

this upcoming National Case Management Week, let us all recognize the value that case management brings to the health care arena.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 16, 2014.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 16, 2014 at 11:09 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 5134.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

□ 1230

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.J. RES. 124, CONTINUING
APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION,
2015

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 722 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 722

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 124) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The joint resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; (2) the further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative McKeon of California or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for six hours equally divided and controlled by Representative McKeon of California and Representative Smith of Washington or their respective designees, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Section 4(c) of House Resolution 567 is amended by adding the following new paragraph:

“(7) The provisions of paragraphs (f)(1) through (f)(12) of clause 4 of rule XI shall be

considered to be written rules adopted by the Select Committee as though pursuant to such clause.”.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my good friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of H.J. Res. 124, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution for fiscal year 2015. The rule is a structured rule which provides for the consideration of a short-term continuing resolution keeping the government funded until December 11, 2014.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the adoption of a technical amendment by Chairman ROGERS and makes in order an amendment by Chairman MCKEON. That amendment provides the authority for the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to train and equip appropriately vetted elements of the Syrian opposition and other appropriately vetted Syrian groups or individuals.

For this amendment, the rule provides 6 hours of debate equally divided between Chairman MCKEON and Ranking Member SMITH. The rule also provides for one motion to recommit.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule corrects a technical error and puts in place the base rules of the House regarding media access to the hearings and meetings of the Benghazi Select Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my friend Chairman ROGERS for bringing a bill to avoid a government shutdown to the House. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, it is frustrating that we are forced into acting on a short-term continuing resolution when we spent much of this year, both in committee and on the floor, updating congressional funding priorities for fiscal year 2015.

This House has done its work. I wish I could say the same for the other body. While the Senate has chosen not to pass even one appropriations bill on the floor, this House has passed seven.

While the Senate Appropriations Committee has passed eight of the 12

appropriations bills out of committee, the House Appropriations Committee has approved all but one. If the Senate would work with us, I believe we could pass all of our bills on time.

The CR we are considering today is a clean bill continuing the funding of government operations at last year's levels. It includes only 36 so-called anomalies all within the total level of funding.

These changes are necessary to address current immediate needs like addressing the Ebola crisis, funding programs to counter regional aggression toward Ukraine and other former Soviet Union countries, and funding to ensure appropriate treatment of veterans and continued oversight of the VA.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, this bill extends the Export-Import Bank through June 30, 2015. I know some of my friends will disagree with me; however, I believe the Export-Import Bank provides a vital service. In an era when foreign governments are directly subsidizing industries, our companies are in need of a level playing field. I believe the Export-Import Bank does that.

In my home State of Oklahoma, since 2007, financing provided by the Export-Import Bank has supported over \$1.1 billion in sales by U.S. companies that would not have existed otherwise; in addition, the Export-Import Bank has returned over \$2.6 billion to the United States Treasury since 2008.

Finally, and most significantly, the McKeon amendment would provide the President with the authority he has requested to train and equip appropriately vetted elements of the Syrian opposition. The amendment ensures congressional oversight by requiring detailed progress reports on a plan, a vetting process, and procedures for monitoring unauthorized end use of provided training and equipment. It would also require the President to report on how this authority fits within a larger regional strategy.

Mr. Speaker, when we look back on what brought us to this point, there are at least three significant failures that we can point to: first, former Iraqi Prime Minister al-Maliki was given the opportunity to create a multiethnic, multisectarian, inclusive State of Iraq, but, instead, he squandered it; secondly, President Obama didn't insist forcefully enough to keep a residual American presence in Iraq; and, third, Mr. Speaker, when ISIL expanded out of Syria and into Iraq, both Prime Minister al-Maliki and President Obama were slow to respond.

When Ramadi and Fallujah fell to ISIL, their indecisive leadership allowed and encouraged this terrorist organization to assert itself in the Middle East. Mr. Speaker, the salient discussion is not about the past and how we got here but about the future and what we must do now.

I agree with the President that ISIL represents a clear and present danger

that must be dealt with, confronted, and destroyed. I am willing to give the President the authority and the funds needed to accomplish this mission. This amendment gives the President what he has requested while maintaining an appropriate role for Congress, but I do disagree with the President on several important issues.

I don't believe that he has the inherent authority to use military force in Syria, and nothing in this amendment authorizes him to do so.

I believe that going to war on the authorizations that were passed in 2001 and 2002, which dealt with very different times, places, and peoples, is shaky, at best. In fact, Mr. Speaker, a vast majority of my colleagues, including myself, were not even here in Congress when those authorizations were approved.

When we return in November, I hope that we repeal the 2001 and 2002 authorizations and replace them with ones that reflect the views of this Congress not the Congress of the last decade.

Additionally, I disagree with the President's choice of tactics. Regardless of whether he intends to use them or not, I believe the President was far too quick to rule out options and tools that he, in fact, may need later. War is the most unpredictable of all human enterprises. History shows that it is vital for a commander to maintain as much flexibility as possible.

I also do not believe that the authority and resources the President has requested will be nearly enough to achieve the mission he has outlined. It is going to take far more from our country, our allies, and our friends on the ground to destroy ISIL than envisioned in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the President can succeed in the effort to destroy ISIL without bipartisan, popular support, and I hope he will take this opportunity to build on that. We are not Republicans or Democrats in war, but Americans first. The Commander in Chief has asked for our support in the underlying legislation. He should get it.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the excellent Representative of Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, when James Madison declared the Congress' "power over the purse" in the Federalist Papers as the most "complete and effectual weapon," he warned of "dishonorable stagnation." I fear we have achieved that. Rather than doing the hard work of coming up with long-term fiscal solutions for our Nation, we have resorted, once again, to short-term measures.

In the 4 years since Republicans took control of the House, not a single regular appropriations bill has been signed into law; instead, we have had manufactured crises, brinkmanship, fiscal

cliffs, near defaults on the national debt, massive omnibus bills, and government shutdowns.

This continuing resolution may avert a national crisis in the short term by funding the government until December 11 of this year, but it is further demonstration the House majority has failed to do their most basic job.

They have been so obsessed with suing the President, investigating the nonexistent scandal in Benghazi, and holding more than 50 votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act that they have not done the routine work of Congress, funding the government. It is clear that under the current House majority our "power of the purse" has turned into "dishonorable stagnation."

Not only has the House majority found new ways to procrastinate on finding long-term solutions, they insist on passing the most closed rules in a single Congress ever; in fact, just last week, they celebrated the 75th closed rule, which makes this their diamond jubilee. They continue to pass closed rules which stifle debate and impede the work of this Chamber.

Through this tactic, half of the country's Representatives have been silenced by the House majority. Even though Democrats received over a million more votes than Republicans did in the 2012 election, we are shut out. Our Nation's districts have been so gerrymandered, our representative democracy has been skewed beyond recognition.

I also oppose the inclusion of section 2 in the continuing resolution. That provision, which further excuses the Select Committee on Benghazi from adopting written rules to govern its work, does not belong in a rule for a must-pass funding bill; rather, the Benghazi Select Committee, just like every other committee of the House, should be required to meet, debate, and vote in open session on its basic rules and procedures that will govern its work.

The House majority previously tried to free the Benghazi Select Committee from this responsibility when it passed H. Res. 567 and established the committee last May. Four months later, they have realized on the eve of the select committee's first hearing that H. Res. 567 was not adequate; and so they inserted at the last minute a provision that, rather ironically, now excuses the select committee from the express requirement contained in clause 4 of rule XI for committees to adopt written rules to assure that meetings open to the public may be covered by audiovisual which means "in conformity with acceptable standards of dignity, propriety, and decorum."

When H. Res. 567 was brought to the floor for a vote in May, 186 Democrats voted against it. Let me reiterate that what this bill was doing is excusing the Benghazi Select Committee from having written rules like every other committee of the House is required to do. Not a single Republican joined us in voting against what we normally do.

Many of us objected to the creation of the Benghazi Select Committee in the first place as an unnecessary and partisan pursuit. Seven different congressional committees issued nine separate reports that answer the key questions about what went wrong in Benghazi.

Many of us believe that, to the extent any legitimate questions remain, the standing committees of jurisdiction along with Select Committees on Intelligence are fully capable of addressing those and overseeing the implementation of the needed reforms. It is unfortunate that not everyone seems to have the same confidence in the work of their colleagues.

We also objected because H. Res. 567 skews the process by failing to equalize majority and minority representation and resources and by seeking to excuse the select committee from following the basic requirements that apply to other committees of the House.

Basically, that says that we on the minority side have been shut out again. No guarantees and no discussion at all of fairness or openness either in resources, ability to see documents, or to call for witnesses.

I offered an amendment to address many of these concerns, but the effort failed. After much debate about whether even to participate in the select committee's work, Democrat members of the House ultimately agreed to do so in the hope that Republicans would fulfill their promises of a bipartisan, fair, and transparent process.

□ 1245

Just as we were guaranteed an open process at the beginning of the term, we have been had yet once again.

Inserting a last-minute provision in the rule on this must-pass funding bill will allow a select committee to avoid negotiating over or adopting the basic rules and procedures, and it does not honor the promise of openness. It will not win the public's trust. You cannot continually shut out half the Congress.

The Benghazi Select Committee, like every other committee in the House, should be required to meet, debate, and vote in open session on the ground rules that will govern its investigation. What the CR does is fund the government, and the rule for it should not be a means for the House majority to change language governing the highly political Benghazi Select Committee.

Programs and services all over the country cannot continue to run, as we are going to be asking them to do, on a month-to-month basis. They need certainty and reliability, which they clearly aren't getting.

Instead of investing in emerging technologies or medical research, of which we used to be at the forefront, the majority lurches from stopgap to stopgap, and now that strategy has caught up with us. Running the United States Government in 3-month tranches is a true recipe for disaster.

The CR does extend funding for operations of all Federal agencies, programs, and services until December 11

of this year and provides funding at the current annual rate of just over \$1 trillion. However, it does include changes to existing law that are needed to prevent catastrophic, irreversible, or detrimental changes to government programs, specifically to address current national or global crises.

Regarding Ukraine, the CR continues the current flexibility with the State Department and USAID to respond to the ongoing crisis in Ukraine. Congress and the United States must continue to support the Ukrainian people in their fight for a free and democratic country. It is with some delight that we welcome Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko to our Chamber later this week.

The CR also increases funding to address the disability claims backlog at the Department of Veterans Affairs as well as to investigate claims about medical care. We all agree that when our troops come home they deserve the best medical care, and this increase in funding will help to ensure that we provide just that.

Finally, regarding our involvement in confronting the rising threat to the Islamic State, or ISIL, while I am disappointed in the process that led to the continuing resolution, I do agree the House must debate at least one portion of the President's plan. We as Representatives need to debate if or how we arm rebel forces in Syria as well as other tactics in the broader effort. However, I have deep concerns about the ever-louder drumbeat toward war.

The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan claimed the lives of 6,640 of our men and women in uniform and critically wounded 50,450—50,450 come home to an already stressed VA system that cannot adequately care for them. The true cost of a war is not just in dollars, but in lives taken and destroyed, and I urge my colleagues to seriously consider the path before us.

Mr. Speaker, with this continuing resolution, we have an opportunity to avoid a short-term crisis, but if we continue to postpone the fundamental work of Congress, the Nation's economy will be at risk.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising I am going to disagree with my friend about who has and who hasn't done their job and who has been open and who hasn't been open in terms of how they have operated on the floor.

The reality is this House majority has repeatedly brought appropriations bills to the floor and moved them across the floor. Unfortunately, our counterparts and the Democratic majority in the Senate have not been able to do that for whatever reason. It's a little hard to have an appropriations process when the United States Senate will not bring a single appropriations bill to the floor largely because the majority on that side is evidently

afraid of voting on any sort of amendments to an appropriations bill.

Now, if you actually look at the record in terms of who has been open and who hasn't, I remind my friends that the Democrats' 2006 manifesto, "A New Direction for America," states:

Bills should generally come to the floor under a procedure that allows open, full, and fair debate consisting of a full amendment process that grants the minority the right to offer its alternatives, including a substitute.

The fact remains that when Democrats took control of the House they did just the opposite. Throughout the 111th Congress, in the final 2 years of Representative PELOSI's time as Speaker, the House never considered a single bill under an open rule. That is the definition of a closed process.

On the contrary, under Republican control, the House has returned to consideration of appropriation bills under an open process, with 22 open rules. This year alone, the House has considered 404 amendments during the appropriations process, 189 of which were offered by our Democratic colleagues. Contrast that to the United States Senate, where that process has not happened at all.

When you compare the record of the Republican majority to the most recent Democratic majority, any fair analysis will show Republicans are running a much more open, transparent House of Representatives.

Let me also, if I may, Mr. Speaker, turn to the issue of the Benghazi Select Committee. I know that has caused considerable concern, I think, largely based on misunderstanding.

Clause 2(g)(1) of rule XI, which applies to all standing committees and the select committees, mandates that the meetings of the select committee be open to the public, including the press, unless there is a vote conducted in open session to close such a meeting. The rule today only ensures that the logistics for media covering the hearing follow the standing rules of the House. There is no change to the rules governing public access to the meetings of the select committee.

Might I, just for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, actually read the relevant portion of the rules here—" (7) The provisions of paragraphs (f)(1) through (f)(12) of clause 4 of Rule XI shall be considered to be written rules adopted by the select committee as though pursuant to such clause"—essentially applying to the select committee our own rules. That is the only thing that is being done here. It is a technical amendment, certainly no effort to short-circuit the process or make it less transparent.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I know we have had this debate before and this discussion before, blaming everything on the Senate, but the fact is we have not done our job here in the House.

There were several appropriations bills that had committee approval, but none of us ever had the chance to vote for them. They were never brought to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a valued member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and in opposition to the amendment on Syria that will be offered later today and voted on tomorrow.

If it was a bad idea before to get involved in Syria's civil war, why is it now a good idea?

Is it only because ISIL has expanded its operations over a fluid border into Iraq?

How long will we support the Syrian Free Army?

Who are these people?

How much will it cost?

What happens if and when our weapons fall into the wrong hands?

What are the countries in the region offering in terms of substantive solutions?

What is the clearly defined mission?

How does this end?

Do we have answers to any of these questions as we prepare to vote?

We are talking about war, Mr. Speaker. When you drop bombs on people, that is war. And we can talk all we want about so-called boots on the ground, but unless some of our soldiers weren't given shoes, we already have boots on the ground. We need to be honest about that.

We have trained and equipped Iraqi soldiers for over a decade. And for what? To watch them shed their uniforms and to turn their weapons over to ISIL? Is that what we are doing here again, Mr. Speaker?

If the real purpose of U.S. military operations in Syria is to bring the killers of the two American journalists to justice, then perhaps good intelligence and a well-prepared Special Forces operation could do so, just like we hunted down Osama bin Laden.

I want to be perfectly clear on one other point. Any amendment to provide title 10 authority to train and equip Syrian opposition forces must not be seen in any way as an authorization for U.S. Armed Forces to engage in hostilities in Iraq or Syria. It must not be seen as a substitute for specific congressional action.

Authorization to carry out sustained military operations is not something that should be stuck into a conference report. There should be nothing backdoor about it. That would be an insult to our uniformed men and women, an insult to their families, an insult to this House, and an insult to the American people.

On July 25, this House voted 370-40—370-40—in favor of my resolution to require specific congressional authorization for sustained combat operations by U.S. Armed Forces in Iraq. Yet,

since August 8, the U.S. Navy and Air Force have flown more than 2,700 missions against the Islamic State in Iraq, including 156 airstrikes. These airstrikes have occurred almost daily over the past 6 weeks.

Last week, the President announced that those operations will escalate and likely expand into Syria. This morning, they expanded to targets near Baghdad. If that doesn't qualify as sustained combat, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what does.

So, if this House is serious about what it said in July, then we should demand a vote this month on congressional authorization for U.S. military operations in Iraq and Syria. Anything less would constitute yet another failure on the part of this House to carry out its constitutional duties. Anything less would make a mockery of that vote that this House took in July. But, if this leadership gets its way, we will leave Washington for nearly 2 months without such a vote, and I expect and I think we all expect that during that time U.S. combat operations in Iraq and Syria will expand and escalate.

I know this is a hard vote. I know it is politically difficult. But we were not elected to duck the hard votes. We weren't elected to avoid difficult choices. War is a big deal. We need to do our jobs.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will vote "no" on this rule, and I will vote "no" on the Syria amendment.

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

First, I want to respectfully, once again, disagree with my friend from New York on the appropriations process. The reality is we have brought bill after bill to this floor. Every Member has had the opportunity to offer any amendment on seven different bills and to vote "yes" or "no" on their final disposition. The Senate hasn't brought any. And, frankly, at some point the Senate's failure to do its job begins to impact our ability to do ours, because it is very difficult to get time on the floor and use it knowing there is not anything going on on the other side. And that is just the reality of it.

So, if my friends can talk the Senate into beginning to move, I think they would actually find the House, which is already far ahead of them, would continue to work with them and we would actually begin to pass bills. But until the Senate will bring a bill to the floor of any kind for an appropriation, very difficult for us to get our work done over here.

Now I want to address myself, if I may, to my friend and colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN. There is much in what he says that I agree with. Frankly, I think he is correct when he says that we need at some point a full authorization, a full debate, full discussion. He is absolutely right, and I want to commend him for the action he took in his amendment on Iraq in July that we voted on. I was very happy to vote it. So I think, in

substance, I find very little to disagree with in what my friend has to say. I do point out a couple of things, though.

First, and I think my friend is aware of it, the Speaker has actually taken the position that we need a full authorization debate and discussion. And I am told that he conveyed that to the President and actually said he thought this institution, our country, which I know is what we care about supremely, and the President himself would be better off under such discussion. That is a viewpoint that I agree with, and I think many Members on both sides of the aisle and with both points of view on the issue also hold that opinion. So this is actually a decision that has been largely made, in a sense, by the President.

We are trying to respond in a short period of time to what the President has asked us to do, and I think that is an important point to remember in this. This is not a fight on this floor between Democrats and Republicans or even for proponents. I think it is, at another level, a difference in perception about what authority the President has, his view versus probably Congress' view on a bipartisan basis.

□ 1300

I think it is a challenge in terms of timing. It is extremely difficult for the leaders of either Chamber to look like they are undercutting the President at a time of danger and when he has come with this request. We have set 6 hours of debate aside for a reason. If you will remember, the President's original request was simply to drop this measure in the continuing resolution and have no vote and no discussion at all. It was actually our side and your side that insisted that it be pulled out and that a vote and discussion occur. When we come back—again, I share my friend's opinion—I would be prepared to do it before the election. I see no particular need in waiting, but I don't get to make that decision.

At the end of the day, we are giving the Commander in Chief what he is asking for. I think we are trying to be both responsible and helpful. We have actually curtailed considerably what the President asked for. We noted specifically that this does not authorize the use of military force in Syria. We have required reviews. I suspect we will be revisiting this issue again—I certainly would hope so—and I look forward to working with my friend to make sure that we do.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my friend.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the gentleman, and I appreciate his words about his view that we ought to have a vote here in the Congress with regard to authorizing any kind of military operations in Iraq and Syria, and I appreciate his comments last night in the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I think what he is saying and I think what I am saying reflects the sentiment of most Democrats

and Republicans. This is not a partisan issue. I think the gentleman is right in saying that the piece that we are voting on today has nothing to do with bombing Syria or with bombing in Iraq, but that continues, and that has escalated. My concern is that we may very well adjourn by the end of this week and not come back until after the elections, and that that involvement in both of those countries will have deepened, and we have not yet been promised that we will actually have that vote.

I think Members on both sides would feel a little bit more relieved if, in fact, the Speaker would give us an ironclad promise that there will be a vote on an AUMF with regard to Iraq and Syria.

Mr. COLE. In reclaiming my time, if I may, I don't presume to speak for the Speaker. I know that we have this vote largely because the Speaker wanted to make sure that we had a vote, and I know the request that he made of the President. Look, I am not condemning the President on this either. I understand all Executives try to tell you they have the authority to do everything they want. Ours do when we have a Republican, and Democrats do.

All I can say is, at the end of the day, I think we have a robust debate, and we have an opportunity to register opinion. But I want to continue to work with my friend and make sure that we have precisely the kind of debate and discussion and vote that his own amendment in July actually envisioned, because I think my friend is correct. I think this is an issue of constitutional propriety, and I think it is an issue, ultimately, of war and peace, and I think we ought to all vote on it. I would be happy if we did it before the election, but I will work with my friend to make sure that we do it as quickly as possible.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds because I can't resist it, although I am so fond of Mr. COLE, but we can't really blame it on the Senate that we have not done our work over here.

The House was able to find the time to vote 55 times to kill the health care bill, which is providing health insurance for 8 million Americans who didn't have it before. For goodness shakes, we could do that once a week, but we couldn't do the appropriations bills.

Now I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

I want to thank the Speaker, and I want to thank Leader PELOSI for working together to give us an opportunity to vote on this question of developing a Free Syrian Army. Make no mistake: the decision that Congress will make on that question is of great importance because it is, in fact, a major escalation in U.S. involvement.

Mr. Speaker, there is a collective revulsion at what ISIS did in the beheadings of two young Americans, and there is a good people here in this country, where parents saw the possibility of their own sons being in that circumstance, and everything in all of us wants to react to that.

The question is: Is the prospect of creating a Free Syrian Army a good step at this time?

The administration is briefing us. All of us are doing all of the consideration we can. We are going to have a debate on that. I want to ask some questions that I think are important for us to come to a conclusion.

First, I want to compliment President Obama. He did use air power to stop the slaughter of the Yazidis. In that circumstance, he had ground forces, the Peshmerga, and a reliable ally in the Kurdish Government.

Number two, the President was wise not to bomb when they were threatening Baghdad because he saw rightly that the problem was Mr. Maliki, who had created sectarian division and who had really undercut the capacity of his army by putting cronies in instead of good leaders.

Then, third, the President has exercised great restraint about not having us be involved in the maelstrom of the Syrian civil war. That is a Sunni-Shia civil war that is out across the entire belt of Syria and Iraq.

But what do we do?

As for our allies who are in the region—Qatar, the United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Egypt—what are they going to contribute when they are the principal objects of this threat? They have over 1,000 planes among them, and they have armies. We haven't yet seen that.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. WELCH. Second, the vetting process: How on a practical level will that work?

We want the moderate Syrian rebels, but, in fact, we are going to be working with Egypt and with Saudi Arabia. They would nix Muslim Brotherhood participation. They want extreme folks who support the very conservative regime in Saudi Arabia. We are creating a very practical dilemma in the potential success of the so-called "Free Syrian Army."

Finally, is the fundamental issue here one of military leadership or is it one of political reconciliation between Sunni and Shia? Is that a problem that can be solved by our military or is it a problem, ages old—centuries old—in that region, the conflict between Sunni and Shia?

When I consider the contributions that the men and women of our Armed Forces made to Iraq, in which they threw out Saddam Hussein and gave stability and gave an opportunity for the people of that country to decide to live civilly together or in civil war for-

ever, we gave them the chance they deserved.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), my good friend, a fellow member of the Appropriations Committee and a fellow subcommittee chairman.

Mr. KINGSTON. Thank you, Mr. COLE.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make three points about the continuing resolution.

Number one, as an appropriator, I would be remiss in my duty if I did not say we do not like continuing resolutions, because we on the Appropriations Committee have worked hard to pass our bills. We passed seven off the House floor, and the Senate was unable to move one single bill and, as a result, shut down the appropriations process.

The reason Members should be attuned to this is, during the appropriations process, you find out about a lot of programs that need to be discontinued, some that need to be modified, some that need to be enhanced, some that need to be limited altogether. We passed those bills on the House floor through a very vigorous amendment process, and that is a superior way to handle appropriations compared to the continuing resolution method, which just continues programs and really empowers more of the executive branch over the legislative branch.

I believe that Chairman ROGERS and Speaker BOEHNER have worked very hard to return this body to the regular order process of 12 different appropriations bills. We were well on our way to having that happen when the Harry Reid Senate shut down the process, and that is why we are here with the CR today. I am hopeful that we can go back into these bills and improve on the continuing resolution, and I do stand in support of it.

Number two, let me say this about the bill. It has appropriate and important funding to take on the Ebola virus that has broken out in West Africa. This bill provides \$88 million—\$30 million for the CDC—to put staffers on the ground and to address the needs there and then \$58 million to the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority, which is working on the possibility of 12 different vaccines for Ebola. They are not in the marketplace right now. We do not have a vaccine, and we need to do this research. That is why this amendment has been put in the continuing resolution, and it is something that all Members should be attuned to.

I want to remind the Speaker that 2,500 people have already died because of Ebola and that the number who have been infected is somewhere between 3,800 and maybe as high as 4,500, or even higher than that. Getting the number, itself, is very difficult to do.

Then, thirdly, let me say this about the use of force in the McKeon amendment that we are having, and I think Members do deserve to have a separate vote on this. It is important for the

educational process. It is important for the discussion and the debate for the entire country.

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

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

Mr. KINGSTON. As I have looked at the 2001 and the 2002 authorizations for military force, I believe that the President is probably right. I haven't come to a 100 percent conclusion on that, but I believe that he does have that authority. I think it would be far better off for everyone to have a separate vote, and I hope that we can have that happen sooner rather than later. But, in the meantime, this vote is very significant, and Members need not fool themselves that the McKeon amendment does help move this process forward.

When we talk about airstrikes only and training only, and when we have made this decision not to have ground troops, we do not need another half-pregnant war in the Middle East. If it is important enough to fight, it is important enough to win, and we need to give the Commander in Chief all of the resources that he needs to have this victory. People often say airstrikes will get the job done, and they point to the NATO operation in Yugoslavia in 1999—1,000 aircraft, 38,000 combat missions, 2,300 missiles—but the reality is that that war only ended when the President took the next step, and that was to commit ground troops. That is how important this is.

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

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

Mr. KINGSTON. I want to be sure Members look back because that is the example where people say airstrikes alone are sufficient, when they point out the operation in Yugoslavia that was from March 24, 1999, to June 10. Even though we did not have ground troops, the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, General Wesley Clark, said that he was convinced that the planning and preparation for ground intervention, in particular, pushed Milosevic to concede. We need to be very, very careful and mindful about this. If it is worth fighting, it is worth winning, and if it is something we are going to win, we need to give the Commander in Chief all of the tools that he needs to have a victory.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, the Middle Eastern tragedy in which this resolution will further entangle America is directly related to the wholly unnecessary Bush-Cheney invasion of Iraq. Having learned so little from the sacrifices of that conflict, the Congress now approves greater involvement in a Syrian civil war that has already taken almost 200,000 lives.

The administration has affirmed this very day that what it is talking about

is definitely a war, a declaration of war, while it seeks to avoid this Congress declaring that war, a Congress in which too many of the people's representatives fear making a decision today on whether to declare war.

□ 1315

Instead, we vote on an amendment here to authorize the administration to do what it is already doing in Jordan, while declining to consider a vote on what it should not do without specific congressional authorization.

Reliance on resolutions approved by this Congress on this floor over a decade ago, in 2001 and 2002, is very instructive. First, it shows the dangers of open-ended authorizations. Resolutions such as the one we have today will not only govern the actions of President Obama but future Presidents as well.

Second, once begun, this Congress, even under Democratic control, has shown little ability to contain war. Third, despite billions expended and with courageous Americans on the ground, the results over more than a decade of trying to successfully train Iraqis and Afghans is not particularly encouraging; indeed, the reality is the American taxpayers have been compelled to pay for the arms for our enemies as well as for our allies; nor do we have any explanation today as to how taking a few Syrians for training in Saudi Arabia—a country with its own brutal history of regular beheadings, financing extremists around the world, and opposing democracy most everywhere—how that will work better than our previous training on the ground with Americans.

Rejecting the resolution today does not mean that we should do nothing. When Americans are brutally murdered, the President already has the necessary authority, which he should use forcefully, to go after these barbaric murderers. There is a significant difference between confronting the savagery of ISIS and initiating a multiyear war in the region.

With the steadily growing number of U.S. military on the ground in Iraq now approaching 2,000 and recurrent demands from the same people that led us wrongly into Iraq in the first place that we add even more on the ground, the danger of escalation is very real.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. Now, with our military leaders conceding that ISIS is a regional threat, it would kill as many Americans as it could—if it could—just as is true of some of the terrorist groups today in Africa; but, with it being a regional threat, not a threat to our homeland today, the question arises of why the countries in the region—who are more directly impacted from ISIS—why aren't they providing the bulk of the resources necessary to confront it?

They are always content to have Americans kill as many of their en-

emies in their centuries-old conflict as we will kill. They would let the Americans do all of the bleeding and all of the paying for this conflict. A photo-op with 40 countries does not an army make.

Ultimately, this resolution, like our previous unwise invasion, will make our families less secure, not more secure, and that should be the ultimate test of our actions.

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

I just wanted to quickly note that I actually agree with a very good deal of what my friend from Texas has to say.

I do want to correct him on one item. The amendment we are talking about is not like the authorizations of 2001 and 2002, mostly because it is very finely tailored to limit the executive branch.

It actually runs out on December 11 or earlier if we actually pass a National Defense Authorization Act and deal with the Syrian issue in that context; so it is very limited in terms of time, very limited in terms of scope. It explicitly states that it does not authorize military action in Syria.

With all due respect, I would suggest that most of my friend's disagreements are with this administration. They are largely disagreements with the President. The Speaker is doing what he can to provide an opportunity for us to debate and express that in the continuing resolution, and I will work with my friend from Texas to make sure that we have a fuller, more robust debate because I think the country deserves that, and I think my friend is right to demand it.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that makes two changes: first, it would strike a special waiver for the Benghazi Select Committee that lets them avoid the transparent and deliberative process of debating and voting on their own written rules for media access, which every other committee has to do; second, we would bring up the bill introduced by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank for 7 years, bringing certainty and stability to an agency that helps to create jobs in the United States.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. HECK of Washington. I thank the gentlewoman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose the previous question so that I might, indeed, offer H.R. 4950 to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank for 7 years instead of what the underlying continuing resolution would do, which would reauthorize it for 9 years.

I do so for two reasons: number one, the argument of certainty—here is the truth: the fact of the matter is a 9-

month extension of the Export-Import Bank is not certainty. Here is the truth: we are already losing business because of the cloud of the debate that hangs over this Chamber with respect to the continuation of the Export-Import Bank, and that is documented, I might add; so we need certainty.

Everybody who comes from the private sector has made that argument on this floor. I come from the private sector. I make that argument.

The truth of the matter is this: the number one advocate for eliminating the Export-Import Bank likes the idea of a 9-month extension because it plays into his hands of getting rid of it.

Now, I take the gentleman from Oklahoma at his word. I know him to be a gentleman of honor and integrity, and I appreciate, deeply, his words in support of the Export-Import Bank, but the Export-Import Bank will be weakened with this language and will be subject to termination at the end of June 30 when it is isolated and left alone.

One of the arguments that is offered for 9 months is to give time for an effort to develop a reform proposal. I know of one such effort underway by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FINCHER), and he is operating in absolute good faith. There is no question in my mind. He is working hard to get there.

There is equally no question in my mind that the effort to extend the Ex-Im, if we do it for 9 months, will be severely weakened, severely weakened. There is no assurance. There is no certainty that it will go beyond that date. We have a proposal that would do that, which has 201 signatures on it as co-sponsors, I might add.

The second reason, the Export-Import Bank makes America stronger. It created 205,000 jobs last year. It reduced our Nation's deficit by \$1 billion in October when that amount of money was transferred to the U.S. Treasury. It creates jobs, and it creates good-paying jobs, manufacturing jobs. It enables America to compete in an increasingly global economy.

Most people lose sight of the fact that, just since the year 1980, global trade has increased fivefold. I beseech the House: do not unilaterally disarm.

Here is the truth: 59 other countries, virtually every developed nation on the face of the planet, has an export credit authority, and most of them are larger than ours, expressed either in terms of absolute dollars or percentage of their gross domestic product.

For us to allow the Export-Import Bank to expire is to unilaterally disarm in an increasingly global trade-driven economy. For us to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank for 9 months is to tee it up for elimination, and you know this in your heart. You know this in your heart because the advocate for doing away with it thinks this is a good idea and has as much said that it tees it up for elimination.

The Export-Import Bank is good for America. It makes America stronger.

It creates jobs. It creates good-paying jobs, and it enables us to compete in a global economy.

I ask you to defeat the previous question so that we might offer a longer-term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

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

I want to thank my friend from Washington for his kind words. I couldn't agree more with him about the Export-Import Bank. I think it is a very important institution that ought to be reauthorized, and I intend to work with my friend to make sure that happens when the time comes.

I don't think, as a rule, reauthorization in a continuing resolution is a good idea. I think it is much more appropriate, particularly for a matter this controversial and this serious—and, again, I agree with the substance of what my friend says—that we go through a normal committee process and that we come to the floor and have a full debate. I don't think this is the appropriate vehicle for that.

While I look forward to working with my friend on the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank, I doubt that it is going to happen in this particular vehicle so, hopefully, in the new Congress, as we make persuasive arguments, as my friend has advanced, we will find that we get the broad bipartisan support we need to do that reauthorization.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the majority's insistence on brinkmanship and short-term solutions threatens the Nation's economy, and regular appropriations bills have been replaced with fiscal cliffs, temporary stopgap measures, massive omnibus bills, and government shutdowns.

It is far past time that this Chamber's majority party does the good work of government and works to provide stability to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" to defeat the previous question. Vote "no" on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I do want to revisit, in closing, this issue of appropriations and openness, and I want to remind my friends on the other side of some recent history.

In 2010, when my Democratic colleagues controlled the House, they only considered two appropriations bills. At that time, by the way, they also had control of the Senate. I presume it would have been easier for them to

have cooperated with a Democratic Senate than for us, but perhaps not because they only got two appropriations bills done the last year they were in the majority.

My colleagues deviated from the longstanding practice of open rules for appropriations bills by making in order only 40 amendments that year. You heard that correctly. Democrats considered two of 12 bills, with only 40 amendments made in order.

This year, Republicans have considered seven of 12 bills, considering 404 amendments, 189 of them which were offered by my Democratic colleagues. I will let the American people decide who has the better record on actually bringing appropriations bills to the floor and opening them up for full consideration by this House.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate all of those who spoke today for the sincerity and the thoughtfulness of the debate. I particularly know that we probably find ourselves on common ground in wanting to make sure the government doesn't shut down, pass a continuing resolution.

It is interesting to me that that was not the subject of a great deal of contention; so I would hope that is something that brings us together. It is something that, certainly, the Speaker wants to accomplish, but the President and the majority leader want to accomplish that as well. Surely, we can find a bipartisan amendment for that.

Obviously, the great issue of the day and this week is going to be this discussion over the Syrian matter, and, again, I want to congratulate my colleagues for the seriousness with which they are approaching this.

I think we have all learned some very hard lessons in the last 13 years, and I am pleased that the amendment that would bring to the floor—an amendment, by the way, the President didn't particularly want.

I would recall for the RECORD that the President wanted this authorization for active title 10 authority for him to train Syrians to simply be dropped into the continuing resolution. It was the Speaker with the support of the Democratic leadership as well that wanted to make sure that we had a separate vote and discussion on this issue. I think that is a very good thing.

Now, I agree with my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). I would prefer a much more robust and fuller discussion, and I hope we reach that point. I think that is exactly the course that the Speaker recommended to the President.

□ 1330

He said:

I think the institution that I preside over will be better served, I think you will be better served, and I think the country will be better served if we have that debate.

I know the Speaker made every effort to get to that point. Others have a different point of view. I respect the President. Like most Chief Executives,

he has had to take some very expansive views of his authority under the Constitution.

I recognize some people, frankly, are concerned about having this vote ahead of an election. Personally, I would prefer to do it ahead of an election, but I don't get to make those decisions, and I think the Speaker has done the best that he can do in reconciling all the conflicting opinions between the Senate, the House, and the executive branch and has managed to bring us at least something that is a serious debate and will be taken seriously by the country; moreover, I am particularly pleased that my chairman, Mr. SESSIONS, on the Rules Committee made sure that we will have not a cursory debate but 6 hours of debate.

If any Member wants to voice their opinion, 6 hours is an awful lot of time. I suspect they are going to have the opportunity to come down here and do that, and I hope they will.

I think what we are going to see is probably a bipartisan opposition to the amendment and bipartisan support. Frankly, in issues of war and peace, that is probably the better way for us to proceed; so I think it is a challenging situation. I think all concerned are trying to work together and do the right thing and to present clarity.

I just want to go on record once again, personally, as hoping that as soon as possible that we come back—the President asked for broad authority—that we repeal the '01 and '02 resolution, something the President has asked us to do himself before, and work together and present a more precisely defined and limited resolution that gives him the authority to act robustly in the defense of our country, to punish people who commit the barbarous acts that we have seen in recent weeks, and to do the things that are necessary with the full bipartisan support of Congress to secure the security of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying resolution upholds the primary responsibility the American people have sent us here to do, ensuring the continued funding of the government. While not my first choice, passage of a continuing resolution is better than any of the alternatives; additionally, it provides the President the additional authority he has requested to degrade and destroy ISIL.

I would urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 722 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

Strike section 2 of the resolution and insert the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4950) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States for 7 years, and for other purposes. The first

reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4950.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amend-

ment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote ordering on the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered, and suspending the rules and passing S. 2154.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 188, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 498]

YEAS—224

Aderholt	Crenshaw	Hall
Amash	Culberson	Hanna
Amodei	Daines	Harper
Bachus	Davis, Rodney	Hartzler
Barletta	Denham	Hastings (WA)
Barr	Dent	Heck (NV)
Benish	DeSantis	Hensarling
Bentivolio	Diaz-Balart	Herrera Beutler
Bilirakis	Duffy	Holding
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Hudson
Black	Duncan (TN)	Huelskamp
Blackburn	Ellmers	Huizenga (MI)
Boustany	Farenthold	Hultgren
Brady (TX)	Fincher	Hurt
Brooks (AL)	Fitzpatrick	Issa
Brooks (IN)	Fleischmann	Jenkins
Broun (GA)	Fleming	Johnson (OH)
Buchanan	Flores	Johnson, Sam
Bucshon	Forbes	Jolly
Burgess	Fortenberry	Jones
Byrne	Fox	Jordan
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	Joyce
Camp	Frelinghuysen	Kelly (PA)
Campbell	Gardner	King (IA)
Carter	Garrett	King (NY)
Cassidy	Gerlach	Kingston
Chabot	Gibbs	Kline
Chaffetz	Gibson	Labrador
Clawson (FL)	Gingrey (GA)	LaMalfa
Coble	Gohmert	Lamborn
Coffman	Goodlatte	Lance
Cole	Gosar	Lankford
Collins (GA)	Gowdy	Latham
Collins (NY)	Granger	Latta
Conaway	Graves (GA)	LoBiondo
Cook	Graves (MO)	Long
Costa	Griffin (AR)	Lucas
Cotton	Griffith (VA)	Luetkemeyer
Cramer	Grimm	Lummis
Crawford	Guthrie	Marchant

Marino	Price (GA)	Smith (NE)
Massie	Reed	Smith (NJ)
McAllister	Reichert	Smith (TX)
McCarthy (CA)	Renacci	Southerland
McCaul	Ribble	Stewart
McClintock	Rice (SC)	Stivers
McHenry	Rigell	Stockman
McKeon	Roby	Stutzman
McKinley	Roe (TN)	Terry
McMorris	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (PA)
Rodgers	Rogers (KY)	Thornberry
Meadows	Rogers (MI)	Tiberi
Meehan	Rohrabacher	Tipton
Messer	Rokita	Turner
Mica	Rooney	Upton
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Valadao
Miller (MI)	Roskam	Wagner
Mullin	Ross	Walberg
Mulvaney	Rothfus	Walden
Murphy (PA)	Royce	Walorski
Neugebauer	Runyan	Weber (TX)
Noem	Ryan (WI)	Webster (FL)
Nugent	Salmon	Wenstrup
Nunes	Sanford	Westmoreland
Olson	Scalise	Whitfield
Palazzo	Schock	Williams
Paulsen	Schweikert	Wilson (SC)
Pearce	Scott, Austin	Wittman
Perry	Sensenbrenner	Wolf
Petri	Sessions	Womack
Pittenger	Shimkus	Woodall
Pitts	Shuster	Yoder
Poe (TX)	Simpson	Yoho
Pompeo	Sinema	Young (AK)
Posey	Smith (MO)	Young (IN)

NAYS—188

Barber	Grayson	Nadler
Barrow (GA)	Green, Al	Napolitano
Bass	Green, Gene	Neal
Beatty	Grijalva	Negrete McLeod
Becerra	Hahn	Nolan
Bera (CA)	Hanabusa	O'Rourke
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Owens
Bishop (NY)	Heck (WA)	Pallone
Blumenauer	Higgins	Pascarelli
Bonamici	Himes	Pastor (AZ)
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Payne
Bralley (IA)	Honda	Perlmutter
Brown (FL)	Horsford	Peters (CA)
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Peters (MI)
Bustos	Huffman	Peterson
Butterfield	Israel	Pingree (ME)
Capps	Jackson Lee	Pocan
Capuano	Jeffries	Polis
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Quigley
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Rahall
Cartwright	Keating	Rangel
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Richmond
Chu	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Ciulline	Kildee	Ruiz
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Ruppersberger
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Ryan (OH)
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cleaver	Kuster	Sanchez, Loretta
Clyburn	Langevin	Sarbanes
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Levin
Cooper	Lipinski	Schneider
Courtney	Loeb	Schrader
Cuellar	Loeb	Schwartz
Cummings	Loftgren	Scott (VA)
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Scott, David
Davis, Danny	Lowey	Serrano
DeGette	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Sewell (AL)
Delaney	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Shea-Porter
DeLauro	Lynch	Sherman
DelBene	Maffei	Sires
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	Slughter
Dingell	Matheson	Smith (WA)
Doggett	Matsui	Speier
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Swalwell (CA)
Duckworth	McCollum	Takano
Ellison	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Engel	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Enyart	McIntyre	Tierney
Eshoo	McNerney	Titus
Esty	Meeks	Tonko
Farr	Meng	Tsongas
Fattah	Michaud	Van Hollen
Foster	Miller, George	Vargas
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Veasey
Fudge	Moran	Vela
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Velázquez
Gallego		Visclosky
Garamendi		Walz
Garcia		

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters

Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Bachmann
Barton
Bridenstine
Capito
Castor (FL)
Crowley
DeFazio

DesJarlais
Edwards
Gutiérrez
Harris
Holt
Hunter
Kinzinger (IL)

Maloney,
Carolyn
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Rush

□ 1402

Messrs. CICILLINE, SCHNEIDER, and ISRAEL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 192, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 499]

YEAS—221

Aderholt
Amodel
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes

Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kiene
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer

Lummis
Marchant
Marino
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
McMorris
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus

Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)

Amash
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gosar
Grayson

NAYS—192

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebisack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Massei
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebisack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Massei
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

DesJarlais
Edwards
Harris
Holt
Hunter
Kinzinger (IL)

DesJarlais
Edwards
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Rush

□ 1412

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES FOR CHILDREN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2154) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 4, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 500]

YEAS—410

Aderholt
Amodel
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole

Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce