore company when the tax bill comes. We should not spend taxpayer money on Federal contracts to companies that have renounced their American citizenship in favor of an island tax haven.

As I said, a similar amendment became part of the Transportation and Infrastructure bill. I urge my colleagues to pass this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, we do not oppose the amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Chair, that is very good to hear.

I join in supporting this amendment as a coauthor of it. Multinational corporations that do business around the globe have an even greater interest in world order and in national security. They should not be paying a lesser rate of taxes than corporations that focus their business right here in America.

Unfortunately, some of them scheme to avoid their fair share and to shift the burden to smaller businesses and to individuals. Some of these same companies have on more than one occasion paid more to their lobbyists to lobby this Congress and the Treasury to avoid paying taxes than they actually pay to the Treasury. It has been a pretty wise investment for them because our Tax Code is a mess. It is riddled with preferences and loopholes and one exception after another.

This amendment addresses one of the most egregious tax gimmicks. That is where a corporation actually renounces its American citizenship, declares itself a citizen of some other country, and then continues operations in

America, demanding the full protection of the laws and the military and the educational system that it refuses to contribute a fair share to pay for. Tax lawyers call it an “inversion”; I call it a perversion of our tax laws.

To add insult to injury, some of these same corporations, which have abandoned their citizenship, then ask for American government contracts paid for with the very tax dollars from the small businesses and individuals to whom they have shifted the tax burden.

American companies that stay and contribute to building our country and keeping her strong at home and abroad deserve a level playing field, and that is what this amendment does.

The action that we take in approving this amendment today sends a message to executives that they can pretend that their company is located on some Caribbean beach to avoid paying taxes, but Congress is not going to put its head in the sand about this kind of tax dodging.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the Chair.

Madam Chair, I and others have long fought for—and we have succeeded in passing through the appropriations process—a ban on Federal contracts for U.S. companies that acquire a business in a lower tax jurisdiction and claim their headquarters there, despite still being a U.S. company.

According to a 2009 GAO report, 63 of the 100 largest publicly traded U.S. Federal contractors reported having subsidies and tax havens in 2007. These companies are currently paying a tax rate of zero percent—zero percent. So unless you believe tax reform should eliminate taxes for U.S. companies, this avoidance is not about corporate tax reform.

We need to send that clear message. If a company is going to abuse the tax loopholes at the expense of businesses that are paying their fair share, they will not be rewarded with defense contracts.

I am happy to hear and I urge my colleagues to make this stand with me again and to pass this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to appoint

chaplains for the military departments in contravention of Department of Defense Instruction 1304.28, dated June 11, 2004, incorporating change 3, dated March 20, 2014, regarding the appointment of chaplains for the military departments.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Louisiana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Chairman, the amendment before you today holds the Department of Defense to current accepted DOD policy and standards when appointing military chaplains. It maintains the status quo, which has been well accepted for decades, if not centuries. My amendment affirms the spiritual role of chaplains in the U.S. armed services, preserving the integrity of the U.S. Chaplain Corps.

I want to thank Representatives JIM BRIDENSTINE and JAMES LANKFORD for their cosponsorship of this amendment. This amendment was adopted last year during the House's consideration of DOD appropriations on a bipartisan basis, although it was ultimately dropped from the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2014. I would urge my colleagues to support its passage again today.

Chaplains by definition are ministers for spiritual needs to people of secular institutions. They are equipped to do so because, like many other professionals requiring a certain skill set, chaplains possess a belief in God or a spiritual world view. Chaplains are experienced in their field, educationally qualified, and are willing to serve and attend to the spiritual needs of all members of the armed services, regardless of whether or not that soldier, sailor, airman, or marine shares the same faith as that of the chaplain.

Current DOD guidelines requires that the candidates be endorsed by a “qualified religious organization” whose primary function is to perform religious ministries to a nonmilitary lay constituency and which holds tax-exempt status as a church.

Faith and spiritual leadership are integral and inseparable from the institution of the Chaplain Corps. It would be difficult for an individual lacking in any faith to be appointed as a military chaplain without first dismantling the purpose of the chaplaincy and making significant changes to the DOD policy.

Madam Chairman, it is an oxymoron to have a secular person attached to a secular institution as a chaplain. How can that person minister to the spiritual needs of others? Even so, there continues to be a movement to appoint atheist chaplains in the military. Such individuals reject the very existence of God, a deity, or even a spiritual world view, and thus an atheist chaplain would not serve any identifiable need for servicemembers that is not already currently being met with the Armed Forces.

There are a host of other nonspiritual services available to support peo-

ple in a nonfaith context, including social workers, psychologists, and counselors. Through Military OneSource and the Military and Family Life Counselor Programs, servicemembers can receive temporary and confidential counseling services from a licensed professional without any attachment to their records. In addition to these services, military chaplains can stand ready to faithfully and respectfully serve all servicemembers with any resources they might need, regardless of whether the individual shares the chaplain's faith.

My amendment would prevent DOD from making changes to its longstanding appointment process that could undermine the integrity of the chaplaincy and interfere with the chaplain's responsibility to meet the religious needs of our brave men and women in uniform.

I would like to thank the Family Research Council and the Chaplain Alliance for their support of this amendment, and urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chair, the gentleman has spoken much about the spiritual role of chaplains in the military. I am very concerned that the impulse here is related to sexual orientation and the limitation in serving as a chaplain in the United States military.

I would tell the gentleman at one time in my life—and I obviously took a bad turn in the road because I got involved in politics—I was in a Roman Catholic seminary. My God is a loving God. My God is a tolerant God. My God passes judgment on the goodness of a person's soul. In this day and in this world, where there is so much hate and violence and anger, I think it is very disappointing that we in public life would try to accentuate that there are differences between us that may cause us not to like each other.

Each of us seeks our God differently. We have different religions, we have different customs, we have different preferences. But it is important to find that chaplain and spiritual guide who meets those needs to help us to find that just and forgiving and kind God.

I think it is wrong to foreclose any avenue for any American, and particularly those who put the uniform of this country on and risk their lives for us and are under incredible stress. To foreclose any avenue of spiritual guidance and relief for them is wrong.

I would simply close by noting that there is a monument—Thomas Jefferson—in Washington D.C.

□ 1845

One of the writings of Jefferson is on the southeast portico. It says:

Laws and constitutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, institutions must advance to keep pace with those times. We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy as a civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of their barbarous ancestors.

My vote would be a vote to have a tolerant policy in a tolerant country. I oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Chair, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. FLEMING. It is interesting. The gentleman argues that—amazingly—somehow a chaplain is not going to be open to serving the spiritual needs of all, whether they be gay or otherwise.

There is nothing in this amendment that says anything about the choice of one's sexual partner whatsoever. In fact, remember that we already have in our chaplaincy Wiccans, Buddhists, Muslims, Christians, and Jews. Many of those accept same-sex marriages.

This argument that the gentleman makes is for another debate, not for this one. This deals purely with atheism. It is very interesting because the scene is that, on the battlefield, you have a chaplain who is serving the spiritual needs of a dying soldier and the soldier asks the chaplain: What happens now? What happens after my death?

The answer from the atheist chaplain is: There is nothing for you after death.

That is really a very disturbing thought, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I stand for a tolerant Nation, and I stand in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, this amendment would simply prohibit funding for any operations or activities pursuant to the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force in Iraq.

Why is this amendment necessary? Well, more than 2 years since the United States troops withdrew from Iraq, the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force remains on the books.

Two years ago, President Obama declared the war in Iraq as over. Just yesterday, according to press reports, White House Press Secretary Jay Carney stated that the 2002 AUMF is "no longer used for any United States Government activities."

Further, in our Appropriations Committee, our chairman confirmed that this bill does not contain any funding to implement the 2002 authorization. That is good news, and it should make supporting this amendment an easy thing to do for Members on both sides of the aisle.

The American people need an affirmative vote that the war in Iraq that began over 11 years ago through the military operation—shock and awe, which took over 2,000 lives—has come to an end and none of their hard-earned tax dollars are being spent.

Some of us agree that it is well past time that we remove this authorization totally from the books, but on this appropriations bill, we only state very clearly that no funds may be obligated or expended for the authorization.

Congress should never allow war-funding authorizations to remain on the books in perpetuity. We don't do this for the farm bill. We don't do this for the transportation bill.

Madam Chair, we are all familiar with reports coming out of Iraq about the horrific sectarian violence taking place there. Once again, I want to applaud President Obama for reiterating again today that there is no military solution to the sectarian war there and also for his clear position that the United States is not going to be returning to combat in Iraq.

This amendment does not limit the President's authority under the Constitution or War Powers Act to act if there is a direct or imminent threat to our national security.

As the President cited in his recent letter to Congress, doing so would be consistent with his responsibilities to protect United States citizens both home and abroad. This amendment does not take away that authority.

Further, this amendment fully allows for the protection of the United States Embassy and its personnel and would not impede any of those efforts by the United States military.

Given that there is no funding in this bill for the 2002 AUMF, supporting this amendment is just plain common sense. The American people deserve this vote. It is long overdue. We should vote primarily also to ensure that our constitutional role is reasserted in war-making.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

As the gentlewoman knows, U.S. military action in Iraq came to an end in December of 2011. I want to make sure that she also knows that there are no funds in this act for military action in Iraq, pursuant to the Iraq AUMF resolution. Its grant of authority has both practically and legally ended.

This amendment is an amendment in search of a problem, a problem that doesn't exist. This amendment is not about substance. To a great extent, it is about symbolism. It is intended to send a message that the United States has washed its hands of Iraq, which we haven't.

At a time when sectarian tensions are at the highest level since we left and terrorists have, once again, succeeded in capturing large swaths of territory in Iraq and brutalizing the Iraqi people after our troops essentially fought to protect them, what kind of message are we sending with this amendment to both the Iraqi people and to the men and women of our Armed Forces and our international armed forces who so valiantly served?

Let me repeat that there are no funds in this act for the purpose the gentlewoman is seeking to limit. The only thing this amendment would accomplish is to make, quite honestly, a political statement.

I recognize, from time to time, that needs to be done, but I think it sends the wrong message at the worst possible time. I don't believe that such an amendment has any purpose on our bill, and I urge strong rejection of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentlewoman for yielding.

The fact is the gentlewoman has mentioned this authorization is very dated. The world has changed. It needs to be reconsidered.

I deeply appreciate her efforts not just today on the floor, but in committee and over the years to essentially force the issue and to ask this institution to reconsider what the authorities should be going forward.

I certainly support her effort.

Ms. LEE of California. I want to thank the ranking member for his comments and for reasserting and reassuring Members that our constitutional role is extremely important in matters of war and peace.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. This Congress has a constitutional obligation to approve military action before any President decides to shoot first and ask questions later. A 12-year-old resolution, enacted in the aftermath of 9/11, should not provide a basis for endless war.

Some of the same self-certified smart people who were talking about mushroom clouds and weapons of mass destruction are, once again, trying to stampede us into war. We have been there, and we have done that, and America is still paying a terrible, terrible price for their past failures, though they refuse to acknowledge them.

Protecting our Embassy in Baghdad is one thing—a true emergency—but if any President wants to launch offensive military action, they need to come and make a specific case to this Congress for authorization, just as President Obama said he would do last year on Syria, not some convoluted interpretation of a resolution from a different time and circumstance.

If there is a case for war, have the courage to come here and make it, but don't rely on an open-ended authorization of military force from long ago.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chair, I thank my friend from California for this amendment, but also for her longstanding work on this issue and related issues.

When we hear about this impossible situation which we find ourselves in today in Iraq, with the country clamoring for us to do something, we should be reminded of how we got there. It is not because of something that has expired. It is because of something that still exists.

The gentlelady is absolutely right that we should repeal that, repudiate that, and get ourselves on a new track, which requires deliberate attention by the Congress, if we are ever going to use military force, and not a blank check to the administration.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, stay tuned as our Commander in Chief and our allies contemplate future action in Iraq. As things get worse, things go south, a lot of innocent people are killed.

I am respectful of the gentlewoman's passion and her continuing battle to get this matter straightened out, but the President is still going to request for Congress to look at things. I think we should stay tuned.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140; 42 U.S.C. 17142).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment which addresses another misguided and restrictive Federal regulation.

Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 prohibits Federal agencies from entering into contracts for the procurement of fuels, unless their life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions are less than or equal to emissions from an equivalent conventional fuel produced from conventional petroleum sources.

My amendment is simple. It would stop the government from enforcing the ban on agencies funded by the Department of Defense Appropriations bill from being forced to comply with section 526.

The initial purpose of section 526 was to stifle the Defense Department's plans to buy and develop coal-based or coal-to-liquids jet fuel. We must ensure that our military has adequate fuel resources and that it can rely upon the domestic and more stable sources of fuel.

One of the unintended consequences of section 526 is that it essentially forces the American military to acquire fuel refined from unstable Middle Eastern crude resources.

I offered this amendment to 13 prior appropriations bills in fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2014; and each time, these amendments passed with bipartisan support.

My friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), also added similar language to the latest defense authorization bill, to exempt the Defense Department from this burdensome regulation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1900

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chairman, the gentleman talks about the burden. The gentleman talks about the requirement. I would talk about our requirement to ease the burden on the American people as far as our continued dependency on fossil fuel, on overseas options as far as how we secure our carbon, and as I have said a number of times during the debate during the last 2 days, we should never foreclose options for our military. There is a pur-

pose for this requirement and this policy because the Department of Defense is the largest entity on the planet Earth relative to the purchase of fuel, and it is a perfect way to begin to wean ourselves from some of these foreign sources.

Some argue that section 526 harms our military readiness. This is simply not the case. In July, the Department of Defense stated very clearly that the provision has not hindered the Department from purchasing the fuel we need today, worldwide, to support military missions, but it also sets an important baseline in developing the fuels we will need in the future.

The Department, itself, supports section 526, recognizing that tomorrow's soldiers, sailors, air personnel, and marines are going to need a greater range—more options—of energy sources. In fact, the Department of Defense says that repealing this section could complicate the Department's efforts to provide better energy options to our warfighters and take advantage of the promising developments in homegrown biofuels.

I do believe that the amendment would damage the developing biofuels sector at the worst possible time for our economy. We need to create jobs, not to eliminate them. It could also send a negative signal to America's advanced biofuels industry and result in adverse impacts in rural development areas and in exports of the world's leading technology. Section 526 doesn't prevent the sale of dirty fuels, nor does it prevent Federal agencies from buying these fuels if they need to. Instead, it simply prevents the Federal Government from propping up the makers of different types of carbon fuels with long-term contracts. Developing and bringing advanced, low-carbon biofuels to scale is a critical step in reducing the Nation's dependency on oil.

As someone who is possessed with the largest inland oil refinery in the United States of America in the First Congressional District, we are going to sell a lot of oil, but we ought to look at having a broad matrix, and the Department of Defense is a place to start, so I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, the opposition does not understand my amendment.

This amendment does not do anything with respect to restricting the ability of the Department of Defense to buy any green fuel, biofuel, experimental fuel, or any other kind of fuel.

What it does do in the situation of the refinery in the gentleman's district, if it turns out to start using Canadian oil sands crude as one of their feedstocks, is to prevent that refinery from not being able to sell its fuel to the military. The gentleman's argument is exactly backwards. This allows the military to buy the fuel from whatever source whether it is biofuels, green fuels, conventional sources, some

other coal-to-liquid source, or a Canadian oil sand source. It gives them the greatest opportunity at the cheapest cost to buy the fuel that allows our warfighters to worry about taking care of defending this country and not to worry about where the source of the fuel comes from.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to transfer man-portable air defense systems (MANPADS) to any entity in Syria.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chair, if there is one simple lesson that we can take away from our involvement in conflicts overseas, it is this: beware of unintended consequences.

As was made vividly clear with the U.S. involvement in Afghanistan during the Soviet invasion decades ago, overzealous military assistance or the hyperweaponization of a conflict can have destabilizing consequences and, ultimately, undercut our own national interests.

It is for this reason that I offer this bipartisan amendment with my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH), and others to prevent funds in this bill from being used to transfer man-portable air defense systems, known as "MANPADS," to parties in the Syrian civil war. MANPADS, also known as "shoulder-fired anti-aircraft missiles," can be fired at an aircraft by individuals on the ground, and they can be easily hidden or transported in the trunk of a car.

According to the Los Angeles Times:

U.S. and Israeli officials have feared that they could be used by terrorists to bring down commercial airliners.

Leaders of the Syrian opposition movements have told The Wall Street Journal and other news outlets that they are actively seeking the transfer of MANPADS from the U.S. and our allies and that U.S. officials continue to consider these requests. I urge the support of the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We accept your amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would join the chairman in thanking the gentleman for his initiative. He raises a very good point, and I support his amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. In reclaiming my time, I thank both of the floor leaders for their support.

Madam Chair, I want to make clear that this amendment will simply ensure that no funds may be made available under this bill for the transfer of these devastating and highly mobile weapons to any party in the Syrian civil war. So, regardless of one's opinion about U.S. intervention in foreign conflicts, this prudent and responsible amendment deserves our support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

Mr. MCKINLEY. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to design, implement, administer, or carry out the U.S. Global Climate Research Program National Climate Assessment, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's Fifth Assessment Report, the United Nations' Agenda 21 sustainable development plan, or the May 2013 Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from West Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Madam Chairman, this amendment is identical to the one that the House adopted last month to the National Defense Authorization Act. The amendment would prohibit the Department of Defense from spending money on climate change policies forced upon them by the Obama administration.

We shouldn't be diverting financial resources away from the primary missions of our military at a time when we face many threats. Just look at what is happening around the globe: Iraq is splintering; Syria is still engulfed in a civil war; Russia continues its threat against Ukraine and Crimea; North Korea continues its saber rattling; Iran refuses to stop its pursuit of nuclear weapons; the Taliban threatens stability in Afghanistan; Hamas has now captured teenagers and is holding one of them, an American teenager, in Israel; and ISIS, Boko Haram, al Qaeda, and other terrorist groups are promoting instability and threatening liberty and freedom all around the world.

Madam Chairman, we live in a dangerous world, yet our military is being

forced to make due with less. Spending precious resources to follow the Obama climate change agenda will compromise our national security.

When this same amendment was being adopted previously, some people claimed the amendment would prevent the military from using science. That is not true. This amendment merely prevents the Pentagon from spending money—precious money—to implement policies based on the Obama administration's climate assessment and on the United Nations' reports. These are widely acknowledged as political documents, adopted by people with an agenda. We should not be spending money pursuing ideological experiments when we face military challenges around the world. This amendment will ensure we maximize our military might without diverting funds for a politically motivated agenda, so I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comment that we should look around the world and see what is happening.

I look in the Pacific, and I am struck because of the gentleman's concern about the Department of Defense and the commander of the United States Pacific Command's pivoting to Asia. Admiral Samuel Locklear states that the single greatest threat to long-term peace in the Pacific basin is climate change. These threats increase with the demand for energy as temperatures rise but also as natural disasters happen with greater frequency, causing increased operational demands on military forces serving in stability and support roles.

With these disturbing trends documented in the most recent assessments, it would be irresponsible, I believe, to prevent the continued assessment of this real and changing threat.

I would note that no funds shall be used for the research program. What has ever happened in this country where we can't do research? What we do today is: let's not see anything; let's not hear anything; let's not learn anything; let's not research anything. If my parents took that attitude of "let's do nothing," we would still be waiting for the interstate system to be built.

It is time we do something. This attack on research and inquisitiveness and on the seeking of knowledge, whether we agree on all of the facts or not, is very disturbing to me, and I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Madam Chairman, with all due respect to the minority leader, in this amendment, we are not stopping research, and we are not denying that there is climate change occurring. We are merely saying that we

should not be diverting money to implement the political documents that we list in the amendment.

□ 1915

There is ample research. There is ample reason to continue the work that we are doing, but we don't need to be using these documents that are widely acknowledged as politically-driven documents.

We want to continue the research, but not using these documents, these very specific documents.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I would simply say that these documents are research-oriented and technical updates, and we ought to pursue knowledge. I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HANABUSA

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used with respect to Iraq in contravention of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.), including for the introduction of United States armed forces into hostilities in Iraq, into situations in Iraq where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, or into Iraqi territory, airspace, or waters while equipped for combat, in contravention of the congressional consultation and reporting requirements of sections 3 and 4 of such Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1542 and 1543).

Ms. HANABUSA (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentlewoman from Hawaii and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Chairman, the Hanabusa-Garamendi amendment is simple. It would ensure that President Obama does not circumvent the War Powers Resolution by unilaterally committing U.S. forces to operations in Iraq.

I have opposed our involvement in Iraq since 2002 and continue to oppose it today.

On Monday, President Obama invoked the War Powers Resolution to send an additional 275 troops into Iraq to increase security at the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad. Today, we heard possibly an additional 300 personnel.

While I understand the need to send troops into Iraq for the express purpose of providing security for U.S. personnel in Iraq, and this amendment would not prevent the additional Embassy security recently announced by the administration or any evacuation operations, I remain resolute that we should not resume combat operations in Iraq.

Congress and the administration need to seriously consider the lack of objectives or an endgame the U.S. would achieve through further military involvement in Iraq. We know the results when we don't know what the end game is and we don't fully consider the consequences of military action, and this miscalculation is not worth repeating to involve our Nation in a situation that is the result of a long-standing sectarian conflict.

After over a decade of U.S. military action in the Middle East that has taken lives and come at far too high a cost of our Nation's resources, we must let the Iraqi people decide their own future.

The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq are estimated to have cost between \$4 trillion to \$6 trillion, taking into account the medical care of wounded veterans and expensive repairs to the force depleted. This monetary figure cannot come even close to measuring the human lives that were taken as a result of our involvement in the Middle East.

Madam Chairman, we simply cannot afford the options under consideration. U.S. forces should be on a new strategy for regional engagement, rather than considering options that we get involved as we have in the past. This amendment would do that.

I ask my colleagues to vote for this amendment and ensure that the President abides by the law and does not put American lives at risk by involving U.S. troops in combat operations in Iraq.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. HANABUSA. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentlewoman for offering the amendment. I certainly would rise in support of it and certainly think it is acceptable to the committee.

I would point out to my colleagues though that, if you would, your view has been anticipated. I would draw my colleagues' attention to section 8113 of the underlying legislation, as well as section 9013.

So I do not want anyone to think that the committee itself, including the chairman, was inattentive to the points you raise.

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Chairman, I thank the chair and the ranking member of the subcommittee for accepting my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FORTENBERRY

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide weapons in Syria.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Nebraska and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I believe this amendment is absolutely consistent with the underlying portions of the bill that reaffirm that the policy of the United States should be that we will not enter into armed conflict in Syria.

Madam Chair, along the Syrian-Turkish border there is a family—a mother, a father, and six children. One of the children is named Elias.

Elias, one day, in his home town in Syria, was walking to school. He had his hand on the schoolroom door. Then all of a sudden he felt another hand come across his face and everything went dark as he was blindfolded and kidnapped by a Syrian rebel group in the name of liberating the Syrian people.

Fortunately, the family was able to get Elias back, but they had to flee to a refugee camp from their hometown in Syria. Perhaps they are the lucky ones, because 160,000 other Syrians are dead.

Let's make no mistake: the current President, the ruler of Syria, Assad, is responsible for many of these deaths. Assad is a brutal tyrant. But many innocent Syrians, like Elias and his family, fear the rebel armies even more than Assad.

The rebel movement is a battleground of shifting alliances and bloody conflicts between groups that now include multinational terrorist organizations. Some of the most violent and the successful rebel militias are linked to al Qaeda.

Now, sending our weapons into this chaotic war zone could inadvertently help these extremists, jihadists who would be all too eager to seize American weaponry. And it has already happened.

The horror show now unfolding in Iraq suggests that we have already, unintentionally, aided sociopathic zealots. The murderous leaders of the so-called Islamic State of Iraq and Syria have seized American Humvees and weaponry from the disintegrating Iraqi army.

Madam Chair, a CIA analyst on acid could not have imagined this nightmare scenario a week ago. Our best foreign policy analyst could not have seen the ferocity and speed of the collapse of large portions of Iraq.



What we are witnessing is the development of a multinational quasi-emirate, ruled with a ruthless interpretation of Shari'a law. The ISIS marches under the black flag of death.

Madam Chair, the naive notion that we can deliver weapons to vetted, moderate opposition groups at war with other rebel militias gives no guarantee that our weaponry won't be seized or diverted, making an already terrible civil war even worse.

The ad-hoc arming of Syrian rebels, absent a broader multinational strategy in the region, is a recipe for disaster, for further disaster.

Look, I understand this is a complicated situation. It is a hard situation, and there are no good options here. But we cannot afford to do something that may make the situation worse.

In my judgment, the potential benefits from this policy do not outweigh this very significant risk. Just talk to the people in the refugee camps. Talk to Muslim families, Christian families who have had to flee their home. Talk to them. I think we should all remember Elias and what his family has had to go through.

Madam Chair, at this time I yield as much time as he would like to consume to the Congressman from New York, Representative CHRIS GIBSON, Army Iraq war veteran, Purple Heart, professor at West Point.

Mr. GIBSON. I thank my friend and colleague.

Madam Chair, if another country gave arms to a rebel group or another country for the express purpose of attacking our country, we would view that act as an act of war. But for some reason, we don't hold ourselves to that same standard.

If it is the intent of the administration to give arms to any group then, under our Constitution, the administration must first come here and debate it on the floor and get authorization from the people's representatives.

So, Madam Chair, I oppose us getting involved in the Syrian civil war. I believe that there is more that we can do diplomatically to isolate the Assad regime, but I don't think giving arms to any rebel group is in our best interest.

But most certainly, if that is ever to occur, there first has to be an authorization. So I urge my colleague to support this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I appreciate the heartfelt arguments and the concern of the gentleman who serves on the committee. We had a discussion of this amendment in committee, and it did fail on a voice vote.

I would agree with the gentleman when he said that the situation in Syria and that part of the world is very complicated, and that there are no

good options. I can't argue that point either.

He also stated that there are significant risks if weapons are, if you would, provided, and I could not deny that.

But at some point in time, given the problems we have in that area of the world and the people who have been displaced and who are in those refugee camps, I think we ought to keep what few unpleasant options we have open, to assume a reasonable risk if, at some future point in time during the next year to year and a half, we can work to improve the situation.

So with all due respect and understanding of the gentleman's concerns, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chairman, let me say I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. But we appreciate the passion in which they make their case and certainly, Mr. FORTENBERRY, in the committee, did a very fine job recognizing congressional concerns regarding potential U.S. involvement in Syria.

Our bill, as you are aware, contains a provision, section 9013, which prohibits the introduction of U.S. military forces into hostilities in Syria, except in accordance with the War Powers Act.

The situation in Syria is as dire as you have described it. We have about 4 million refugees outside the country, doing incredible things, destabilizing one of our best allies, Jordan, in a huge way.

The ranking member and I had an opportunity to visit one of those refugee camps. We need to be mindful of the actions we take here and, perhaps, what we might be doing to limit the President's assistance and our U.S. support for one of our greatest allies, two of our greatest allies in the Middle East, both Israel and Jordan.

So I think we ought to move with caution. We understand your underlying sentiment. In some ways we agree with it.

We don't think we ought to tie the administration's and the Commander in Chief's hands in the way that you have suggested.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield what remaining time I have to the gentleman.

□ 1930

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank both the chairman and the ranking member for this respectful dialogue.

These are tough judgment calls. I understand that. In my judgment, the risks do not outweigh the potential rewards here.

Until we have a strong, significant multinational strategy to contain this contagion, I believe an ad hoc policy—which it appears to me we now have—by sending weapons into this area, po-

tentially could make this situation worse.

As the gentleman from New York, Congressman GIBSON, pointed out, it is the responsibility of Congress to potentially revisit this issue if we need to reassess the situation, and it becomes much clearer and necessitates U.S. action; but now, to me and my conscience, it is important to say no.

Last year, we had a very strong bipartisan vote that demanded that the United States would not enter into a military conflict in Syria. The American people spoke loudly and clearly, and I think this is simply an extension of that understanding.

I understand the differences of opinion here in judgment, and I very much appreciate the time and respect accordingly.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the Fortenberry amendment to H.R. 4870, although I understand my friend's intentions. Our country is wary of intervention halfway across the world.

I understand the impetus to avoid engagement in these very urgent challenges around the world.

Syria's horrendous civil war has seen over 140,000 deaths, 4 million refugees, the use of chemical weapons, mass starvation, the obliteration of entire cities, and growing instability throughout the region.

Syria's odious dictator, Bashar Assad, remains in power and continues to slaughter and starve his people. Innocent civilians have been denied food and medicine, their towns and villages have been razed, and their friends and families driven into refugee camps.

The war crimes and crimes against humanity committed by the Assad regime are a horrific stain on the 21st century, and they demand a much more serious international response.

To many, the carnage in Syria has seemed like a distant problem.

But we can no longer take comfort that our nation is thousands of miles from the Levant. This conflict, which has often seemed like it couldn't get any worse, is evolving in an even more ominous direction.

Of course, we're seeing how the extremist terrorist group, the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) has used Syria and Iraq as its breeding ground. Our headlines show the group is carrying out a bloody offensive in places all too familiar to U.S. marines.

I am most concerned that in recent months, ISIL and its likeminded extremist groups have begun to turn their attention to the west. It appears that they are using the Levant and Iraq.

But choosing between ISIL on one hand and Assad on the other is a false choice. Assad has .let these extremist groups fester in Syria. His plan is to show how reasonable he looks compared to an emerging terrorist threat.

This false choice leaves out the moderate Syrian opposition that doesn't subscribe to Assad's brutality or Al-Qaeda's extremism.

With the emergence of this dual threat in Syria, it is clear that we need a new strategy to end Assad's carnage and prevent Al Qaeda and like-minded groups from establishing safe havens in Syria that could be used to plot attacks against the U.S. and our allies.

Yet, the Fortenberry amendment constrains that strategy. I believe we must aggressively ramp up our efforts to support the moderate opposition in Syria.

It is not too late.

It is not too late to help the moderate opposition. It is not too late to transition to a Syria without Assad. It is not too late to protect ourselves and our regional allies from the threat that ISIL poses. It is not too late to help Syrians build the future they deserve.

Ultimately, I don't believe that the future of Syria will be resolved on the battlefield.

But until the day comes when Syrians representing all segments of society are ready to negotiate peace, we must be prepared to do what's necessary to counter the dangers and tragedy in Syria.

The lives of millions of innocent people and, indeed, our own national security compel us to act—and act quickly.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Fortenberry amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. I have an amendment at the desk, Madam Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. . . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to transfer aircraft (including unmanned aerial vehicles), armored vehicles, grenade launchers, silencers, toxicological agents (including chemical agents, biological agents, and associated equipment), launch vehicles, guided missiles, ballistic missiles, rockets, torpedoes, bombs, mines, or nuclear weapons (as identified for demilitarization purposes outlined in Department of Defense Manual 4160.28) through the Department of Defense Excess Personal Property Program established pursuant to section 1033 of Public Law 104-201, the 'National Defense Authorization Act For Fiscal Year 1997'.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Chair, you may recall, yesterday, I gave an impassioned plea in favor of a different version of this amendment, which was ruled out of order. I am hoping for a better result tonight; but in any event, there is only so much passion in the world, so I will keep my remarks short.

I rise today to address a growing problem throughout our country, which is the militarization of local law enforcement agencies. The New York

Times recently reported that police departments have received thousands of pieces of camouflage and night-vision equipment and hundreds of silencers, armored cars, and aircraft directly from the Department of Defense. These are military weapons.

I think this is appalling. That is why my amendment would prohibit the Department of Defense from gifting excess equipment, such as aircraft—including drones—armored vehicles, grenade launchers, silencers, and bombs to local police departments. Those weapons have no place in our streets, regardless of who may be deploying them.

As The New York Times article "War Gear Flows to Police Departments" explains:

Police SWAT teams are now deployed tens of thousands of times each year, increasingly for routine jobs. Masked, heavily armed police officers in Louisiana raided a nightclub in 2006 as part of a liquor inspection. In Florida in 2010, officers in SWAT gear and with guns drawn carried out raids on barbershops that mostly led only to charges of "barbering without a license."

One South Carolina sheriff's department now takes a new tank that it received from the Department of Defense with a mounted .50-caliber gun to schools and community events. The department's spokesman calls that tank a "conversation starter."

I don't think this is the way I want my America to be. I think we should help our police act like public servants, not like warriors at war.

I think we should facilitate a view of America where the streets are safe and they don't resemble a war zone, no matter who is deploying that equipment. We don't want America to look like an occupied territory.

I hope for the support of my colleagues, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The Department of Defense Excess Property Program provides surplus military equipment to State and local civilian law enforcement agencies for use in counternarcotics, counterterrorism operations, and to enhance officer safety.

It has provided aircraft, including helicopters and small planes; four-wheel drive vehicles, such as pickup trucks and ambulances that can be used for mobile command vehicles with search warrant; entry teams; it has provided vests and helmets to protect officers, as well as other equipment.

Coming from a State and a region which suffered many deaths on September 11, 2001, we welcome this equipment. It is not misused, and the law enforcement agencies in the Northeast and throughout the country that benefit from this equipment have used it to make sure that all of our citizens are protected.

I now would be happy yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT), who is a former sheriff, for some comments.

Mr. NUGENT. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Chair, as a past sheriff, we utilized that equipment in a responsible way. All of the helicopters we had in our fleet were all surplus helicopters that flew as far back as Vietnam. Some of the weapons that we had came from the military. We didn't receive any bombs.

At the end of the day, you can always find misuses of any equipment that is given or utilized by law enforcement. It is the responsibility of those communities to keep that law enforcement agency in check.

To just outright ban the usage of that equipment would devastate local law enforcement agencies across the Nation, not just in Florida, but everywhere.

With that, I do appreciate the comments of the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his comments and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Chair, what I am saying is not so much a question of whether the equipment is being occasionally misused. The question really has become whether it is ever properly used.

Can any of the gentlemen here tonight or anyone else identify a single act of terrorism that was thwarted by handing police officers helicopters that are militarized, bombs, and all sorts of gear that you would only expect to see on the battlefield?

In fact, I would venture to say that the only examples we can come up with for the actual use of these objects is the misuse of these objects, the examples that I gave that were pointed out in national media.

These weapons are not being used to defeat terrorism on our streets. Where is the terrorism on our streets? Instead, these weapons are being used to arrest barbers and to terrorize the general population. In fact, one may venture to say that the weapons are often used by a majority to terrorize a minority.

Certainly, we know of many cases—both recent and in the deep, dark past—where police have used their weapons improperly for the sake of brutality. Now, it used to be that they could only use billy clubs or guns.

Now, they can use helicopters and bombs. Before long, I suppose, given the logic propounded by my colleagues, they will be able to deploy nuclear weapons. That is not an America that I want to live in.

I respectfully submit that this amendment deserves support. We are not cutting off the use of any equipment that is already in the field. On the contrary, that is gone. That is out the door.

Bear in mind that, under the current program, these weapons are given without any strings attached. These are weapons of mass destruction, and they are deployed within our borders by our military to our law enforcement. That is not something I can abide.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Chair, I have heard a lot of things in my life as a sheriff and in my 38 years in law enforcement, but I will tell you this: first of all, the Federal Government does not give local law enforcement or any law enforcement agency bombs.

The helicopters that local law enforcement receive are all demilitarized. They are all stripped out of any capability of having weapons in them. Those are used to save people's lives. They are used to find guys that have murdered people or to find rapists.

This is absolutely ludicrous to think that the equipment that is utilized by law enforcement is utilized for any reason except for public safety interests, and it happens across this Nation every day in a responsible way.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Madam Chair, these are not weapons of mass destruction. What a ridiculous characterization, respectfully. These vehicles, these aircraft are used to protect American citizens, and the law enforcement community uses them wisely, and they are overseen by responsible elected officials.

I have registered my strong opposition to this amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAYSON. I think my colleagues must be attacking some other amendment, not this amendment. This is not an amendment that restricts the distribution of guns or ammunition; rather, this is an amendment that restricts the distribution of armored vehicles, grenade launchers, silencers, toxicological agents, chemical agents, biological agents, launch vehicles, guided missiles, ballistic missiles, rockets, torpedoes, bombs, mines, and nuclear weapons.

Unfortunately, Madam Chair, those are all legally permitted to be distributed to our local law enforcement under current law. That is what I am trying to prevent here.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. NUGENT

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to plan for or carry out a furlough of a dual status military technician (as defined in section 10216 of title 10, United States Code).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Chairman, the amendment treats the National Guard dual status military technicians as uniformed personnel in the event of furlough.

Dual status technicians are uniformed full-time guardsmen, but a lot of their workweek falls into a legal gray area between active duty and civilian. Essentially, they wear two hats.

They are trained to perform a particular job in the Armed Forces, and they drill in that role like all other guardsmen. However, these dual service technicians are the ones that actually keep the equipment operational.

My son serves in the Florida Army National Guard as a Black Hawk pilot. These dual service technicians are there all week long, to make sure that the helicopters he flies are viable, are safe, and can do a mission.

When they were furloughed last time under this President, we lost the ability to respond to natural disasters within the State of Florida. When we were in the hurricane season and the helicopters were not flyable because our dual service technicians had been furloughed and not treated like other full-time military personnel, we lost the capability to respond to issues that are State issues.

More than that, this same unit that I am talking about—and it goes across this Nation with regard to National Guard units and dual service technicians—they have deployed to Afghanistan, to Iraq; and when they deploy, they actually go with them because they are in uniform. They are military.

Because of the gray area they fall in, they can be furloughed by the President, like they did this last time, and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO) and I had come to this floor to talk about that issue, and we had this same amendment, which passed unanimously, I believe, because it protects not only the States, but it also protects our national mission of self-defense here in the homeland and being able to project the force that we need.

□ 1945

So at the end of the day, these technicians who during the day wear a uniform of the United States—this time it would be the Army—in keeping the equipment serviceable and operational—and in this instance were

Black Hawk helicopters—they were furloughed. And guess what? They can only be there when they were on the drill weekend. Well, unfortunately, 3 days out of a month is not enough to keep a Black Hawk operational.

So this is really important. We are lucky this time that sequestration is put off in 2015. But that doesn't stop the Commander in Chief from changing that and furloughing these employees, another reason to save money.

At the end of the day, it is about readiness. We should do nothing that hurts readiness in our military, whether it is National Guard or Reservists, but particularly, and I will tell you from my standpoint in the State of Florida that is hurricane prone, those Black Hawks deliver rescue capability that no other vehicle provides for. And we need to make sure those dual-service technicians are treated with respect and kept on the payroll to do the job of keeping our military active with that Reserve component, the National Guard, keep them ready to respond to emergencies here at home and abroad.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUGENT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Thank you for bringing this important issue to our attention. It is important that we get this right, and you put a very personal face on something which needs correction to make sure we don't go through this again. I appreciate your taking up this challenge and doing it so well.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate it. And, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your comments, and I appreciate the work that you have done on this.

With that, Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Madam Chair, I seek the time because I agree with the assertion of the gentleman, and that is the service that is provided by the military technicians that he is looking to exempt, I agree with every word he said. I want to make it clear to my colleagues that these civilian employees, as a condition of their employment, are a member of the unit in which they work.

My problem is there are other people who are employed by the Federal Government who also do very important work, and I would include everyone who is in the Federal service. I have always taken umbrage, regardless of who was in charge of an administration, at making distinctions between essential or nonessential employees. If you do not have an essential job, I do not know why you are working for anyone.

I find it abhorrent that we lock Federal employees out. I find it abhorrent that we malign Federal employees who

are working very hard. And, again, I agree with the gentleman as far as the value of these military technicians. I made the point when this government was shut down last October and I opposed it that people wanted to ameliorate the discomfort because the Federal Government does nothing for me, and I am also sick of hearing that. My suggestion was, not wanting to shut the government down, well, then, no Federal employee should go to work.

And I happen to use O'Hare International Airport a long time. Maybe people should sit there because FAA employees do very important work to keep us safe when we are at 38,000 feet. I think of all the civilian employees who are doing very important medical work at our hospitals treating those who are wounded and damaged in body and mind because of their service. I think of Federal firefighters who have lost their lives, who have been injured fighting fires. I think of FBI civilian employees who risk their lives every day. I think of those in the Border Patrol who risk their lives every day. I think of civilian employees at the Coast Guard, and obviously I could go on.

So the one concern I have with the gentleman's amendment is we should not be discerning and choosing. We should either be all inclusive or exclusive. And the fact is we would be better spent doing our work, getting our budgets done, and never furloughing any Federal employee again, all of whom are essential.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. I certainly do appreciate the ranking member's comments about other Federal employees, and I am the last one to malign Federal employees, but this is specifically in regard to—do you remember back when we passed the Pay Our Military Act? It was that act that allowed for the President and the Department of Defense to make that determination that these folks were essential. They decided that they weren't. And, in fact, we know they are because they are the ones, like I said, that keep the equipment operational, that allows our pilots and, in particular, Black Hawk pilots the ability to fly to respond to missions at home and abroad.

So while I don't disagree with a lot of what the ranking member said, this is really about those that wear the uniform of this country and allowing them to make sure that they are paid, A, and make sure that they are on duty to keep that equipment operational.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

Ms. SPEIER. I have an amendment at the desk, Madam Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement Executive Order 12473 of April 13, 1984, as amended by Executive Order 13669 of June 13, 2014, as those amendments apply to section 405(i) of the Rules for Courts-Martial.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, last Friday, the President signed Executive Order 13669, which amended the Manual for Courts-Martial. This order delivers a significant blow to an already broken military justice system that will further revictimize servicemembers brave enough to come forward and report that they have been sexually assaulted.

Specifically contained in this executive order is a provision that makes Military Rules of Evidence 412 admissible in article 32 preliminary proceedings. This particular rule of evidence outlines when previous sexual history is admissible in court-martial proceedings and is currently applied to make all sorts of demeaning and irrelevant innuendos about a victim's previous sexual history admissible in courts-martial. Now, mind you, rape shield laws have been passed by virtually every State in the Union, and the question I have is why should servicemembers be considered second-class citizens in this country?

Shockingly, this order doubles down on this harmful rule and allows the sexual history to be admissible in preliminary hearings. What is even worse, under the order, the convening authority will be able to read and consider evidence deemed inadmissible by the article 32 hearing. The military has clearly learned nothing from the Wilkerson case in Aviano, Italy.

You maybe remember that General Franklin, the convening authority, justified overturning a court-martial jury that convicted Wilkerson of having sexually assaulted a woman, and even though he was convicted by five colonels, peers of his, the general was able to look at inadmissible evidence that the judge had ruled out of order and consider that in overturning the decision.

This amendment will prohibit funds to implement the component of Executive Order 13669 to prevent this harmful and wrongheaded provision to go into effect. This order usurps and reverses the progress that, in fact, this Congress has been making in reforming article 32 proceedings, and I hope my colleagues will support the amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SPEIER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate her yielding.

I appreciate her devotion to the issue and to the victims of these crimes and rise in strong support of her position,

and I appreciate not only her work but for offering the amendment today.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SPEIER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I served on the Naval Academy Board for 5 years, and I know there is some issues in some people's mind as to whether this executive order either strengthens or weakens the case for rape shield, but I was appalled by what happened there. So I am supportive of what you are doing. There may be some arguments people may have as to whether you are strengthening or weakening it, but your desire is to strengthen and make this unacceptable behavior go away.

Ms. SPEIER. That is correct.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am supportive of that and congratulate you on your efforts.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I was on that Academy Board of Visitors for a number of years. The inability of the leadership of that academy, and to think that this midshipman had to go through this 30 hours is outrageous, so I commend you for what you have put forward here.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman.

Well, Madam Chair, with that, I thank my colleagues for recognizing the importance of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to pay for storage for patrol boats procured under the Department of Navy Memorandum #105-E2P-196 dated October 12, 2010.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer a commonsense, cost-saving amendment to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2015.

Specifically, my amendment prohibits the Federal Government from wasting more money on storage for eight patrol boats which have cost taxpayers \$3 million, have never been used, and have been sitting in storage for almost 4 years.

Recent media reports and an inspector general's report brought this issue to my attention, and the wasteful spending involved is deplorable.

In 2010, the Federal Government spent more than \$3 million on patrol

boats for the Afghan National Police that were never shipped to landlocked Afghanistan. Even more troubling, the cost of each patrol boat was more than \$265,000. The Washington Post has reported that similar patrol boats can be purchased in the United States for approximately \$50,000 each.

The Office of the Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, also known as SIGAR, was so concerned about this waste of taxpayer money that it conducted an investigation and recently released a report. The report includes a letter dated April 24, 2014, from the inspector general to the commanding general of the Combined Security Transition Command for Afghanistan.

I would like to share a few excerpts from letter:

I am writing to request information on a \$3 million procurement of patrol boats for the Afghan National Police initiated by the Combined Security Transition Command for Afghanistan in 2010.

My focus is on the operational requirements that initiated the procurement of the patrol boats for the Afghan National Police and the reasons for the cancelation 9 months later.

Additionally, I am also interested in the requirement for the United States Government to pay for the storage and related expenses for these boats for the last 3 years, boats that apparently have no planned use.

According to official at the Defense Security Cooperation Agency, the patrol boats were manufactured and delivered to the Navy in 2011 and have been in storage at the Naval Weapons Station/Cheatham Annex, Yorktown, Virginia, ever since.

The full report goes on to detail some other troubling findings, which include missing storage records, missing expenditure authorizations and justifications, and missing documents which should detail the reason for canceling the procurement order.

□ 2000

The inspector general's June 6, 2014, letter is even more harsh as it stated:

I continue to have concerns because the Combined Security Transition Command for Afghanistan was unable to answer a significant number of my questions regarding the patrol boats. The list of unanswered questions is particularly troubling.

Further, the Combined Security Transition Command for Afghanistan's response indicates that its Security Assistance office led a review board that determined that the boats do not fill a valid requirement for Afghanistan.

To help the inspector general better understand how these decisions were made and to help us prepare lessons learned reports intended to avert the waste of U.S. taxpayer funds in the future, please provide a detailed accounting of all the elements of the Security Assistance office review boat's proceedings which led to that decision, including transcripts, testimony, and exhibits.

By letter today, I have also requested the Department of the Navy to provide their plans for disposition of the boats.

I wholeheartedly agree with the inspector general, and not another penny of Federal taxpayer money should be spent on these boats that cost \$3 million to produce, were never utilized,

and have been sitting in storage since 2011.

These boats either need to be put in the water or resold, per Federal law. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support passage of my commonsense amendment that will ensure better use of taxpayer money.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I have amendment No. 34 at the desk, preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) after December 31, 2014.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, my bipartisan amendment is straightforward. It is cosponsored by Congressman BROUN of Georgia and Congressman SANFORD of South Carolina.

It will prohibit any funding in this bill pursuant to the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force after December 31, 2014.

This date is set as the official end of combat operations in Afghanistan. Furthermore, it gives the President and Congress sufficient time to determine what, if any, authorization would be needed to replace the 2001 AUMF.

The fact of the matter is the world has changed dramatically in the aftermath of the horrific tragedy of September 11.

On September 14, 2001, I could not vote for the resolution, an authorization that I knew would provide a blank check to wage war any time, anywhere, for any purpose, and for any length. Thirteen years later, this authorization is still on the books.

According to the Congressional Research Service, there are over 30 known instances of the executive branch invoking authority to engage in hostilities or deploy Armed Forces under this AUMF.

The report, which is on my Web site, lists 30 instances where the AUMF has been invoked by President Bush and President Obama, including to deploy troops in Ethiopia, Djibouti, Georgia, Yemen, justify detentions at Guantanamo Bay, and conduct military commissions, among many other uses, for which this resolution served as the legal justification for.

No executive office, not President Bush, not President Obama, nor any future President can be handed such broad authority to wage war with no oversight.

In fact, President Obama has stated that he looks forward to engaging Congress and the American people in efforts to refine and ultimately repeal the AUMF's mandate, and he will not sign laws designed to expand this mandate further.

We need to take up the President's suggestion. There was very little debate on this resolution. I was here 12 years ago, and so year after year, I have introduced legislation to repeal this resolution.

It is long past time for Congress to have a meaningful debate. I remember that night. There were five or six maybe on the floor, maybe a few more, and we had probably an hour's debate that evening.

We need to have a real debate about our constitutional role in declaring war and our obligation to conduct rigorous oversight, accountability, and to demand transparency and accountability for the American people for their tax dollars. I ask Members to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I oppose this amendment. This amendment, while disguised as a funding limitation, is really an attempt to put in place a major policy change that does not belong on our bill. It would essentially repeal the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Let me be clear about what this amendment does. This amendment cripples our ability to conduct counterterrorism operations against terrorists who pose a threat to U.S. persons and interests.

In my judgment, this amendment dangerously and erroneously assumes that the terrorist threat from al Qaeda and its affiliates ends once military operations end in Afghanistan.

The terrorist threat today is no less real and, in many ways, is more daunting than it was when Congress overwhelmingly gave to President Bush and to President Obama the authority to protect us against those who want to do us harm.

While some would argue that core al Qaeda has weakened, as events in Yemen and most recently Iraq and Syria have not shown, we know that al Qaeda and other terrorist groups are on the rise. This amendment would end our ability to conduct any operations against them at the end of this year—inconceivable.

Core al Qaeda isn't the only threat. Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, operating out of Yemen, is now considered to pose the greatest threat to U.S. citizens.

This amendment would effectively eliminate the President's ability to address the threat or other emerging threats of AQ-affiliated and like-minded groups in north Africa, the Horn of Africa, and elsewhere.

If adopted, this would send terrorists the message that they just need to wait out the military authority to conduct counterterrorism operations, and then they are free to launch their attacks.

The President himself, with all due respect, has reaffirmed the need for this continued authority and uses it. I can assure you, each and every day. It would be a mistake to tie the hands of our Commander in Chief and our military by removing this authority that protects U.S. citizens and our country from terrorist threats.

I strongly oppose this amendment and urge others to do so as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlelady from California.

No, repealing the AUMF will not leave America vulnerable to terrorists. What it will do is put this U.S. Congress in a position to debate the legitimate—or not so legitimate, in some cases—justification for further military action.

It will update the debate. It will put us in a position to really drill down and find out whether there is a national security interest, which would justify military force in the situation moving forward.

Members of Congress, this thing is over a decade old, and it has gone far afield from its original purpose.

This AUMF has been used more than 30 times to take our country into conflict, countries literally hundreds and maybe thousands of miles away from where it was originally intended.

It is time for a new debate. It is time for a new Authorization for Use of Military Force, if we should have one. It is nothing more than a scare tactic to say that this will leave our country vulnerable.

The President is the Commander in Chief and has authority to protect the interests of the United States, but this AUMF has brought us in a direction that was not contemplated.

As the representatives of the people of the United States—that is us—we should have a say on the future of where military conflicts might be conducted. That means we repeal this AUMF, and if there is a legitimate national security interest moving forward, we should debate it on the floor and, if necessary, pass it. It is time to repeal the AUMF.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me say I don't know how much time—how much more time the opposition to this amendment wants to see this authorization on the books and continue to fund it. There is no reason that a 13-year authorization should continue to be funded.

I just want to read you this, as I close, what this authorization said 13 years ago, which totally has abdicated our constitutional responsibility and authority as Members of Congress. We are abdicating our constitutional authority by not going back to the drawing board and debating any further efforts as it relates to military force.

The President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he deems planned, authorized, and aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11.

That is 2001. Again, the Congressional Research Service has cited 30 instances. We know there are more. Once again, we need to come back and have a debate. We need to talk about how far removed now we are from 2001.

If we think this needs to be brought up to date, bring it up to date, but we definitely need to stop the funding.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF ALABAMA

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement the Treaty on Open Skies, done at Helsinki March 24, 1992, and entered into force January 1, 2002.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Alabama and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge Members to support my amendment and to support the underlying bill by my friend from New Jersey. I regret I have to bring this amendment today. It deals with a very arcane issue, the Treaty on Open Skies.

In the FY15 NDAA, H.R. 4435, we included a bipartisan provision to require certification of the national security implications for Russian Federation proposals to implement new sensors on their Open Skies aircraft.

These aircraft are allowed to fly over the United States to conduct surveillance flights. They are not supposed to supplement Russian intelligence col-

lection on the U.S., yet not long after this body passed the NDAA on a 325-98 vote, the administration opted to ignore this body's concerns, ignore the concerns of a bipartisan group of Senators on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and approve a Russian request to improve its sensor platform.

The administration did this without regard to Russia's invasion of Ukraine and illegal seizure of Crimea. The administration did this without regard to Russia's violation of the INF treaty. The administration did this without regard to Russia's compliance failings in the New START Treaty.

The administration did this without regard to the fact that Russia is cheating on the Open Skies Treaty itself—just look at the State Department Web site. The administration did this without regard to the concerns of the Department of Defense and other government agencies.

How did Russia respond to this decision by the administration to accede to Putin's wishes? The New York Times this past weekend answered that question this way:

Rebels also claim to have shot down a Ukrainian AN-30 surveillance plane on June 6, 2014. The June 6 episode was of particular concern because it involved the destruction of one of the two planes that Ukraine used to monitor the Open Skies Treaty.

Mr. Chairman, when will we learn that we can't respond to Russian aggression with concession?

Putin responded, as he always does, by taking our concession and having his shock troops in Ukraine shoot down an airplane.

We cannot continue like this. We cannot continue to ignore Russia cheating when it comes to our treaties. We cannot continue to allow Russia to misuse arms control treaties like the Open Skies Treaty. We cannot continue to allow Russia to foment violence on NATO's borders.

□ 2015

We cannot continue to ignore the concerns of our military and other national security agencies just to make Russia feel good.

I urge support of my amendment to send a message to Russia and safeguard our national security.

With that, I would urge my colleagues to accept the amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS of Alabama).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF FLORIDA

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. \_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to maintain or improve Department of Defense real property

with a zero percent utilization rate according to the Department's real property inventory database, except in the case of maintenance of an historic property as required by the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.) or maintenance to prevent a negative environmental impact as required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

Mr. MURPHY of Florida (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to the Department of Defense Appropriations bill that would eliminate wasteful spending on unused and underutilized facilities.

With the Federal Government being the largest holder of land in the country, management of these properties must be economically responsible. Unfortunately, our government continues to misuse taxpayer dollars maintaining vacant and underutilized properties. This mismanagement must be addressed so that taxpayer money is no longer squandered on these unused facilities.

That is why I am once again introducing this commonsense amendment, as I have with previous appropriations bills, and will continue to do so until wastefulness, both in terms of cost and efficiency, is rooted out of our government.

This proposal is an extension of the bipartisan SAVE Act I had put forward that would cut \$230 billion in government spending by rooting out waste and mismanagement such as this.

I am proud that my amendment is endorsed by a broad coalition, including the Project on Government Oversight and the National Taxpayers Union. I thank them for their support of this commonsense measure to save taxpayers money by making our government more efficient.

The Department of Defense, alone, has hundreds, possibly thousands, of buildings and structures that it has rated at zero percent utilization, yet the Federal Government continues to maintain these unused facilities at an incredible cost to taxpayers. As a CPA, this just doesn't add up. It is unacceptable that taxpayers are on the hook for maintaining these unused facilities. Putting an end to this misuse of resources could save tens of millions of dollars a year, smart savings we should all support, regardless of party affiliation.

Mr. Chair, when I came to Congress, I promised my constituents that I would scrutinize the Federal budget so that their money was not wasted, promoting smarter governing. This is a simple solution to do just that.

This amendment was passed by the House last year with bipartisan support, and I ask my colleagues to again support this measure that can save American taxpayers tens of millions of dollars in this year alone. Let's come together and show the American people that we can work together to promote better government and smarter spending.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am pleased to accept your amendment.

I yield to Mr. VISCLOSKY, if you care to make any comments.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I certainly appreciate the fact that the gentleman is looking to be very cost effective in avoiding the expenditure of unnecessary funds and strongly support his position. I appreciate his offering the amendment, and I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment, 148, at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to procure any Army Aircrew Combat Uniforms.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a commonsense, cost-saving amendment to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2015.

It has been brought to my attention from numerous sources within my district that in 2009 the Department of Army fully phased out the CWU-27/P Army aviation flight uniform and moved to the Army Aircrew Combat Uniform, also known as the A2CU.

Constituents of mine, many of whom are Active Duty, retired, or friends and family of military personnel, have expressed a strong desire for the Army to go back to the CWU-27/P model uniform.

There are multiple reasons to switch back to the CWU model uniform. The

most important reasons to switch back to the CWU model are safety and efficiency. But to sweeten the deal, when making the pitch to me, my constituents explained that moving back to the CWU model would also save the Department millions of dollars a year in procurement costs. Talk about hitting two birds with one stone.

First and foremost, let's touch on CWU model's proven track record of safety and practicality. The CWU model is still authorized for Army Special Operations aviators, all of the aviators in other service branches of the U.S. military, and most air forces and navies around the world. Yes, these points are a testament to the safety and efficiency of the CWU model.

And these safety aspects are of paramount importance to our Army aviators, because the chances of a fire in an aviation crash are very high. The CWU model flight suits have antistatic fiber woven in them to prevent sparks, which, for obvious reasons, are not desirable when operating an aircraft with thousands of pounds of highly volatile jet fuel on board.

The one-piece design of the CWU model is also extremely important as it does not, in the event of a fire, leave any opportunities for exposed skin. Being that the A2CU is a two-piece model exactly like ground troop uniforms, it cannot offer the same amount or types of protection. Moreover, the A2CU is also cut to a looser standard than the CWU-27/P, creating the potential for more items of clothing to snag on controls in the cockpit.

Speaking to the cost savings, the A2CU model costs an average of 56 percent more than the CWU model, and the A2CU has proven to wear out faster than the CWU. Further, every time the Army decides to change the camouflage pattern of the duty uniform, they have to spend millions more purchasing the new flight uniform. The CWU model, to my knowledge, is usually only one color per uniform.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office stated that this amendment does not score as it is written; but being that the intent is to move back to the CWU model, the effects of the policy should actually net some cost savings. Conservative estimates show that the Army could save around \$5 million a year in procurement costs if it were to move back to the CWU model. Further, it should not cost anything to reintroduce the CWU model back into the supply system, as the rest of service branches still use them. In other words, there is no need to reboot the supply chain.

Further, the Army could replace the A2CU's with CWU's as they are exchanged by soldiers without the upfront cost of re-outfitting each soldier. The cost savings are tantalizing for someone like me who was sent to this town to rein in spending. More importantly, I listen to these Army aviators and flight operators. They tell me it is safer, and being that they are the ones

doing the training and fighting, I will take them at their word.

Given the safety and practicality applications, and given that the United States is not exactly running a budget surplus right now, saving a few million here and there in the name of safety and practicality is something we should all strive to achieve.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment which cuts costs and improves safety.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any person whose disclosures of a proceeding with a disposition listed in section 2313(c)(1) of title 41, United States Code, in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System include the term "Fair Labor Standards Act."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, if there is one thing I think Democrats and Republicans can actually agree on, it is that, if a penny is earned, that penny must be paid. This amendment is very straightforward. In fact, a version of it has already passed the House of Representatives. What it says is that, if there is a Federal contractor who has been found to engage in wage theft, that they may not benefit from this appropriation.

Now, there are many contractors who work for the Department of Defense who have employees that cook the meals for our troops, wash their uniforms, do all manner of many, many important tasks to keep fighting men and women in a position to serve our Nation. Some of them may even work in the commissary. They may work at various jobs. And they sometimes, the Federal contractors who serve the Federal Government, do not pay these workers.

Mr. Chairman, you may think, well, you know, maybe that happens, but how often does it happen? Is it really a big problem? I am here to tell you that it is a serious problem. In fact, the Economic Policy Institute found that, in total, the average low-wage worker loses a stunning \$2,634 per year in unpaid wages, representing 15 percent of their earned income.

A recent report by the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee of the United States Senate revealed

that 32 percent—that is 32 percent, fully a third—of the largest Department of Labor penalties for wage theft were levied against Federal contractors.

Now, I think that Democrats and Republicans can agree that, if you are a Federal contractor and you want to do business with the United States, you should be fair to your workers. This bill doesn't go out and look and we are not asking anyone to make any judgments. We are talking about people who have been found to engage in wage theft already.

This amendment simply says that the funds made available in this act may be used to enter into contract with any person whose disclosures of a proceeding with a disposition listed under section 2313(e)(1), title 41, and it goes on. But what it means is that you must be fair to your workers, and if you are not, you cannot benefit.

Last word I want to say about this is that don't we want to incentivize good contractors and discourage bad ones? One way we can do that is say, if you don't treat your workers right, we are going to find some Federal contractors who will.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

□ 2030

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLISON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman offering the amendment and speaking out on behalf of the dignity of labor, whatever human labor that may be, and certainly believe that the amendment is acceptable to the committee. Thank you very much.

Mr. ELLISON. I certainly appreciate that.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FORBES

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to implement the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman

from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, if you turn on your TV tonight, you will see U.S. foreign policy in shambles almost across the globe. It shouldn't surprise us because basically this administration has given our adversaries or potential adversaries almost everything they wanted, even when it jeopardized our national defense.

Let me just walk you around the globe.

The number one concern the Russians had was for us to pull our missile defense systems out of Europe, and we did that, even though it left huge gaps for us in our missile defense.

The number one concern the Iranians wanted was to pull off their sanctions, and we agreed to that.

The number one concern the Afghan insurgents had was a time certain when we were going to get out.

The number one concern the Chinese had was that we not increase our Navy and we decrease it, and we saw the President send over a budget that would have effectively taken an aircraft carrier out of our fleet, would have beached half of our cruiser fleet, would have essentially eliminated or severely impacted the production of our Tomahawk missiles, and they have plans to bench six destroyers next year. Now they are getting ready to do something that is probably as egregious as all the rest, and that is to execute within the next couple of weeks the Ottawa Treaty, which would require us to pull our landmines up along the DMZ, which is the number one concern for the North Koreans.

When President Clinton looked at this, he rejected that treaty because he realized that those landmines were what kept the North Koreans from invading South Koreans for decades. When George W. Bush looked at it, he rejected it because he realized how militarily impractical it would be. And when this administration looked at it in 2009, this is what their State Department said:

We would not be able to meet our national defense needs nor our security commitments to our friends and allies if we signed this.

Then when a White House aide pushed back on that about 3 years later, the commander of our forces in South Korea, General Thurman, said this:

I wake up every morning with 1 million North Korean troops right across the border.

When we asked our current general, who is in charge of our South Korean forces, whether he thought we should move those landmines, he said they were critical to the defense of South Korea.

When we asked the top uniformed general in the United States, General Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he said it was a critical part of our defense. And when we asked him if anything had changed since 2009,



he quickly came back and said things have gotten worse, not better.

Mr. Chairman, these are not the landmines of yesterday that were just dropped somewhere and you worried a child would come along and stumble on them. These landmines are very targeted. They only come on when we activate them, and then they deactivate within a certain number of hours after that. In fact, the United States has already spent more than \$2 billion over the last 20 years taking those up.

So, Mr. Chairman, what this would do is to prohibit any funds from being made available under this act for the implementation of that Ottawa Treaty. It is time we start listening to our military experts at the Pentagon and we start taking their advice on what we need for national security.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, essentially, for two reasons.

One, I believe that the gentleman's amendment is moot because we are not a signatory to the convention. The United States Senate has not ratified the treaty so funds could not be expended for it.

Secondly, I do think it sends a very bad signal. The gentleman alludes to the sophistication of mines that are used today compared to say a generation ago. I don't think it is a secret that the United States does use such equipment.

But I would point out, and it is a different program within the bill—and I thank publicly the chairman, as well as the members of the subcommittee and the full committee, for increasing funding for Humanitarian Mine Action Program. It is not a large program, but its mission is of immense value. All too often innocent civilians are victims of explosive remnants of war, not just new sophisticated U.S. equipment. It is only right that we share our expertise with others, and I acknowledge it is a different program.

But the chairman and others have alluded to our visit to Afghanistan, and still remember a picture of two brothers—one didn't have a leg and the other was blind because of a mine. So I don't want to send negative signals internationally. I know that is not the gentleman's intent, but, unfortunately, I think it is inferred and, therefore, am opposed to his amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 1¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, first of all, this is not moot. We have it on

widespread information that the administration is planning to do this within the next 2 weeks. We even had various embassies tell us the same thing.

Secondly, as he mentioned, he is talking apples to oranges. These are not the same two kinds of programs. There is nothing more humanitarian than preventing war. We have 28,500 troops in South Korea facing all those troops in North Korea, and the thing that stands between them and us are those landmines. The gentleman can't tell me one thing that is going to stop them from coming over there if we pull those landmines up. That is why it is crucial we act now and make sure we don't make this crucial mistake and see another part of this globe in shambles over our foreign policy.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the purpose of conducting combat operations in Afghanistan after December 31, 2014.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, my straightforward bipartisan amendment is cosponsored by Representatives WALTER JONES and JIM MCGOVERN.

What this amendment does is prohibit any funding for combat operations in Afghanistan after December 31, 2014. Even though some of us would rather have all of our troops returned, the President announced in May that the United States would end the U.S. combat mission in December 2014.

This simple amendment codifies and clarifies the President's position. It would also allow Congress to determine and reauthorize any further combat operations in Afghanistan should the President deem it necessary.

By reinserting Congress' constitutional authority, this amendment would ensure that we have a debate and a vote in this body for the future of combat operations in Afghanistan.

Last month, I joined Congressmen MCGOVERN, JONES, GARAMENDI, and Armed Services Ranking Member ADAM SMITH in offering an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act that would have required a congressional vote to continue deployment

of U.S. combat troops in Afghanistan after December 31, 2014.

Unfortunately, that amendment was not allowed to come to the floor.

Instead, to date, the Republican leadership of this House has failed to allow the American people any say in the future of America's longest war. It is really unconscionable that the Afghan public through the Afghan parliament has ample opportunity to weigh in on the future presence of United States combat troops in Afghanistan, while the American public has been given no such opportunity through this Congress.

For many years, we have known there is simply no military solution in Afghanistan, and our constituents are sick and tired of this endless war.

This war has cost taxpayers over \$750 billion, and promises to cost tens of billions more for every year our troops remain in Afghanistan. We have lost thousands of our young men and women. They conducted themselves in a way that everything we asked them to do they did, and so it is time now to honor them by ending this endless war.

This war, again, when you look at the human cost, the lives of I think it is 2,321 soldiers, and tens of thousands injured, it is really time to end this. It is time to look out for our veterans, our brave young men and women, bring them home, not fund any more combat operations, and ensure their job security, their health, their mental health, and their future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment.

This amendment is very vaguely crafted. It could have undue consequences. This very short amendment would make no funds available for "the purpose of conducting combat operations in Afghanistan after December 31, 2014."

Our bill contains funding for combat operations, not only for United States troops, but provides funding, equipment, lift, and sustainment of allies in the fight.

Further, within the overseas contingency operations funding account—when the OCO budget finally arrives, and we have been asking for it for months—there will be funding for combat operations for Afghanistan troops, and I suspect other troops, American troops, or international troops, through what we call the Afghan Security Forces Fund. I think there is a degree of inevitability that that will happen. Certainly we are going to have troops there I think for some time.

This amendment, in my judgment, goes too far, as it attempts to tie the U.S. Government's hands in navigating the complicated situation we face related to threats emanating from Iraq.

Let's be realistic. What this amendment would do is it would remove the possibility of the U.S. engaging under any circumstances, even if such engagement would be in the best interest of our country or allies.

I strongly oppose the amendment. It doesn't make sense.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, first of all, this amendment says we are not going to fund combat operations after December 31, 2014. That is what it says. That is what it will do. That is what the President has indicated.

For the life of me I don't understand why the opposition really believes that there is a military solution in Afghanistan. We have been there 13 years. History shows that the United States military is not going to continue to have a military presence and support what has taken place in Afghanistan. It is now up to the Afghan government and people to secure their own future.

Of course, we are not taking away any authority from the President. We have taken away our authority here, our constitutional duty and responsibility. We can't allow funding for combat operations beyond December 2014. The President has said that will not happen. So what in the world are we talking about by saying, yes, here is the money, we want you to continue funding these combat operations?

He said they would end in December of 2014, so we should do what we need to do here in Congress. We should end it, we should not allow any more funding. If, in fact, the President believes, and if you believe, that we want to engage in more combat action and operations—which, of course, the American public I believe are telling us in no uncertain terms they are war-weary—but if you believe that, then come back to Congress and exercise your constitutional duty and responsibility, and vote for whatever it is that the President is asking for. This doesn't make any sense—13 years. Again, we sunset in the farm bill, the transportation bill. Here we have got an authority now and funding for the last 13 years. It doesn't make any sense. We want to do what the President has said he is going to do.

□ 2045

This Congress needs to reassert itself and do our constitutional duty, engage in our constitutional authority and responsibility, and say in no uncertain terms: no funding for combat operations after December 31, 2014.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out any of the following:

(1) Sections 2(b), 2(d), 2(g), 3(c), 3(e), 3(f), or 3(g) of Executive Order 13423.

(2) Sections 2(a), 2(b), 2(c), 2(f)(iii-iv), 2(h), 7, 9, 12, 13, or 16 of Executive Order 13514.

(3) Section 2911 of title 10, United States Code.

(4) Sections 400AA or 400 FF of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6374, 6374e).

(5) Section 303 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13212).

(6) Section 203 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15852).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, my amendment forbids defense dollars from being spent to fund two executive orders and several other provisions of law that require the military to squander billions of dollars on so-called green energy.

For example, according to the GAO, the Navy has spent as much as \$150 per gallon for jet fuel. In 2012, the Navy purchased 450,000 gallons of biofuel for its so-called green fleet at the cost of \$26.60 per gallon, at a time when conventional petroleum fuel cost just \$2.50.

What taxpayer in his right mind would pay \$26.60 per gallon to fill up his car when, next door, they are selling it for \$2.50? Yet that is precisely what our Armed Forces are ordered to do—except they are not just filling up their cars, they are filling up entire ships and aircraft, and this all comes out of our precious defense dollars.

The Air Force paid \$59 per gallon for 11,000 gallons of biofuel in 2012—10 times more than regular jet fuel.

It is not just biofuels. The Pentagon expects to purchase 1,500 Chevy Volts at a subsidized price of \$40,000 apiece and a production price of \$90,000 apiece, paid for by other subsidies. As Senator COBURN's office points out:

Each one of these \$40,000 Chevy Volts represents the choice not to provide an entire infantry platoon with all new rifles or 50,000 rounds of ammunition that cannot be used for realistic training.

Under these green energy mandates, the Army and Navy have been required to install solar arrays at various facilities. At Naval Station Norfolk, the Navy spent \$21 million to install a 10-acre solar array, which will supply a

grand total of 2 percent of the base's electricity.

According to the inspector general's office, this project will save enough money to pay for itself in only 447 years. Of course, solar panels only last about 25 years.

In Alaska, the Pentagon was ordered to convert three radar stations from diesel fuel to wind turbine energy. The Air Force claimed it will take 15 years to pay for itself, but auditors found that the generators produce only "sporadic, unusable power," and the inspector general charged that the Air Force claim was completely unsubstantiated.

As of 2013, the Defense Department had at least 680 such projects, including 357 solar, 29 wind, and 289 thermal energy projects.

There are several arguments that we hear for this mandate. One of them is it is going to save us money, but as you can see, these orders are running up huge costs. We don't know exactly how much because, as the GAO said:

There is currently no comprehensive inventory of which Federal agencies are implementing renewable energy-related initiatives and the types of initiatives they are implementing.

Outside estimates are as much as \$7 billion for the Department of Defense for this year, a figure that will only grow each year.

We are told it is to move our Armed Forces toward energy independence from hostile foreign sources. This is from an administration that has obstructed every effort to develop America's vast oil shale reserves that would make Saudi Arabia look like a petroleum pauper. The XL Keystone pipeline, by itself, would bring a half-million barrels of Canadian crude a day into this country.

Finally, we are told this is all a grand strategy to protect us from climate change, which the Secretary of State has called as big a threat as terrorism. Even if it were possible to wage an environmentally-sensitive war—which I doubt—I think there is a good chance that climate will continue to change, as it has that past 4 billion years, whether or not we waste our defense dollars to pay for this quixotic venture.

This explanation does reveal the real reason for this folly. This is an ideological crusade imposed on our military that will pointlessly consume billions of defense dollars, mainly to keep money flowing to politically well-connected green energy companies that can't get anybody else to buy their products.

These green activists are willing to squander the resources of our military to do so. This is a travesty that we can end here and now with this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, this debate will mirror one that took place earlier today.

The fact is I would talk about flexibility. The gentleman talks about the costs involved. I think, when you develop new products, new technologies, there is going to be a cost, as far as that research and development.

I will point out that the comparisons, as far as some of the costs, perhaps do not fully factor into the issue of transportation and how some of those fuels get on those ships and in those airplanes in remote parts of the world.

The gentleman also alluded to the flexibility on foreign soil, where you don't have a gas station handy for some of the energy that those troops may need, so I would also reiterate that the commander for the Pacific Command, Admiral Samuel Locklear, did state that the greatest threat to long-term peace in the Pacific region is climate change.

I certainly do think that alternative fuels, given the fact that the Department of Defense is the largest consumer on the planet Earth, is worth abiding by, and therefore, I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would simply point out that forcing the military to pay \$26.60 per gallon for fuel that can be obtained for \$2.50 a gallon isn't about flexibility. It is about insanity, and it is time that we put an end to this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would, again, simply assert that the comparison of a gallon of gasoline at a local station compared to getting it to a jet aircraft for the Department of Defense perhaps is not necessarily comparing apples to apples.

I renew my objection to the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to "consult", as the term is used in reference to the Department of Defense and the National Security Agency, in contravention of the "assur[ance]" provided in section 20(c)(1)(A) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-3(c)(1)(A)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that is substantially

similar to an amendment that passed by unanimous voice vote among Democrats and Republicans on the House Science and Technology Committee a couple of weeks ago.

My amendment, the Grayson-Holt-Lofgren amendment, seeks to address a serious problem. Recently, it was revealed that the National Security Agency has been recklessly subverting American cryptographic standards—and deliberately so.

Cryptographic standards for the national security community and the commercial software industry are developed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, or NIST. That is an agency within the House Science and Technology jurisdiction.

These standards are intended to protect Americans from foreign intelligence agencies, from cyber criminals, from industrial espionage, and from privacy violations by those who wish us harm. They are embedded in software products which are used and sold widely—in fact, almost universally in this country and elsewhere.

Unfortunately, recent media reports indicate that the National Security Agency successfully and deliberately weakened encryption standards promulgated by NIST to further NSA surveillance goals at the cost of the privacy of ordinary U.S. citizens—in fact, universally throughout the United States.

This is extremely dangerous. It leaves users of these standards vulnerable to anybody who is familiar with these weaknesses.

We can recall that, just a few weeks ago, millions of Americans were told that they had to change their user IDs and their passwords. That, Mr. Chairman, was because of this.

The NSA apparently is doing this as part of its domestic spying program, but as World Wide Web inventor Tim Berners-Lee put it:

It's naive to imagine that, if you deliberately introduce into a system a weakness, you will be the only one to use it.

My amendment would seek to address this issue by prohibiting the intelligence community from subverting or interfering with the integrity of any cryptographic standard that is proposed, developed, or adopted by NIST.

It is only common sense that we should not want taxpayers' dollars that are appropriated to one agency being used to deliberately and actively subvert the work of another agency and, at the same time, destroy the privacy and the liberty and the personal property of our own citizens.

I urge support for this amendment on both sides of the aisle, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am not actually opposed to the

amendment, but I would like to talk about some of the assertions or allegations made by the gentleman, and I do that respectfully. I am not in opposition to the amendment, but I think there are some things that have been said that need to be replied to.

The National Security Agency has participated in standards setting with the National Institute of Standards and Technology, known as NIST. Of course, they would participate.

Wouldn't we want our Nation's best cryptographers to help strengthen and secure the Internet?

Their participation in setting standards is a no-brainer. You want the standards to be designed by the people who best understand the threat. They recommended the standards that they themselves use.

As the National Security Agency stated on September 30 of last year:

NSA is responsible for setting the security standards for systems carrying and transporting the Nation's most sensitive and classified information. We use cryptography and standards that we recommend, and we recommend the cryptographic standards we use.

We do not make recommendations that we cannot stand behind for protecting national security systems and data. The activity of NSA in setting standards has made the Internet a far safer place to communicate and to do business.

Indeed, our participation in standards development has strengthened the core encryption technology that underpins the Internet.

The idea that NSA has deliberately sabotaged security is ridiculous. These folks know the threat we face and are helping to secure the Internet we all rely on so heavily.

Again, I don't oppose the amendment, but the assertions need to be rebutted.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to, in some respects, associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey.

Obviously, we have a difference of agreement about the facts, but I think we agree that the NSA should actually be helping to establish the best possible standards for privacy in this country, regardless of whether the published reports that have been widely reported in the media are true or not.

I appreciate the gentleman's allegiance to the underlying principle that Americans deserve privacy.

□ 2100

How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. I thank my friend from Florida for offering this amendment. It should go a long way toward recovering the lost reputation of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

Mr. Chairman, this came about because the National Security Agency

has a dual role of developing encryption standards and breaking encryption. The reports widely circulated and, I think, generally verified show that these two dual roles caused real problems for American standards and, hence, for American technology and American companies.

It is unfortunate that NIST, which is supposed to be an impartial arbiter of national and of even global standards for technology, was effectively used to propagate defective encryption standards, and this amendment, I think, will help correct that. It is important that we keep high standards and that everyone knows it. This is an important amendment, and I thank the gentleman for offering it. I also appreciate the comments of the chair of the committee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think the National Institute of Standards and Technology, aka NIST, has always enjoyed a good reputation. I served on the committee as a ranking member, and we heavily invested in the work they do. They enjoy an incredible reputation, and the suggestion that somehow they have lost their luster and their reputation is totally inappropriate, but let's move on.

I support the bill with the reservations that I have made about some of the earlier assertions that have been basically within the media that have been pumped up, maligning not only NIST but the National Security Agency, which I think does an incredible job of protecting national security and all of us.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I join in the gentleman's desire to move on, and I appreciate the gentleman's fair consideration of this amendment on the merits.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WITTMAN

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to propose, plan for, or execute an additional Base Realignment and Closure round.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is pretty simple. It says that we are not going to use any funds at this particular time to propose, plan, or execute any additional Base Realignment and Closure rounds, better known as BRAC, the reason being that this language was adopted in the

National Defense Authorization Act by an overwhelming vote of 325-98. The House has spoken and has said now is not the time to use these funds to begin this. I want to make sure that people understand that this is also in the Senate language.

I want to make sure people understand, too, that this is a process by which we want to make sure we are understanding how decisionmaking takes place. A force structure comes before decisions on infrastructure, and as you know, the service branches are still making the decision about what the end strength should be—how many people we should have in our military. That will determine what our infrastructure should be. We are also undergoing an overseas base and housing assessment to determine what our presence should be overseas. That is ongoing. That should be completed before we even entertain any consideration about what our base structure needs to be here at home.

The cost estimates for the last Base Realignment and Closure Commission in 2005 indicated that it would cost \$21 billion. Now we see it costs \$35 billion. The 2005 BRAC, as we see, hasn't saved money at all at this particular point, and it won't save money until 2018, so now is not the proper time to pursue a Base Realignment and Closure.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITTMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let me thank the gentleman for his incredible service on the House Armed Services Committee.

May I say that the Defense Appropriations Committee has worked very closely with Chairman MCKEON as well as with you, and as you know, our bill contains no funding for a future BRAC. I think all of us are still digesting the last BRAC and understand how expensive it was. I think it is important for you to know that we will repeat in our bill, through your amendment, what you put in the authorization bill, which would make it quite clear to the administration.

Mr. WITTMAN. I thank the chairman for his leadership.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, although I am not opposed to his amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make just a couple of points.

The gentleman noted that the last BRAC in 2005, if I am correct, is not going to save money until 2018. That implies it is going to save money in 2018. The concern I have is we do have to think about the future budgets for the Department of Defense, and sometimes we have to make hard decisions

in years like 2014 so that we can begin to accrue savings in the out-years.

I mentioned in my opening statements and more than once over the last couple of days—but I feel compelled to do it again—that I do have a concern about Congress' continued failure to confront our long-term fiscal challenges relative to the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense proposed significant initiatives, including military pay adjustments, the restructuring of TRICARE, changes in commissaries, the retirement of several weapons programs—the A-10, the Kiowa Warriors, and others—to provide for future flexibility and to meet our national security strategy.

A number of the proposals—I am not saying they all have incredible value—do possess merit, but with few exceptions, these proposals have not gained any traction in Congress. Most have been excluded in language, prohibiting or postponing the start in the most recently passed National Defense Authorization Act. I certainly don't dismiss the results and impacts on many Members' congressional districts, but, again, I don't think we should foreclose any options to consider in order to possibly save money in the out-years.

I would make the observation, although I am not going to vote against the gentleman's amendment, that we have got to stop saying "no" to everything. We have got to start saying "yes" to some things, but, unfortunately, for the last 2 days, all we have been doing is saying, "Don't do anything."

I appreciate the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for his leadership on this issue as well as for the chairman's support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, now is not the time for BRAC. Due to the passage of the Budget Control Act, our military is facing unprecedented cuts which, I believe, could jeopardize our national defense—maintenance is being deferred; force structure is being reduced to levels we haven't seen since before World War II; training is being deferred as well. A BRAC would siphon precious defense dollars away from our military at a time when the ultimate end strength is uncertain.

We should learn from past lessons. We are still paying for the last BRAC. In 2005, a BRAC was approved. It was supposed to cost \$21 billion, but in fact, it is actually costing taxpayers \$35 billion. We are still paying off the last BRAC. Now is not the time to take the precious dollars that need to be going to our men and women in uniform and spend them on a BRAC, especially when we have not determined the ultimate force end strength at this point.

What are we not going to spend money on for our defense if we okay a

BRAC? Are our men and women in uniform not going to get the equipment they need? Are we going to cease even more training? Are we going to just mothball further platforms? Are we going to cut the benefits to our military families?

We need every dollar in defense right now to go to protect our national defense, not to reduce our future options that we may need. With all of the threats facing our country—and as we watch TV now, we see all of the threats that are in the world—we need to make sure we have a strong national defense and that we not further weaken it and not weaken our options. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, in closing, we are at a decisive point.

As you know, right now, we are bringing equipment back from Afghanistan. We are resetting our force, and we are training them for the next missions that they are about to face. Those efforts take resources, and we cannot forget that we have to devote those resources on the list of priorities. Making sure that our men and women are properly trained and that the equipment they have is properly operating and maintained is critical to this Nation's readiness. That should be job one. That is not to say we shouldn't look at saving money elsewhere through infrastructure, but we must restore lost readiness now. That is where those funds need to go. We certainly can look at infrastructure later, but now is the time to make sure we maintain readiness.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Article II, section 2 of the Constitution.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the chairman of the subcommittee and, as well, the ranking member for the courtesy of your staffs and for the work that this committee is doing on behalf of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today as the ranking member of Homeland Security's

Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee, working on human trafficking and smuggling, as I come from a city that has been called the epicenter of human trafficking—Houston, Texas. So I thank both the chairman and the ranking member for this opportunity to put forward this simple and straightforward amendment that affirms the example of the national goodness that makes America the most exceptional nation on Earth.

The amendment says that none of the funds made available by this act may be used in contravention of article II, section 2 of the Constitution.

I am joined on this amendment by Congressman STEVE STOCKMAN, Congresswoman LOIS FRANKEL, Congresswoman FEDERICA WILSON, and Congressman JOHN CONYERS.

Mr. Chairman, recently, I was proud to support House Resolutions 573 and 617, strongly condemning the ongoing violence and systematic gross human rights violations against the people of Nigeria that have been carried out by the militant organization Boko Haram, especially the April 15, 2014, kidnapping of more than 200 young girls who were kidnapped from the Chibok school by Boko Haram.

□ 2115

This is what the people of northeast Nigeria are facing every single day. Since 2013, more than 4,500 men, women, and children have been slaughtered by Boko Haram.

In addition, it took the United States 25 months after the first two Americans were attacked, and 1 year after the third and fourth Americans were targeted, before Boko Haram was designated a foreign terrorist organization.

It took the United Kingdom 16 months from the time its first citizen was killed by Boko Haram to legally brand them as terrorists.

It took the United Nations 33 months after the United Nations headquarters in Nigeria was bombed before Boko Haram was sanctioned as an al Qaeda-linked terror group.

On June 2, 2014, the European Union finally designated Boko Haram as a terror group.

NGOs have indicated that, in April, the average deaths were hundreds a week by Boko Haram, and later it was an average of 100 deaths a day.

So they couldn't do enough killing, killing of Christians and Muslims and journalists and health care providers and relief workers and schoolchildren. They had to kidnap 200 children, 200 girls.

The international community, working with the African Union, is assisting the government of Nigeria in locating and rescuing the missing girls, bringing an end to Boko Haram's reign of terror, and ensuring that they are brought to justice because of their crimes against humanity.

On May 21, 2014, the President notified the Congress that, pursuant to the

authority vested in him by article 2, section 2, as the Commander in Chief, and to conduct foreign relations, that he had directed deployment of approximately 80 U.S. Armed Forces personnel to Chad as part of the U.S. efforts to locate and support the safe return of our 200 girls reported to have been kidnapped in Nigeria.

The President informed the Congress that these personnel would support the operation of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance aircraft for missions over northern Nigeria and the surrounding area. The force will remain in Chad until its support in resolving the kidnapping situation is no longer needed.

My simple amendment indicates that nothing in this bill will contravene the President's authority while these girls are missing.

Mr. Chairman, four Members of Congress, over June 12 to June 16, went to Nigeria. We were in northeast Nigeria. We were in the Borno State, in Abuja. We visited with the victims, the girls who escaped from the Chibok school. They drove 2 days to meet with us to tell us of the outrageous violence, and how they were laid on the ground, and the Boko Haram, pointing AK-47s at their heads, said: Answer my questions or die.

Then we met a woman whose throat was sliced, and her husband, a police officer, was decapitated.

The enforcement, the military, and the police officers of Nigeria need our help.

No, this is not an encouragement or a suggestion at all for boots on the ground. It is a simple collaboration that will stop the siege of Boko Haram that is spreading across Africa and the surrounding area. It is almost like the unknowing understanding of the Taliban by many in America before 9/11.

Boko Haram is a disaster waiting to happen for the continent. In a state like Nigeria that is about to be 440 million people, that has a 7 percent growth rate, and is one of the most prosperous nations in Africa, it has 60 percent poverty, it has 10 million children out of school. And Boko Haram is burning hospitals, schools, Christian churches, mosques, and killing pastors and emirs.

So this amendment is to remind us, just as Hubert Humphrey said, "People are the great issue of the 20th century." Now they are the great issue of the 21st century.

It is time to treat our boys and girls and women with respect.

As I close, I ask my colleagues to support the amendment, to stop the headlines like this, as Boko Haram continues to rage across Nigeria. I ask support for the Jackson Lee amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VIS-CLOSKY for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their devotion to the men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives to keep our nation safe.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is simple and straightforward and affirms an example of the national goodness that makes America the most exceptional nation on earth:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Article II, section 2 of the Constitution.

Mr. Chair, it was a proud occasion when the House passed H. Res. 573 and H.R. 617, resolutions strongly condemning the ongoing violence and the systematic gross human rights violations against the people of Nigeria carried out by the militant organization Boko Haram, especially the April 15, 2014 kidnapping of more than 200 young schoolgirls kidnapped from the Chibok School by Boko Haram.

Since 2013, more than 4,400 men, women, and children have been slaughtered by Boko Haram.

The victims include Christians, Muslims, journalists, health care providers, relief workers. And schoolchildren.

The international community, working with the African Union, is assisting the Government of Nigeria in locating and rescuing the missing girls, bringing an end to Boko Haram's reign of terror, and ensuring that its crimes against humanity are documented so its leaders can be held accountable.

On May 21, 2014, the President notified the Congress that pursuant to the authority vested in him by Article II, Section 2, as Commander in Chief and to conduct foreign relations, that he had directed the deployment of "approximately 80 U.S. Armed Forces personnel to Chad as part of the U.S. efforts to locate and support the safe return of over 200 schoolgirls who are reported to have been kidnapped in Nigeria."

The President informed the Congress that "these personnel will support the operation of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance aircraft for missions over northern Nigeria and the surrounding area. The force will remain in Chad until its support in resolving the kidnapping situation is no longer required."

The Jackson Lee Amendment simply makes clear that nothing in the bill contravenes the President's authority to take the actions just described which he has determined to be in furtherance of U.S. national security and foreign policy interests.

Boko Haram's outrageous conduct will not be tolerated or overlooked for not only is it a violation of the girls' human rights, it is also contrary to United States policy which supports and promotes equal access to education and economic opportunity for women and girls.

"People are the great issue of the 20th century," declared, then-Senator Hubert Humphrey in 1948.

Mr. Chair, the well-being of people remains the great issue of the 21st century.

And there is no better measure of any society than the way it treats its women and girls and boys and families.

Boko Haram understands that when Nigerian girls are educated, Nigerian women can succeed; and when Nigerian women succeed, Nigeria succeeds.

And that is why it is so important that the United States help Nigeria ensure that Boko Haram fails.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee Amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to transfer weapons to the Palestinian Authority.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Iowa and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, simply, this amendment says, as the gentlelady read, "None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to transfer weapons to the Palestinian Authority."

I would like to express why I brought this amendment. I take you back, Mr. Chairman, to April 23, 2014, when Fatah and Hamas unified within the Palestinian Authority in the Palestinian organization. That unification brought about a terrorist-designated organization, a foreign terrorist organization, joined together with Fatah. This is April 23.

On June 6 of 2014, State Department spokeswoman Jen Psaki said: "We will work with and fund the new Palestinian Authority government."

So what that means is, they have decided, for the first time, that our taxpayers' borrowed money is going to be committed to a terrorist organization.

1997 was when Hamas was designated as a foreign terrorist organization. Since 1997, Hamas has launched tens of thousands of rockets from the Gaza Strip into Israel.

Khaled Mashal of Hamas said the reconciliation of the two organizations, Fatah and Hamas, will consolidate the resistance. Not bring about peace, but consolidate the resistance.

We can't afford and cannot fund a power-sharing Palestinian government that includes Hamas because they are a foreign trade organization.

I would bring to the attention of the floor, Mr. Chairman, the Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act of 2006, which bans funding to a government that includes Hamas until they meet three different conditions.

One is that they recognize Israel.

Two is that they renounce violence.

And three is that they accept previous Israeli-Palestinian agreements.

They have done none of those three things and, therefore, can't qualify for this funding. So we cannot fund a power-sharing Palestinian government that includes Hamas because they are a foreign trade organization, because they do not recognize the Jewish state, they do not recognize their right to exist.

But prior to June 2, 2014, the U.S. has never recognized a government that includes Hamas, and so that is why I bring this amendment.

And I would point out that the administration has been isolating Israel in a number of ways. Secretary Kerry, in April of this year, compared Israel to an apartheid state. I have been there a number of times and I have not seen that. I don't recognize that, and I don't think it is true. I think Israel would reject that, and I would encourage them to do so.

But in May of 2011, President Obama said that Israel should return to its 1967 borders. That would be indefensible for Israel to do that.

So we need to stick with the existing statute, the 2006 Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act. And this amendment cuts off funding to that military supply and support.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, Grayson Amendment 5.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to detain, without conviction, any person for more than 15 years at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment at the desk is simple. It reads as you just read it.

As you know, Guantanamo was opened for business, so to speak, in January of 2002. It is now June of 2014.

My amendment seems to give some kind of clue as to how long we, a free people who respect freedom, are willing to incarcerate and imprison people who have been accused of no crime, have faced no judge, no jury, and have never been subject to the American system of justice.

My amendment has no immediate effect during this fiscal year. As it says, it is limited to persons who have served for 15 years or more at Guantanamo Bay. The facility itself is only 12 years old.

What this amendment does do is ensure that no funds will be made available by this bill that are carried over to future fiscal years and are then used to imprison anyone for 15 years or longer if they haven't been accused, much less convicted of any crime.

I would hope that we, as a free people, would understand that principle and agree that this is reasonable.

Nobody, nobody, foreign or American, should be subject to imprisonment for more than 15 years without ever even facing his accusers, much less being convicted of a crime. That is particularly true under the auspices of the U.S. Government because we are a people of laws, not a people of people.

This amendment is silent as to whether detainees could be convicted under an article III court, a military tribunal, a commission, or some other form of court with the authority to render any judgment.

It simply says that a person must be convicted of a crime or must be released from Guantanamo if they have served 15 years, 15 years, Mr. Chairman, of detention.

We have speedy trial rules in this country that guarantee the right to face your accusers within 6 months. These prisoners, both the innocent ones and the guilty ones, have been incarcerated without hearing any charges against them now for more than a decade.

I would urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment and recognize the dignity of all human beings, whether or not they have the privilege to be American citizens.

In the year 1209, in a French city called Beziers, a monk oversaw the Albigensian crusade. The crusaders were brought into that city to deal with the heretics, the Albigensians, who lived in that French town. Arnaud Amelric, a monk, was asked: What should we do with these people, these Christians who are like us who don't believe exactly what we believe?

He said: Kill them all and let God sort it out.

That has stood for many years as a signal that we must expect more from civilized people than that. We are holding these people in that prison, all of them, the innocent and the guilty apparently, under current rules, forever and ever and ever.

What is worse, killing them all and letting God sort it out, or holding them forever and not letting them ever meet their God but remain in prison for their entire lives?

I submit to you that we Americans are better than this. There has to be some kind of limitation.

This amendment will not force the release of anyone imminently, but will be a signal to all mankind that we, the American people, we retain our dignity and our humanity.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Our Nation has invested millions of dollars in building state-of-the-art, humane, safe, and I may say, air-condi-

tioned facilities to detain and prosecute the terrorist detainees at Guantanamo.

In order to close that facility, we need to know what the President intends to do with those terrorist detainees who are too dangerous to release but could not be tried.

They had an opportunity to prosecute. What has been going on for the last 6 or 7 years?

How will he ensure that the terrorists transferred overseas don't return to the fight?

No way, apparently, he can reassure us of that because plenty have, and they have killed a lot of our soldiers in the process.

And what will he do with terrorists we capture in the future, like the one we captured the other day in Libya?

Well, we know what he does. He brings them back to this country, and they are prosecuted as common criminals, not as enemy combatants.

He hasn't answered those questions, so our committee is just as adamant as the authorizing committee in opposition to this amendment. I strongly oppose this amendment, and urge my colleagues to do so.

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

□ 2130

Mr. GRAYSON. I would respectfully submit that, on the gentleman's logic, there is no longer any distinction between the innocent and the guilty.

Those who are at Guantanamo Bay undoubtedly contain both innocent and guilty, but those categories, under the gentleman's logic, do not even apply to them any longer. They are simply captives forever and ever, going untried until they themselves decide to end their life, and we permit it. That is a fundamentally undignified view of the human conditions.

Whatever these people may be, American or not American, they are not just innocent until proven guilty, but on the gentleman's logic, they are not just guilty until proven innocent. They are guilty, guilty, guilty—no matter what.

That is something that is fundamentally unfair to them and to us and has cast an aspersion and a blotch on the American reputation throughout the world. That is why I call on this to end.

I am not saying that these people need to be released. I am saying that they need to be tried. Let's get to the bottom of it and determine if they are guilty or innocent. For God's sake, let's stop punishing the innocent.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let's remember the innocent people who were killed on September 11, 2001. How about justice for them?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAYSON. Well, of course, nothing that we do here today is likely to bring any of those victims back; but as President Lincoln once said, It is for we, the living—we, the living, that carry forth the principles of justice.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used by an officer or employee of the United States to query a collection of foreign intelligence information acquired under section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a) using a United States person identifier.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to queries for foreign intelligence information authorized under section 105, 304, 703, 704, or 705 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1805; 1842; 1881b; 1881c; 1881d), or title 18, United States Code, regardless of under what Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act authority it was collected.

(c) Except as provided for in subsection (d), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Security Agency or the Central Intelligence Agency to mandate or request that a person (as defined in section 1801(m) of title 50, United States Code) alter its product or service to permit the electronic surveillance (as defined in section 1801(f) of title 50, United States Code) of any user of said product or service for said agencies.

(d) Subsection (c) shall not apply with respect to mandates or requests authorized under the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (47 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Kentucky and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, the American people are sick of being spied on. Our Founding Fathers wrote an important provision into the Bill of Rights—the Fourth Amendment—and that requires probable cause and a warrant before the government and government agents can snoop on any American.

During the debate on the USA FREEDOM Act, we knew that more work was needed to ensure Americans' privacy rights are protected. That is why our bipartisan group has joined together to shut surveillance backdoors that do not meet the expectations of our constituents or the standards required by the Constitution.

At this time, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to know that the Director of National Intelligence has confirmed publicly that the government searches vast amounts of data, including the content of emails and telephone calls, without individualized suspicion or probable cause when it comes to U.S. persons.

Last week, the director of the FBI testified under oath, before the Judiciary Committee, that this information is used for prosecution and without a warrant.

This amendment is simple. It allows us to get the bad guys, but it also says use probable cause and the Fourth Amendment. It also closes a backdoor to technology holes.

The broad support for this, I think, shows why it is important for Mr. SEN-SENBRENNER of Wisconsin; myself; Mr. CONYERS of Michigan; Mr. POE of Texas; Ms. GABBARD; Mr. JORDAN of Ohio; Mr. O'ROURKE; Mr. AMASH; of course, Mr. MASSIE; Mr. HOLT; Mr. NADLER; Mr. PETRI; Ms. DELBENE; Mr. FARENTHOLD; Mr. SANFORD; and Mr. BUTTERFIELD—this spans all over this House of Representatives, from right to left, with Members saying: yes, we need to protect our country, but we also need to honor our Constitution and especially the Fourth Amendment.

We started this Congress by reading the Constitution of the United States aloud in this Chamber. Let's finish this bill by making sure that we honor that Constitution by adopting this amendment.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, I will submit for the RECORD the letter from the Director of National Intelligence that my colleague from California referred to.

DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE,  
Washington, DC, Mar. 28, 2014.

Hon. Ron Wyden,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WYDEN: During the January 29, 2014, Worldwide Threat hearing, you cited declassified court documents from 2011 indicating that NSA sought and obtained the authority to query information collected under Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence and Surveillance Act (FISA), using U.S. person identifiers, and asked whether any such queries had been conducted for the communications of specific Americans.

As reflected in the August 2013 Semiannual Assessment of Compliance with Procedures and Guidelines Issued Pursuant to Section 702, which we declassified and released on August 21, 2013, there have been queries, using U.S. person identifiers, of communications lawfully acquired to obtain foreign intelligence by targeting non U.S. persons reasonably believed to be located outside the U.S. pursuant to Section 702 of FISA. These queries were performed pursuant to minimization procedures approved by the FISA Court as consistent with the statute and the Fourth Amendment. As you know, when Congress reauthorized Section 702, the proposal to restrict such queries was specifically raised and ultimately not adopted.

For further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact Deirdre M. Walsh in the Office of Legislative Affairs, at (703) 275-2474.

Sincerely,

JAMES R. CLAPPER.

Mr. MASSIE. At this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the gentleman's

amendment. This is our Appropriations bill. There is nothing in this amendment about funding. You won't see one dollar sign or numeral. The goal was to change policy—that is why they are here—and the application of the law without the oversight of the authorizing committees. The authorizers ought to be dealing with this issue.

It is my pleasure to yield such time as he may wish to consume to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary, to respond to this amendment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, last month, the House passed H.R. 3361, the USA FREEDOM Act, with overwhelming bipartisan support. This amendment undoes the carefully crafted reforms that this body passed, with overwhelming support.

A similar amendment regarding section 702 was offered and rejected by the House Judiciary Committee during its markup of H.R. 3361.

The bipartisan legislation passed by the House last month was closely negotiated on a bipartisan basis with the House Intelligence Committee, House leadership, and the intelligence community—to create a product that provides real, meaningful reforms to intelligence-gathering programs, while ensuring that the operational capabilities of the intelligence community are protected.

H.R. 3361 explicitly codifies existing minimization procedures for section 702 of the FISA Amendments Act that requires the intelligence community to minimize the collection and prohibit the retention and dissemination of wholly domestic communications.

H.R. 3361 also prohibits the government from using communications to or from a United States person or a person who appears to be located in the United States, except where the communication relates to a target under section 702 or to protect against an immediate threat to human life.

The intelligence community is strictly prohibited from using section 702 of the FISA Amendments Acts to target a U.S. person. If a U.S. person is the target of intelligence gathering under FISA, this must, at all times, be carried out pursuant to an individualized court order based upon probable cause.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER), the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

The USA FREEDOM Act that reformed the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act was the product of nearly a year of carefully considered negotiation and debate. It passed the House last month with an overwhelming bipartisan majority of 303 votes, but now, we have an amendment to an appropriations bill that makes major legislative changes to FISA with only 10 min-

utes of debate, and it makes our country less safe.

It would prohibit the urgent search of lawfully-collected information to thwart a bomb plot against a synagogue in Los Angeles, a church in Maryland, or the New York Stock Exchange.

It has no emergency exceptions, and it basically says that what you can do to stop a criminal in this country, you can't do to stop a terrorist. That is wrong. We cannot allow this to happen.

We will continue to work on FISA and our other national security laws to maximize privacy and civil liberties, especially for U.S. persons, but we must do so carefully and deliberately. We must make sure to also keep our country and our allies safe from terrorist attacks.

Ultimately, while I applaud these Members for continuing to look for ways to reform our intelligence laws, we shouldn't be doing this on an appropriations bill with only 10 minutes of debate.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee is correct. This was in the original FREEDOM Act, and it was stripped out in his committee. That is why many of the Members who originally sponsored the FREEDOM Act did not, in fact, vote for the final version, and I would argue that it was not legislated.

The final version of the FREEDOM Act was done behind closed doors, and when it came to this floor, we would have loved to have offered amendments, but the rules were written such that we could not amend it.

Legislators from 435 districts had no say in the final bill, and that is why we are here tonight with this amendment, to reinsert this provision which over 150 Members of this body sponsored.

At this point, I would like to yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Chairman, our number one priority is keeping the American people safe. We do that by focusing our resources on those who actually pose a threat to our safety, while upholding the freedoms and civil liberties of the American people, not by continuing this dragnet spying on millions of Americans.

There is no evidence to date that these programs have made our country more secure. Not a single taxpayer dollar should be used to fund a program that spies on innocent Americans, violating the principles of liberty and freedom that so many have fought and given their lives for.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the NSA has shown they will always interpret the law to the extent that allows them to seize the information. That is why the law has to be much more clear to the NSA. We all must remember that the NSA was violating the PATRIOT Act, as written.



This amendment does something that is very concrete. It tells the NSA: Get a warrant. Get a warrant through the front door. You get a warrant through the backdoor. You can't spy on Americans unless you get a warrant. That is what this amendment does, and I support this amendment.

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, my friend from Texas is correct. The American people can be kept safe, and we can follow the Constitution. We don't have to disregard it, and that is what this amendment would allow us to do, to keep the American people safe while protecting their civil liberties.

There are two provisions here, and they both close backdoors. One backdoor currently allows, without probable cause or a warrant, for the NSA to query a database of American persons' information. This is wrong. They should have a warrant.

The other part of this amendment would prevent money from being spent to fund companies to put backdoors into products. When the government causes these companies to intentionally make defects in their products, they make Americans less safe. They make Americans' data less safe, and they compromise the quality of American goods overseas.

Ultimately, this is about the Constitution, and if you believe in the Constitution, if you believe that it is still valid, if you think we can honor the Fourth Amendment and that we can still keep people safe, then I urge you to vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2145

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the bill passed by this House honors the Fourth Amendment and protects the rights of American citizens. At the same time, Islamic radical terrorists are on the march in Iraq, and the leader has publicly threatened to attack America, Syria has become a vortex of jihadists from across the globe, and the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Homeland Security have warned of the growing threat these jihadists pose to our own homeland. State control has collapsed in Libya, and rival gangs of radical terrorists have established safe havens that rival those in Afghanistan prior to 2001.

Meanwhile, in Afghanistan, the Taliban, Haqqani Network, and al Qaeda continue to fight. Moreover, the administration has released the Taliban Five from Guantanamo, emboldening the terrorists. The terrorist danger is grave and growing. The terrorist threat is not contained overseas. The U.S. homeland remains a prime aspiration and target.

This amendment would create a blind spot for the intelligence community

tracking terrorists with direct connections to the U.S. homeland. This amendment would impose greater restrictions on the intelligence community's ability to protect national security than constitutionally required and create an impediment to the government's ability to locate threat information already in its possession. Such an impediment would put American lives at risk of another terrorist attack.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and stand by the legislation passed. It is also being considered in the Senate and there will be further negotiations, but this—this—contradicts the intent of the House and endangers America's national security.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, this amendment answers questions millions of Americans have asked: Will we stop the government's unconstitutional searches of Americans' stored communications? Will we prohibit the government from deliberately sabotaging the security of the internet and America's technology products?

This amendment would do both while still giving the government all the authority it needs to collect foreign intelligence on real threats. It is a first step towards reversing the current government paradigm of treating our people as suspects first, and citizens second. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this bipartisan amendment.

It has been over a year now since the nation learned of the scope of the National Security Agency's vast surveillance programs targeting global communications, and thus the communications of every American. These programs have been executed in the absence of true, probing Congressional oversight, and they have been repeatedly rubber-stamped by a secret court that has too often acted as an enabler of this domestic spying rather than a check on it.

Earlier this spring, the House passed a bill—the USA Freedom Act—that if enacted into law would have the effect of essentially enshrining these unconstitutional programs into law. While I hope the Senate will either reject or substantially improve that legislation, there is no guarantee that the USA Freedom Act or any other stand-alone NSA reform legislation will pass the Congress this year. That is why I and over a dozen of my colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, have brought this amendment to the House floor tonight. I should also note that this amendment is supported by dozens of groups from across the political spectrum, as well as some of America's leading technology companies, including Google.

This amendment answers questions millions of Americans have asked: will we stop the government's unconstitutional searches of Americans' stored communications? Will we prohibit the government from deliberately sabotaging the security of the internet and America's technology products? This amendment would do both while still giving the government all the authority it needs to collect foreign intelligence on real threats.

The first part of this amendment would prohibit the government from conducting warrantless searches of the communications of Americans collected under Section 702 of

the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. One of the predictions I and others made in 2008 when this provision became law was that it would be misused for the "reverse targeting" of Americans' communications while collecting against foreigners. As we now know, that is exactly what happened, and those communications—billions of phone calls, emails, text messages and the like—now sit on National Security Agency servers, available for search without a warrant. This amendment would bar the NSA from using any funds in this act to conduct any search of stored communications of Americans collected under Sec. 702 of FISA, thus protecting the privacy and Constitutional rights of all Americans.

The second part of this amendment would prohibit the government from forcing American technology companies to build in "back doors" to their products that would compromise the encryption and privacy safeguards built into them. Early this year, published reports revealed that RSA, which provides the SecureID remote login devices used by House Members and staff, had, at NSA's insistence, built in such "back doors" to some of its other products that compromised the privacy and encryption features of the devices in question. This amendment would prohibit that practice, thus helping to restore public confidence in the security and integrity of American produced high technology products.

This amendment is a first step towards reversing the current government paradigm of treating our people as suspects first, and citizens second. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this bipartisan amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I want to thank Rep. JIM SENSENBRENNER of Wisconsin, Rep. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and the other sponsors of this amendment for their continued leadership on the effort to roll back dragnet surveillance of United States citizens.

Last month, a broad, bipartisan majority passed H.R. 3361, the USA FREEDOM Act. That bill rightly ends domestic bulk collection.

But, as I said then, ending bulk collection is only part of the work that must be done to fully reform government surveillance.

This amendment closes the "backdoor surveillance" loophole—through which the government queries U.S. person information without a warrant.

This amendment also prohibits the government from mandating the creation of vulnerabilities in commercial products and services for later exploitation.

Together, these changes end two demonstrated threats to our privacy and civil liberties—without any measurable loss to our national security.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I am proud to be a leading co-sponsor of the Sensenbrenner/Lofgren/Massie amendment and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The NSA must stop conducting illegal 'backdoor searches' into the communications of U.S. citizens. Congress must adopt the Sensenbrenner/Lofgren/Massie amendment and make sure that this loophole is closed in the law. For too long, the NSA has misused authority granted under section 702 of the FISA Amendments Act, which was meant only to authorize spying on foreigners. However, the NSA has misused this authority to search emails, pictures, videos, and other internet

traffic of innocent Americans. This practice is clearly unconstitutional and violates the Fourth Amendment, which protects against unreasonable search and seizure, and normally requires a court-issued warrant. Clearly, this is not how Congress intended the law to be applied.

After the passage of the USA Freedom Act, this amendment is the logical next step to prevent improper surveillance. I will continue to work to improve our nation's privacy laws and to ensure that this Administration, and all those that follow it, respect the constitutional rights of all Americans.

As I said at the time, the USA Freedom Act certainly did not give us everything we wanted or needed. It was far from perfect, but it was an important step forward. We must not leave in place a framework that leads to the dragnet surveillance of our citizens.

During the last several months, I have worked with my colleagues on the House Judiciary Committee to pass the USA Freedom Act. While that bill contains some significant reforms, such as ending NSA's bulk collection of metadata from Americans, more reforms are still needed. And this amendment is an important step in the right direction.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chair, I rise today to support this amendment to the Fiscal Year 2015 Department of Defense Appropriations Act. I would like to thank Representatives LOFGREN and MASSIE for their work on this issue.

To my colleagues who supported the USA FREEDOM Act, this amendment further defends the constitutional rights we voted to protect. To cosponsors who didn't believe the FREEDOM Act went far enough, this amendment reclaims an important protection stripped from the original bill.

I believe the amended USA FREEDOM Act is an important step toward striking the proper balance between privacy and security, and I look forward to seeing it signed into law. But as I said at the time of that vote, the FREEDOM Act was a first step—not a final step—in our efforts for reform.

The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act prohibits the government from targeting U.S. communications. The Administration believes, however, that as long as it incidentally or inadvertently collects Americans' communications, it can read our emails and listen to our phone calls without any judicial process at all.

The Administration has admitted it violates our rights in this way, but it refuses to say how often or to what extent.

The Obama Administration knows that FISA does not authorize collection of wholly domestic communications. It also knows that the content of our communications are, by and large, protected by the Fourth Amendment. But the Administration nevertheless believes that as long as those communications are inadvertently collected, it has the right to disregard the law and the Constitution.

This amendment says that the Fourth Amendment means what it says and there should be no shortcuts around it. For those who believe the sky will fall and U.S. security will be undermined, it has only been since 2011 that the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court opened the backdoor and allowed these illegal searches. This amendment closes that door.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARROW OF  
GEORGIA

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to—

(1) disestablish, or prepare to disestablish, a Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program in accordance with Department of Defense Instruction Number 1215.08, dated June 26, 2006; or

(2) close, downgrade from host to extension center, or place on probation a Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program in accordance with the information paper of the Department of the Army titled "Army Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (SROTC) Program Review and Criteria", dated January 27, 2014.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Georgia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their work on what is undoubtedly the most important bill we pass on an annual basis.

I rise in support of the bipartisan Barrow-Benishek amendment to H.R. 4870, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2015. This is a straightforward amendment that provides the certainty that our Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps needs to select, educate, train, and commission college students to be officers and leaders of character.

In the coming days, the Army is expected to initiate the closure of some ROTC programs. On that list could be any of the 275 ROTC host programs located in every State in the Union. Unfortunately, for thousands of cadets in these programs, the Army's timeline for closure is too short. According to the plans, the Army would close ROTC programs as early as next June. That is simply not fair for the students in these programs or their host universities.

This amendment would simply delay closure of these ROTC programs by 1 year. We would be doing everything we can to make sure that our ROTC programs and our cadets succeed. They are

the next generation of Army leadership, and 1 year of delay would give all of us the certainty that we need to do so.

At this time, I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK), my partner in this measure.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment I co-introduced with my friend, Mr. BARROW, to prevent the closure of Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs across this country.

ROTC programs not only benefit the Army, they strengthen communities and provide opportunities to promising young students. However, in October of this past year, the Army released a list of 13 ROTC programs slated for closure following the 2014–2015 school year.

Following advocacy from Members, including Chairman ROGERS, we were able instead to get the Army to institute a new evaluation system for ROTC programs. This amendment simply holds the Army to their promise of giving these programs enough time to institute changes.

One of these valuable programs is located at Northern Michigan University. Over the 45-year history of the program, Northern Michigan has seen 400 students graduate and go on to military service.

A closure of the NMU ROTC program next school year would prove especially unfair to the cadets currently in the program. These young men and women have worked hard in order to be accepted and maintain their spot. Let's give them a chance to succeed and serve the country they love. Support this amendment. Please vote for it.

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, for all the reasons given, I urge a "yes" vote on the bipartisan Barrow-Benishek amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract for the planning, design, refurbishing, or construction of a biofuels refinery any other facility or infrastructure used to refine biofuels unless such planning, design, refurbishing, or construction is specifically authorized by law.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 628, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. This is a pretty straightforward amendment, Mr. Chairman, that would simply require

that any effort under the Defense Production Act to build a hundreds-of-millions-of-dollars refinery for biofuels could not happen until it was authorized by this body.

It is not allowed to stop this from happening. It simply means that the Department of Defense and the Department of Agriculture, who both are funding this misguided attempt, in my opinion, couldn't do that until they bring a business case to this body for consideration.

I would think my colleagues on the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee as well as the MilCon Subcommittee would be offended by this backdoor approach to spending hundreds of millions of dollars on a project of dubious value.

The Defense Production Act is a World War II, post-World War II vintage program supervised by the Financial Services Committee—not the Defense, not the Armed Services Committee or the Subcommittees on Appropriation—but the Financial Services Committee.

There is currently a refinery that is being proposed to be joint-funded by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense to build a biofuels refinery. Neither of these agencies' core competencies is in this arena. They each have their own core competencies, and it has absolutely nothing to do with biofuels.

I would argue that the Department of Energy—if anybody—should be the one who authorizes this work, but they have got a dubious distinction, as well, with decisions such as Solyndra and others of making really poor decisions.

The other side will argue that this somehow protects the Department of Defense from price shocks on oil and gas that they have simply purchased. They have never brought us that business case. We have no clue what the break-even point on biofuels is against some equivalent cost for fossil-based fuels. Currently, they are spending somewhere between \$16 and \$27 a gallon for algae-based jet fuel versus the \$3 to \$4 a gallon commercially available.

These folks who are proponents of biofuels are not proponents of better alternative resources like coal to liquids. So I would urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the amendment to require an authorization for the spending of some \$300-plus million on a refinery that is, in my view, of dubious distinction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much this is the third iteration of a very similar amendment, so my comments will also mirror those that I have made earlier in the debate.

The first thing I would make clear to the gentleman from Texas, though, is I am not going to suggest in any way,

shape, or form that his amendment is offered to protect the oil and gas industry of his State. As I mentioned earlier this evening, the largest inland oil refinery in the United States of America is in the First Congressional District of Indiana, and I am very proud of that. I tell my constituents that we need a matrix of fuels, and while we work from using carbon almost exclusively, we are also a coal State in Indiana. We are not to foreclose our options, and particularly for the Department of Defense.

Given the fact that the Department is the largest consumer of energy on planet Earth as far as a single entity, I do think we ought to also allow them to examine what is the best matrix and mix of fuels for the particular missions and locations that they find themselves in. For these reasons, I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I would not take offense—I should—but I won't take offense that the gentleman suggests that somehow this amendment has anything to do whatsoever with respect to oil and gas that we produce in Texas. When you don't like the merits of your own argument, you go ahead and attack the folks on the other side, and I understand that technique.

The truth of the matter is the Department of Defense can, in fact, make judgments for themselves once a product is available to them at commercial products. This just prevents them from going ahead and trying to build something, build up a market and build a fuel that no one else wants. It is only available here in the United States. It would not be available anywhere else in the world to fuel our airplanes, or our ships, or our tanks and other things.

So, this is a misguided attempt driven by the White House on this green initiative that is spending millions and millions of dollars of taxpayer money, and it is a waste every time they do that.

I would argue that the better argument is to say "no" to this, allow the Department of Defense to spend their dollars, as has been said previously, on guns, tanks, ships, and salaries for our soldiers. This is a wrong-headed tip. It ought to be authorized by the HASC and by the Senate equivalent, and these two subcommittees on Appropriations ought to be offended by this backdoor approach at spending hundreds of millions of dollars on a program that has no oversight.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I just want to correct the statement that my colleague just made. At the outset of my remarks, I was careful to note, because in the gentleman's original remarks he said that some would suggest he had offered his amendment to defend the oil and gas industry. I specifically said I know that is why he did not do that in the amendment and made the further point that the largest inland oil refinery in the United States of America is in my district, so I would in no way infer that. So I want the RECORD to be very clear that I am not impugning the motives of the gentleman who offered the amendment. I simply rose in disagreement with his amendment.

Mr. CONAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. I did misunderstand you. I thought you were saying I was disqualified from offering an amendment like this because I simply represent west Texas, which is the leading oil and gas producer in our country. So if I misunderstood you, I will accept that.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield back the balance of my time.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. COTTON of Arkansas.

An amendment by Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

Amendment No. 31 by Ms. LEE of California.

Amendment No. 33 by Ms. LEE of California.

An amendment by Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky.

An amendment by Mr. FORTENBERRY of Nebraska.

An amendment by Mr. GRAYSON of Florida.

Amendment No. 34 by Ms. LEE of California.

An amendment by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MILLER OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 300, noes 114, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 322]

AYES—300

Amash	Gardner	McMorris
Amodi	Gerlach	Rodgers
Bachmann	Gibbs	McNerney
Barber	Gibson	Meadows
Barletta	Gingrey (GA)	Meeks
Barr	Gohmert	Messer
Barrow (GA)	Goodlatte	Mica
Barton	Gosar	Michaud
Beatty	Graves (GA)	Miller (MI)
Benishek	Graves (MO)	Miller, George
Bentivolio	Grayson	Mullin
Bera (CA)	Green, Al	Murphy (FL)
Bilirakis	Green, Gene	Murphy (PA)
Bishop (NY)	Griffin (AR)	Nadler
Bishop (UT)	Grijalva	Nadler
Black	Grimm	Negrete McLeod
Blackburn	Guthrie	Nolan
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	Nugent
Boustany	Hahn	Nunes
Brady (PA)	Hall	Olson
Brady (TX)	Hanabusa	Palazzo
Braley (IA)	Harper	Pallone
Bridenstine	Harris	Pascarell
Brooks (AL)	Hartzler	Pastor (AZ)
Broun (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Brown (FL)	Hastings (WA)	Pearce
Brownley (CA)	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Buchanan	Himes	Perlmutter
Burgess	Hinojosa	Perry
Bustos	Holding	Peters (CA)
Butterfield	Holt	Peters (MI)
Camp	Honda	Peterson
Capps	Horsford	Petri
Cárdenas	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)
Carney	Hudson	Pittenger
Carson (IN)	Huelskamp	Pitts
Cartwright	Huizenga (MI)	Pocan
Castor (FL)	Hultgren	Poe (TX)
Castro (TX)	Israel	Pompeo
Chabot	Jackson Lee	Posey
Chaffetz	Jeffries	Price (GA)
Ciçilline	Jenkins	Price (NC)
Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Rahall
Cleaver	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Roe (TN)
Coble	Jones	Rogers (AL)
Coffman	Jordan	Rogers (MI)
Cohen	Keating	Rohrabacher
Collins (GA)	Kelly (IL)	Rooney
Conyers	Kelly (PA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cook	Kennedy	Roskam
Costa	Kildee	Ross
Cotton	Kilmer	Rothfus
Courtney	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Crawford	King (IA)	Ruiz
Crenshaw	King (NY)	Runyan
Crowley	Kingston	Ruppersberger
Cuellar	Kinzinger (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Cummings	Kuster	Salmon
Daines	Labrador	Sánchez, Linda T.
Davis (CA)	LaMalfa	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis, Danny	Lamborn	Sarbanes
Davis, Rodney	Langevin	Schakowsky
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Schiff
DeGette	Latta	Schneider
Delaney	Levin	Schock
DeLauro	Lewis	Schrader
DeSantis	Lipinski	Schweikert
Deutch	LoBiondo	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Loeb	Scott, Austin
Doyle	Lowenthal	Scott, David
Duckworth	Lowe	Serrano
Duffy	Lucas	Sessions
Duncan (SC)	Luetkemeyer	Sewell (AL)
Ellison	Luján, Ben Ray	Shea-Porter
Ellmers	(NM)	Sherman
Engel	Lummis	Shimkus
Enyart	Lynch	Shuster
Esty	Maffei	Simpson
Farenthold	Maloney, Sean	Sinema
Fattah	Marino	Sires
Fincher	Massie	Smith (MO)
Fitzpatrick	Matheson	Smith (NJ)
Foster	Matsui	Smith (TX)
Foxx	McAllister	Southerland
Frankel (FL)	McCarthy (CA)	Speier
Franks (AZ)	McCaul	Stewart
Gabbard	McClintock	Stivers
Galleo	McGovern	Stockman
Garamendi	McHenry	Stutzman
Garcia	McIntyre	

Swalwell (CA)	Vargas	Westmoreland
Terry	Veasey	Whitfield
Thompson (CA)	Vela	Williams
Thompson (PA)	Wagner	Wilson (FL)
Thornberry	Walberg	Wilson (SC)
Tiberi	Wasserman	Wolf
Tierney	Schultz	Woodall
Tipton	Waters	Yoho
Tonko	Weber (TX)	Young (AK)
Turner	Webster (FL)	
Upton	Wenstrup	

NOES—114

Aderholt	Freilinghuysen	Neugebauer
Bachus	Garrett	Noem
Bass	Gowdy	O'Rourke
Becerra	Granger	Owens
Blumenauer	Griffith (VA)	Paulsen
Brooks (IN)	Hanna	Quigley
Bucshon	Heck (NV)	Reed
Byrne	Hensarling	Reichert
Calvert	Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Campbell	Higgins	Ribble
Neal	Huffman	Rigell
Capito	Hunter	Roby
Carter	Hurt	Rogers (KY)
Cassidy	Issa	Rokita
Chu	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Clarke (NY)	Jolly	Sanford
Clay	Joyce	Schwartz
Cole	Kaptur	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	Kline	Slaughter
Conaway	Lance	Smith (NE)
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Smith (WA)
Cooper	Latham	Takano
Cramer	Lee (CA)	Titano
Culberson	Lofgren	Titus
DelBene	Long	Tsongas
Denham	Maloney,	Valadao
Dent	Carolyn	Van Hollen
DesJarlais	Marchant	Velázquez
Diaz-Balart	McCollum	Visclosky
Doggett	McDermott	Walden
Duncan (TN)	McKeon	Walorski
Edwards	McKinley	Waxman
Eshoo	Meehan	Welch
Farr	Meng	Wittman
Fleischmann	Miller (FL)	Womack
Fleming	Miller, Gary	Yarmuth
Flores	Moore	Yoder
Forbes	Moran	Young (IN)
Fortenberry	Napolitano	

NOT VOTING—17

Bishop (GA)	McCarthy (NY)	Ryan (OH)
Capuano	Mulvaney	Scalise
Fudge	Nunnelee	Thompson (MS)
Kirkpatrick	Polis	Walz
Lankford	Rangel	
Lujan Grisham	Richmond	
(NM)	Rush	

□ 1227

Messrs. WALDEN, ISSA, ADERHOLT, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. CLARKE of New York changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. PITTS, CARSON, JOHNSON of Ohio, CHAFFETZ, and RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. COTTON

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 184, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 323]

AYES—230

Aderholt	Granger	Pearce
Amodi	Graves (GA)	Perry
Bachmann	Graves (MO)	Peterson
Bachus	Green, Gene	Petri
Barber	Griffin (AR)	Pittenger
Barletta	Grimm	Pitts
Barr	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Barrow (GA)	Hall	Pompeo
Barton	Harper	Posey
Benishek	Harris	Price (GA)
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Reichert
Black	Heck (NV)	Renacci
Blackburn	Hensarling	Ribble
Boustany	Herrera Beutler	Rice (SC)
Brady (TX)	Holding	Rigell
Bridenstine	Hudson	Roby
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Roe (TN)
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Bucshon	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Burgess	Hurt	Rohrabacher
Byrne	Issa	Rokita
Calvert	Jenkins	Rooney
Camp	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Cantor	Jolly	Ross
Capito	Jones	Rothfus
Carter	Jordan	Royce
Cassidy	Joyce	Ruiz
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Runyan
Chaffetz	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Coble	King (NY)	Salmon
Coffman	Kingston	Sánchez, Loretta
Cole	Kinzinger (IL)	Schock
Collins (GA)	Kline	Schweikert
Collins (NY)	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Conaway	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Cook	Lance	Sessions
Cotton	Latham	Shimkus
Cramer	Latta	Shuster
Crawford	Lipinski	Simpson
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Smith (MO)
Cuellar	Long	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Daines	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Davis, Danny	Lummis	Southerland
Davis, Rodney	Marchant	Stewart
Denham	Marino	Stivers
Dent	Matheson	Stockman
DeSantis	McAllister	Stutzman
DesJarlais	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Diaz-Balart	McCaul	Thornberry
Duffy	McClintock	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	McIntyre	Turner
Ellmers	McKeon	Upton
Farenthold	McKinley	Valadao
Fincher	McMorris	Wagner
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Walberg
Fleischmann	McNerney	Walden
Fleming	Meadows	Walorski
Flores	Meehan	Weber (TX)
Forbes	Messer	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	Mica	Wenstrup
Foxx	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Whitfield
Freilinghuysen	Miller, Gary	Williams
Gardner	Mullin	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Gerlach	Neugebauer	Wolf
Gibbs	Noem	Womack
Gingrey (GA)	Nugent	Woodall
Gohmert	Nunes	Yoder
Goodlatte	Olson	Yoho
Gosar	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Gowdy	Paulsen	Young (IN)

NOES—184

Amash	Braley (IA)	Cartwright
Bass	Broun (GA)	Castor (FL)
Beatty	Brown (FL)	Castro (TX)
Becerra	Brownley (CA)	Chu
Bentivolio	Bustos	Ciçilline
Bera (CA)	Butterfield	Clark (MA)
Bishop (NY)	Capps	Clarke (NY)
Blumenauer	Cárdenas	Clay
Bonamici	Carney	Cleaver
Brady (PA)	Carson (IN)	Clyburn

Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Gibson  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Griffith (VA)  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Hastings (FL)  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel

NOT VOTING—17

Bishop (GA)  
Capuano  
Fudge  
Kirkpatrick  
Lankford  
Lujan Grisham (NM)

□ 2231

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 249, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 324]  
AYES—163  
Amash  
Bass  
Gibson  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kuster  
Labrador  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe y  
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lynch  
Maffei  
Maloney, Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Masse  
Matsui  
McColum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
Meeks  
Meng  
Michaud  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Negrete McLeod  
Nolan  
O'Rourke  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters (CA)  
Peters (MI)  
Pingree (ME)  
Pocan  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (PA)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

NOES—249

Aderholt  
Amodei  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barber  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barrow (GA)  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bentivolio  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Broun (GA)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cotton  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Daines  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellison  
Ellmers  
Engel  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxx  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallego  
Garcia  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Gene  
Griffith (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jolly  
Jordan

[Roll No. 324]  
AYES—163  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Negrete McLeod  
Nolan  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters (CA)  
Pingree (ME)  
Pocan  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
Matheson  
McAllister  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

Joyce  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peters (MI)  
Peterson  
Latham  
Latta  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Maffei  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
Matheson  
McAllister  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peters (MI)  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Rahall  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Meadows  
Rothfus  
Royce  
Ruiz  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shea-Porter  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stockman  
Stutzman  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vela  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Royce  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—19

Bishop (GA)  
Capuano  
Fudge  
Kirkpatrick  
Lankford  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
McCarthy (NY)  
Meng  
Mulvaney  
Nunnelee  
Polis  
Rangel  
Richmond

□ 2235

Mr. BARBER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 250, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 325]

AYES—165

Amash  
Barber  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Benishek  
Bera (CA)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici

Brady (PA) Himes
Braley (IA) Hinojosa
Broun (GA) Holt
Burgess Honda
Capps Huffman
Cárdenas Jackson Lee
Castor (FL) Jeffries
Castro (TX) Johnson (GA)
Chu Johnson, E. B.
Cicilline Jones
Clark (MA) Kaptur
Clarke (NY) Keating
Clay Kelly (IL)
Cleaver Kildee
Coffman Kilmer
Cohen Kind
Conyers Kuster
Courtney Labrador
Crowley Larsen (WA)
Cummings Larsen (CT)
Daines Lee (CA)
Davis (CA) Levin
Davis, Danny Lewis
DeFazio Loeb sack
DeGette Lofgren
DeLauro Lowenthal
DelBene Lowey
Deutch Luján, Ben Ray
Dingell (NM)
Doggett Maffei
Doyle Maloney, Carolyn
Duncan (TN) Maloney, Sean
Edwards Massie
Ellison Matsui
Eshoo McClintock
Esty McCollum
Farr McCollum
Fattah McDermott
Foster McGovern
Frankel (FL) McNerney
Garamendi Meng
Garcia Michaud
Gibson Miller, George
Grayson Moore
Green, Al Murphy (FL)
Green, Gene Nadler
Grijalva Napolitano
Gutiérrez Neal
Hahn Negrete McLeod
Hanabusa Nolan
Hastings (FL) O'Rourke
Heck (WA) Pallone
Higgins Pascrell

NOES—250

Aderholt Connolly
Amodei Cook
Bachmann Cooper
Bachus Costa
Barletta Cotton
Barr Cramer
Barrow (GA) Crawford
Barton Crenshaw
Bentivolio Cuellar
Billirakis Culberson
Bishop (NY) Davis, Rodney
Bishop (UT) Delaney
Black Denham
Blackburn Dent
Boustany DeSantis
Brady (TX) DesJarlais
Bridenstine Diaz-Balart
Brooks (AL) Duckworth
Brooks (IN) Duffy
Brown (FL) Duncan (SC)
Brownley (CA) Ellmers
Buchanan Engel
Buchshon Enyart
Bustos Farenthold
Butterfield Fincher
Byrne Fitzpatrick
Calvert Fleischmann
Camp Fleming
Campbell Flores
Cantor Forbes
Capito Fortenberry
Carney Foxx
Carson (IN) Franks (AZ)
Carter Frelinghuysen
Cartwright Gabbard
Cassidy Gallego
Chabot Gardner
Chaffetz Garrett
Clyburn Gerlach
Coble Gibbs
Cole Gingrey (GA)
Collins (GA) Gohmert
Collins (NY) Goodlatte
Conaway Gosar

Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Posey
Quigley
Jones
Rahall
Ribble
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scheider
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schneider
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)

Langevin
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo

NOT VOTING—16

Bishop (GA)
Capuano
Kirkpatrick
Lankford

Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schock
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman

NOT VOTING—16

Lujan Grisham (NM)
McCarthey (NY)
Mulvaney
Nunnelee
Polis

Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Viscosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman
Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IN)

Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Huelskamp
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)

Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Schultz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho

NOES—231

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA
The Acting CHAIR. The unrecorded business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.
The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE
The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 231, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 326]

AYES—182

Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishkek
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Capps
Cárdenas

Carney
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers

Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Daines
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Billirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buchshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper

Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie

Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry



McAllister Paulsen  
 McClintock Pearce  
 McCollum Pingree (ME)  
 McDermott Pitts  
 McGovern Pocan  
 McHenry Poe (TX)  
 McIntyre Posey  
 McMorris Price (GA)  
     Rodgers Ribble  
 McNerney Rice (SC)  
 Meadows Roe (TN)  
 Meeks Rohrabacher  
 Messer Rooney  
 Michaud Ros-Lehtinen  
 Miller (FL) Ross  
 Miller (MI) Rothfus  
 Moore Ruiz  
 Moran Salmon  
 Murphy (PA) Sánchez, Linda  
 Nadler T.  
 Neugebauer Sanchez, Loretta  
 Nolan Sanford  
 Nugent Schrader  
 Olson Schweikert  
 Palazzo Scott, Austin  
 Pallone Sensenbrenner  
 Pastor (AZ) Serrano

NOES—244

Amodei Farr  
 Bachus Fattah  
 Barber Fleischmann  
 Barr Flores  
 Beatty Forbes  
 Becerra Foster  
 Bera (CA) Foxx  
 Bishop (GA) Frankel (FL)  
 Bishop (NY) Franks (AZ)  
 Blackburn Frelinghuysen  
 Blumenauer Gabbard  
 Bonamici Gallego  
 Boustany Garcia  
 Brady (PA) Gardner  
 Brady (TX) Gerlach  
 Brooks (IN) Gibbs  
 Brown (FL) Gingrey (GA)  
 Brownley (CA) Goodlatte  
 Bucshon Gowdy  
 Butterfield Granger  
 Byrne Graves (MO)  
 Calvert Grayson  
 Camp Green, Al  
 Cantor Green, Gene  
 Capito Griffin (AR)  
 Carney Griffith (VA)  
 Carson (IN) Grimm  
 Carter Gutiérrez  
 Cartwright Hanna  
 Castro (TX) Harper  
 Chabot Hartzler  
 Chaffetz Hastings (FL)  
 Cicilline Hastings (WA)  
 Clyburn Heck (WA)  
 Coffman Hensarling  
 Cohen Himes  
 Conaway Hinojosa  
 Connolly Holding  
 Cook Horsford  
 Cooper Hoyer  
 Costa Huizenga (MI)  
 Cotton Hultgren  
 Courtney Hunter  
 Cramer Hurt  
 Crawford Israel  
 Crenshaw Issa  
 Crowley Jackson Lee  
 Cuellar Johnson, E. B.  
 Culberson Jolly  
 Cummings Joyce  
 Davis (CA) Kaptur  
 Davis, Rodney Kelly (IL)  
 DeFazio Kelly (PA)  
 DeGette Kennedy  
 Delaney Kildee  
 DeLauro Kilmer  
 DelBene Kind  
 Deutch King (IA)  
 Diaz-Balart King (NY)  
 Dingell Kingston  
 Doggett Kinzinger (IL)  
 Doyle Kline  
 Duckworth Lamborn  
 Edwards Lance  
 Ellison Langevin  
 Ellmers Larsen (WA)  
 Engel Larson (CT)  
 Enyart Latham  
 Esty Levin  
 Farenthold Lipinski

Simpson Thornberry  
 Sires Tipton  
 Slaughter Titus  
 Smith (NE) Tsongas  
 Smith (TX) Upton  
 Smith (WA) Valadao  
 Stewart Van Hollen  
 Stutzman Vargas  
 Takano Veasey  
 Tiberi Swailwell (CA)  
 Tierney Vela  
 Tonko Thompson (CA)  
 Turner Thompson (PA)  
 Velázquez  
 Wagner  
 Weber (TX)  
 Webster (FL)  
 Welch  
 Westmoreland  
 Williams  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wolf  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Yoho  
 Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—20

Denham  
 Fudge  
 Graves (GA)  
 Kirkpatrick  
 Lankford  
 Lujan Grisham (NM)  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 Mulvaney  
 Nunnelee  
 Pascrell  
 Polis  
 Rangel  
 Richmond  
 Rokita  
 Runyan  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Southerland  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Walz

□ 2252

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 62, noes 355, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 329]

AYES—62

Amash  
 Barrow (GA)  
 Blumenauer  
 Braley (IA)  
 Bridenstine  
 Broun (GA)  
 Cárdenas  
 Cartwright  
 Castor (FL)  
 Chu  
 Conyers  
 Duncan (TN)  
 Edwards  
 Ellison  
 Gibson  
 Grayson  
 Griffith (VA)  
 Grijalva  
 Holt  
 Honda  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Jones  
 Jordan  
 Kingston  
 Labrador  
 Lee (CA)  
 Lewis  
 Maffei  
 Massie  
 Matheson  
 Matsui  
 McClintock  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McKeon  
 Miller, George  
 Nadler  
 Negrete McLeod  
 O'Rourke  
 Pallone  
 Perlmutter  
 Perry  
 Petri  
 Pocan  
 Rohrabacher  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sanford  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Scott (VA)  
 Serrano  
 Shimkus  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (WA)  
 Stewart  
 Stockman  
 Takano  
 Tierney  
 Tonko  
 Velázquez  
 Waters

NOES—355

Aderholt  
 Amodei  
 Bachmann  
 Bachus  
 Barber  
 Barletta  
 Barr  
 Barton  
 Bass  
 Beatty  
 Becerra  
 Benishek  
 Bentivolio  
 Bera (CA)  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Black  
 Blackburn  
 Camp  
 Boustany  
 Bradley (PA)  
 Brady (TX)  
 Brooks (AL)  
 Brooks (IN)  
 Brown (FL)  
 Brownley (CA)  
 Buchanan  
 Bucshon  
 Burgess  
 Bustos  
 Butterfield  
 Byrne  
 Calvert  
 Campbell  
 Cantor  
 Capito  
 Capps  
 Capuano  
 Carney  
 Carson (IN)  
 Carter  
 Cassidy

Castro (TX)  
 Chabot  
 Chaffetz  
 Cicilline  
 Clark (MA)  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Coble  
 Coffman  
 Cohen  
 Cole  
 Collins (GA)  
 Collins (NY)  
 Conaway  
 Connolly  
 Cook  
 Cooper  
 Costa  
 Cotton  
 Courtney  
 Cramer  
 Crawford  
 Crenshaw  
 Crowley  
 Cuellar  
 Culberson  
 Cummings  
 Daines  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis, Danny  
 Davis, Rodney  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 Delaney  
 DeLauro  
 DelBene  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 DeSantis  
 DesJarlais  
 Deutch  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Doyle  
 Duckworth  
 Duffy  
 Duncan (SC)  
 Ellmers  
 Engel  
 Enyart  
 Eshoo  
 Esty  
 Farenthold  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Fincher  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Fleischmann  
 Fleming  
 Flores  
 Forbes  
 Fortenberry  
 Foster  
 Foxx  
 Frankel (FL)  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Gabbard  
 Gallego  
 Garamendi  
 Garcia  
 Gardner  
 Garrett  
 Gerlach  
 Gibbs  
 Gingrey (GA)  
 Gohmert  
 Goodlatte  
 Gosar  
 Gowdy  
 Granger  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (MO)  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Griffin (AR)  
 Grimm  
 Guthrie  
 Gutiérrez  
 Hahn  
 Hall  
 Hanabusa  
 Hanna  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Heck (NV)  
 Heck (WA)  
 Hensarling  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Higgins  
 Himes  
 Hinojosa  
 Holding  
 Horsford  
 Hoyer  
 Hudson  
 Huelskamp  
 Huffman  
 Huizenga (MI)  
 Hultgren  
 Hunter  
 Hurt  
 Israel  
 Issa  
 Jackson Lee  
 Jeffries  
 Jenkins  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jolly  
 Joyce  
 Kaptur  
 Keating  
 Kelly (IL)  
 Kelly (PA)  
 Kennedy  
 Kildee  
 Kilmer  
 Kind  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kinzinger (IL)  
 Kline  
 Kuster  
 LaMalfa  
 Lamborn  
 Lance  
 Langevin  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Latham  
 Latta  
 Levin  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Loebsock  
 Lofgren  
 Long  
 Lowenthal  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Luján, Ben Ray  
 Lummis  
 Lynch  
 Maloney,  
     Carolyn  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Marchant  
 Marino  
 McAllister  
 McCarthy (CA)  
 McCaul  
 McCollum  
 McHenry  
 McIntyre  
 McKeon  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 Meadows  
 Meehan  
 Meeks  
 Meng  
 Messer  
 Mica  
 Michaud  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller (MI)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Moore  
 Moran  
 Mullin  
 Murphy (FL)  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Napolitano  
 Walden  
 Walorski  
 Wasserman  
 Waxman  
 Waters  
 Waxman  
 Whitfield  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Yarmuth  
 Young (IN)  
 Nugent  
 Nunes  
 Olson  
 Owens  
 Palazzo  
 Pascrell  
 Pastor (AZ)  
 Paulsen  
 Payne  
 Pearce  
 Pelosi  
 Peters (CA)  
 Peters (MI)  
 Peterson  
 Pingree (ME)  
 Pittenger  
 Pitts  
 Poe (TX)  
 Pompeo  
 Posey  
 Price (GA)  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Rahall  
 Reed  
 Reichert  
 Renacci  
 Ribble  
 Rice (SC)  
 Rigell  
 Roby  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Rokita  
 Rooney  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roskam  
 Ross  
 Rothfus  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Royce  
 Ruiz  
 Runyan  
 Ruppersberger  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Salmon  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Scalise  
 Schiff  
 Schneider  
 Schock  
 Schrader  
 Schwartz  
 Schweikert  
 Scott, Austin  
 Scott, David  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Sewell (AL)  
 Shea-Porter  
 Sherman  
 Sinema  
 Sires  
 Smith (MO)  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Southerland  
 Stivers  
 Stutzman  
 Swailwell (CA)  
 Terry  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tipton  
 Titus  
 Tsongas  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Valadao  
 Van Hollen  
 Vargas  
 Veasey  
 Vela  
 Visclosky  
 Wagner  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walorski  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waxman





Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)

Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Titus

Tonko  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOYCE) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4870) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. MULVANEY (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of a medical procedure.

Mr. RICHMOND (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and June 20 on account of attending a family matter.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 20, 2014, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6043. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan, Conformity Budgets, Emissions Inventories; State of New York [Docket No.: EPA-R02-OAR-2014-0182; FRL-9911-56-Region 2] received May 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6044. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions for Permitting of Particulate Matter with Diameters Less Than or Equal to 2.5 Micrometers (PM2.5) [EPA-R06-OAR-2011-0495; FRL-9909-35-Region 6] received May 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6045. A letter from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Connect America Fund, Developing a Unified Inter-carrier Compensation Regime [WC Docket No.: 10-90] [CC Docket No.: 01-92] received June 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6046. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — 2014 Quadrennial Regulatory Review — Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; 2010 Quadrennial Regulatory Review — Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; Promoting Diversification of Ownership in the Broadcasting Services; Rules and Policies Concerning Attribution of Joint Sales Agreements in Local Television Markets [MB Docket No.: 14-50] [MB Docket No.: 09-182] [MB Docket No.: 07-294] [MB Docket No.: 04-256] received June 2, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6047. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Proposed Revisions to Physical Security Early Site Permit and Reactor Siting Criteria [NRC-2014-0101] received May 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

NOES—204

Aderholt  
Amash  
Amodei  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bentivolio  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cotton  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Daines  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Ellmers  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxx  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy

Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffin (AR)  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huiuzenga (MI)  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jolly  
Jordan  
Joyce  
King (IA)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latham  
Latta  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McAllister  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mullin  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE DISPOSITION OF RUSSIAN HIGHLY ENRICHED URANIUM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-122)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the emergency declared in Executive Order 13617 of June 25, 2012, with respect to the disposition of Russian highly enriched uranium is to continue in effect beyond June 25, 2014.

The risk of nuclear proliferation created by the accumulation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13617 with respect to the disposition of Russian highly enriched uranium.

BARACK OBAMA,  
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 19, 2014.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

NOT VOTING—15  
Fudge  
Johnson (GA)  
Kirkpatrick  
Lankford  
Lujan Grisham (NM)

McCarthy (NY)  
Mulvaney  
Nunnelee  
Polis  
Rangel  
Richmond

Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Thompson (MS)  
Walz

Mr. MESSER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”