

Rogers (MI)	Sewell (AL)	Valadao
Rohrabacher	Shea-Porter	Van Hollen
Rokita	Sherman	Vargas
Ros-Lehtinen	Shimkus	Veasey
Roskam	Shuster	Vela
Ross	Simpson	Velázquez
Rothfus	Sinema	Visclosky
Roybal-Allard	Sires	Wagner
Royce	Slaughter	Walberg
Ruiz	Smith (MO)	Walden
Runyan	Smith (NE)	Walorski
Ruppersberger	Smith (NJ)	Walz
Rush	Smith (TX)	Wasserman
Ryan (OH)	Smith (WA)	Schultz
Ryan (WI)	Southerland	Waters
Salmon	Speier	Waxman
Sánchez, Linda T.	Stewart	Weber (TX)
	Stivers	Webster (FL)
Sanchez, Loretta	Stockman	Welch
Sanford	Stutzman	Wenstrup
Sarbanes	Swalwell (CA)	Westmoreland
Scalise	Takano	Whitfield
Schakowsky	Terry	Williams
Schiff	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Schneider	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (SC)
Schock	Thompson (PA)	Wittman
Schrader	Thornberry	Wolf
Schwartz	Tiberi	Womack
Schweikert	Tierney	Woodall
Scott (VA)	Tipton	Yarmuth
Scott, Austin	Titus	Yoder
Scott, David	Tonko	Yoho
Sensenbrenner	Tsongas	Young (AK)
Serrano	Turner	Young (IN)
Sessions	Upton	

NOT VOTING—12

Barletta	Castor (FL)	Hastings (FL)
Barton	Conyers	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (NY)	DesJarlais	Nunnelee
Byrne	Harris	Rooney

□ 1359

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS
RESOLUTION, 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXF). Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule 19, further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 124) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed on Tuesday, September 16, 2014, 3 hours and 30½ minutes of debate remained on the amendment printed in part B of House Report 113-600 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) has 1 hour and 41½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) has 1 hour and 49 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), my friend and colleague.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of something that I am for, and that is the chairman's amendment as he has presented it.

Madam Speaker, I think that for so many of us who represent men and

women in uniform who comprise our fighting forces and who have been so diligent in this battle, in this war on terrorism, we look at these votes and certainly it causes us concern; and we know that the measure that the House is taking up is a measure as requested by the President—we recognize that—and we recognize, also, the severity and importance of the issue.

Madam Speaker, this is an issue that should require the full attention of every member and every staff member of this body. And I think that we all approach this—I do—with a lot of questions, and we realize that what the Commander in Chief has asked for is really, in the opinion of so many of the men and women that I represent, a half measure.

I wish we would see more leadership, and I am hopeful that in days to come we will see leadership from our Commander in Chief. That is what the men and women deserve, and that is what the American people deserve as we seek to protect our homeland.

I wish that we could stand here and say this administration has learned their lessons, because they have so mishandled the drawdown in Iraq. And the rhetoric of al Qaeda being on the run was truly a disservice to our military forces and to our men and women in uniform and to the American people.

It would be my hope that as we take a first step that we recenter our focus and commit to annihilating ISIL from the face of the Earth.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, the threat from ISIS is real. All of us have seen the violence and the barbarism of ISIS. The rapid advance of ISIS militants within Iraq and Syria is an immediate threat to these countries in the region.

No one should be under any delusion about what will happen if the U.S. sits this one out. If unchecked, the ISIS threat will grow and become even more difficult to address down the road and directly threaten our Nation.

As we have seen since President Obama authorized the limited airstrikes against ISIS in August, we have the ability to mitigate the ISIS threat, but we cannot defeat ISIS by ourselves with U.S. airstrikes.

Thomas Friedman said it well in The New York Times:

ISIS loses if our moderate Arab-Muslim partners can unite and make this a civil war within Islam—a civil war in which America is the air force for the Sunnis and Shiites of decency versus those of barbarism . . . It is about them and who they want to be.

As I see it, an important aspect of U.S. assistance under this amendment in the training of Syrian rebels is that it will be an occasion for nations with a Sunni majority to join in a battle against the fanatical Sunni ISIS. Hope-

fully, this can lead to expanded involvement of other nations in this battle at the same time as Iraq's Shi'a majority, with our active encouragement, finally provides full rights and participation for its Sunni and Kurdish minorities.

So amidst all the difficulties and the challenges—and they are serious and many—this amendment can hopefully serve as a stepping stone, as a stepping stone to a broad-based, effective coalition against the spread of ISIS.

Our country can provide air support, can provide intelligence and other logistics, but in the end, it cannot achieve for the people of Syria and Iraq on the ground what they can only do for themselves.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), my colleague and the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California, the chairman, whose amendment I support here today, and I will support any measure that will lead to the destruction of ISIS.

This administration has known about this threat for over a year. It wasn't until the two beheadings of an American journalist and a British aid worker that the American people really understood the pure evil that is ISIS. The White House has been sending mixed messages. Words do matter.

Finally, I believe this administration realized, despite its flawed narrative over the years, what the threat from ISIS really is. In fact, General Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, said, to fully defeat ISIS, we have to go into Syria. I agree with him. We must cut off the head of the snake wherever it exists, and it does exist in Syria.

While limited in nature, this authorization will begin the process to do just that by vetting, equipping, and training moderate forces by the United States military in Saudi Arabia.

I had some reservations about the vetting process. I did visit with Pentagon officials, and I got greater confidence. I do believe the numbers are a little bit too low, but the broader strategy under General Allen is to lead a coalition not only of NATO allies, but of these moderate Sunni nations to build a ground force in Syria which currently does not exist.

It is vital, Madam Speaker, that Sunni moderates stand up, Sunni moderates and Arab nations step up to the plate to defeat and combat Sunni extremists in their own backyard.

While this is a step in the right direction, I believe that, long term, the administration needs to come forward with a comprehensive strategy, one that the American people and Congress can debate, which could be fully authorized by Congress.

In closing, Madam Speaker, there is nothing more important that we debate up here, that we talk about here,

that we vote on up here than matters of war and peace. It is for that reason that I support this amendment. For, if we do not hit ISIS overseas, they will certainly hit us in the United States.

Mr. SMITH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this amendment.

I don't take that lightly. I spent 18 years on the Armed Services Committee and about 12 years on the Homeland Security Committee, and with any decision like this, we have to weigh what we know and what we don't know.

We know that, if left unchecked, ISIS would become a direct threat not only to the United States, but possibly to the entire world. That is why we are going after them currently in Iraq with partners that we know we can trust, such as the Kurds.

We know that we cannot sit on our hands, close our eyes, and hope that ISIS goes away. That is why we need a good plan.

We know that we cannot do this alone, that we need a committed international coalition to stop ISIS.

The President says we have a coalition of 40. You know, it is interesting because I remember the Iraq war and the coalition. Some of our coalition members sent one person. I would really like to know who our coalition is and what they are really going to do before I vote for any plan.

What don't we know? We don't know how moderate these Syrian rebels really are. In fact, some of my Syrian constituents, Syrian Americans who live in Orange County, have told me that there are no moderates left or, worse, that the moderates, given the choice between losing or Assad or ISIS, want ISIS, and they say people aren't going to fight against ISIS.

We don't know if somewhere down the line they will turn our guns right back on us. In fact, that is one of the scarier things that we have to face. We simply don't know who we can trust. In an uncontrolled, war-torn destabilized country, who do we trust?

We can look back, for example, at what happened in Central America, how the rebels there, who were armed by the United States, went after innocent civilians. This blood will be on our hands when that happens.

We need a winning strategy to degrade and ultimately destroy ISIS.

Now, we are in an election season. Everybody says this isn't political, but I know, I have been talking to colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and some are wondering what they do 7 weeks away from an election.

I have got to tell you, this is not a political vote. The last time people took a political vote in this House, it was on the Iraq war, and many of my colleagues say it was the worst vote they took.

□ 1415

Mr. McKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), my friend and colleague.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I thank our chairman.

This proposal just examines one piece of the puzzle, not the totality of the Syrian crisis. The White House should have come to Congress for a full authorization for use of military force in Syria to put all of our options on the table with no limitations.

ISIS is part of the radical Islam threat, which the 9/11 Commission identified as a serious threat to U.S. national security and to world peace and stability.

I have serious reservations about the President's plan to train and equip the so-called "moderate opposition" in Syria because we don't want ISIL to get even more of our equipment and arms, as it did in Iraq.

ISIL is not the only terror group in Syria, Madam Speaker, nor is it the only hurdle for stability in Syria and Iraq. There are dangerous terrorist groups operating in Syria, like al-Nusra and other terrorist organizations, that are waiting to take up the mantle should ISIL fall. And, then, of course, Assad is still responsible for the deaths of over 200,000 people.

Last year, the President failed to act militarily when Assad used chemical weapons against his own people. We cannot have a plan that does not address the removal of Assad simultaneously alongside the destruction of ISIL and other terrorist threats.

Even though I will vote for the McKeon amendment, we still won't be approaching this situation in a comprehensive manner that is required.

We were successful in isolating Iran with sanctions until we unraveled that with these nuclear negotiations. We can do the same in Syria. I am afraid that this misguided negotiations approach in Iran will preempt many to acquiesce and take a deal that will undermine our national security and leave Iran with enrichment capabilities.

That, Madam Speaker, is a real and present danger in the Middle East: a nuclear Iran. This could be a calamity for the region and U.S. national security interests, such as the safety and the security of our strong ally, the democratic Jewish State of Israel.

Yesterday, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dempsey, revealed that the use of military forces on the ground may be needed in Syria. If our military officials believe that it is absolutely necessary to use the U.S. military on the ground, I would fully support that.

We cannot take anything off the table and showcase to the terrorists what we are not willing to do. The full range of United States political, economic, and military power must be brought to bear against this radical threat. Announcing to the enemy a

self-imposed limit on the part of our arsenal is signaling that we do not possess the necessary will to prevail against radical Islam.

I thank the chairman for the leadership.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank the gentleman for his leadership. I thank Mr. McKEON for his leadership.

We will see today a bipartisan action, bipartisan action on behalf of America, on behalf of its security, on behalf of our international partners in confronting terrorism.

Madam Speaker, today, the House is fulfilling one of its most important responsibilities: to protect our national security and defend our interests overseas. Among those interests is to prevent the dangerous ISIL terrorist group from spreading and threatening American personnel, our allies, and innocent civilians.

The amendment before us will authorize the President to train and equip moderate Syrian opposition to degrade and destroy ISIL in Iraq and Syria. No sanctuaries, no place to hide. ISIL is already threatening Americans and our allies in the Middle East and Europe; and, if left unchecked, it will surely threaten us here at home.

This amendment is Congress' opportunity to demonstrate unity in support of the President's strategy and provide him with the authorization he needs to help train and equip our regional partners to go on the offense against ISIL. ISIL has already murdered and captured soldiers, innocent civilians, and journalists, including, of course, two Americans, and members of religious communities have been targeted, targeted for their faith. They are no more than a collection of criminal terrorists bent on imposing their fanatical objectives on others by force, violence, and barbarism.

ISIL constitutes a dual threat. They pose a counterterrorism threat to the United States and our regional partners and they represent a destabilizing force in the region.

Madam Speaker, we cannot ignore the challenge that ISIL presents to America and to the world. There is no question that there will be challenges. But we know empirically the cost of doing nothing is far too great.

The President was right to wait until a government had been formed in Iraq that is ready to move forward against ISIL. Americans don't want American women and men on the ground, but Americans do want ISIL confronted. Congress has an important role to play in this effort, and this amendment ought to be a strong and clear message to the world that the American people, through their elected representatives, will join those in the region to prevent the terrorist group ISIL from running rampant across the Middle East.

It is a message to our allies and regional partners that our Nation is prepared to train and equip those who are working to stop ISIL's advance. And it is a message to the world that we are united in our resolve to meet this threat. We clearly may have differences on this House floor, but we are Americans when it comes to defending our people and our country.

Madam Speaker, with regard to the underlying bill, the continuing resolution, let me make some brief comments.

House Republicans have chosen not to repeat their government shutdown from last year. I think they are making a wise decision.

There are things I would change in this bill, just as I know there are things my friends on the Republican side would change in this bill. That is compromise. That is the legislative process. That is what our Founding Fathers envisioned. That, in fact, is governing.

I am hopeful that this continuing resolution will give Congress the time it needs to complete work on appropriations for the fiscal year 2015 that meet our obligations to the American people and to America's future.

We need a budget that embraces fiscal sustainability while investing in job growth and competitiveness so that we can grow our middle class.

While it is important that Congress move forward with this 72-day funding bill, I am disappointed, Madam Speaker, that we are not extending the Export-Import Bank's charter for multiple years. Not doing so is another example of undermining our competitive position for the world and the competence of our job creators.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. As CNBC pointed out last week:

At first glance, it might seem like a congressional deal to extend the Export-Import Bank's charter through June would be good news for the beleaguered institution, which supports American exports with loan guarantees and other credit assistance. In fact, it is the exact opposite. An extension to June could be a death sentence for the bank.

I sincerely pray it is not.

Congress has a responsibility to make sure the bank's charter is extended beyond June. We need a multiyear reauthorization along the lines of the one proposed by Ranking Member WATERS and Representative DENNY HECK.

The Export-Import Bank is instrumental in helping small businesses access foreign markets, and uncertainty over its future has already cost American businesses lucrative trade deals.

I urge us between now and June to come together in a bipartisan way to move forward with legislation that achieves this goal. I believe if the House is allowed to vote, we will

achieve that objective, as we have in the past.

While I oppose this provision, I will vote for the amendment and for final passage of the continuing resolution, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. I think it is in the best interest of America, the best interest of our national security, and I urge this House to act in a way that will make our constituents proud and safer.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may comment.

I have a letter that was written to myself and Ranking Member SMITH from four of our leading experts in the area, former Ambassadors to the area, and former generals: Ryan C. Crocker, Robert S. Ford, General Jack M. Keane, and General David H. Petraeus. This letter was dated this morning:

Dear Chairman McKeon and Ranking Member Smith:

We write to express our strong support for congressional authorization of the provision of assistance and training to properly vetted members of the Syrian opposition.

The Free Syrian Army is simultaneously fighting both the murderous regime of Bashar al-Assad and the barbaric Islamic State in Iraq and al-Sham. Providing greater assistance to the Free Syrian Army is the United States' best opportunity to develop a moderate force that is capable of defeating ISIL and bringing about a post-Assad Syria that is free of terror.

As you may know, Free Syrian Army forces have recently achieved some successes on the ground against ISIL forces in northern Syria, but their effectiveness is limited by their lack of sufficient assistance and training.

Building up the moderate opposition in Syria will be a key element of any successful strategy against ISIL. To be sure, after 3 years of war, it will take a long time to build the moderate opposition. But there is no viable alternative. The United States must set to this task immediately.

Finally, we note that approval of this measure should not prevent or circumscribe Congress from considering a properly scoped authorization for the use of military force in the future, or from otherwise revisiting or revising its position on this issue as conditions on the ground evolve. But time is of the essence, and we are convinced of the urgent need for Congress to authorize this effort.

Sincerely, Ambassador Ryan C. Crocker; Ambassador Robert S. Ford; General Jack M. Keane, USA, Retired; and General David H. Petraeus, USA, Retired.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), my friend and colleague, a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my good friend, and the chairman, whom I am very, very lucky and honored to serve under and serve with.

Madam Speaker, I oppose this amendment. It is not an easy vote. I have been looking for reasons to support this amendment and I can't find it.

This amendment does nothing to destroy the Islamic state. This amendment does not crush the Islamic state.

What this amendment does is start training Islamists to fight Islamists, and we may have that Islamist army to fight Islamists in a matter of a few years.

I will not vote for something that I know will not work. Arming Islamists to fight other Islamists is not a winning strategy. I don't believe the weapons and tactics that we bestow to the Islamists will only be used against America's enemies. We have been through this before in Iraq and Afghanistan. I think I am one of the only people speaking here today who has served in the U.S. Marine Corps in Iraq and Afghanistan.

In a confusing situation with many warring factions on all sides, the last thing that we should do is arm Islamic rebels to fight other Islamic rebels.

□ 1430

The truth is that the President invited the Islamic State into Iraq when he removed our eyes and ears on the ground and removed the U.S. military from Iraq 2 years ago. We will continue to be at war with radical Islam in this area well into the future, but that doesn't matter now. What matters is that the Islamic State is on the march, and it presents a serious regional threat.

We need to crush the Islamic State. We need to kill them. We need to destroy them. We need to burn the Islamic State to the ground, and you don't do that by training Islamic Syrians. You don't crush the Islamic State by training Islamists to fight other Islamists.

Arming Islamic fighters is no longer a viable strategy. It was a year ago, it was 2 years ago, but it is not now. There is no confidence that we are arming the right people, and there is no assurance that those weapons and U.S. tactics and U.S. communications gear won't fall into the wrong hands.

The Saudi Arabians are going to help us fight in Syria. If I remember right, Madam Speaker, the Saudi Arabians provided the majority of the hijackers who killed 3,000 Americans on 9/11. I refuse to stand with the Saudi Arabians.

We need to crush ISIS, not work on training more Islamic radicals.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

I rise in support of the McKeon amendment to grant the President the authority needed to fund and train Syrian opposition forces and counter the threat posed by ISIS.

Since the September 11 attacks, our Nation has taken the fight to terrorists. Our brave men and women in uniform supported by the defense and intelligence agencies have kept us safe from another attack on American soil. Now, our allies on the ground in the Middle East must take the fight to

ISIS, supported by our air power, arms, and expertise.

I agree with the administration that the most effective way for the United States to realize this goal is providing training and equipment to our allies in Iraq and select groups among the Syrian opposition. This is not a situation that can be solved by the introduction of U.S. troops into combat. In fact, such a response would jeopardize the gains made recently following the air campaign over Iraq.

It is vital, however, that the Syrian opposition groups selected to receive support be fully vetted by the administration to ensure to the greatest extent possible that no weapons or expertise will end up in the hands of our enemies, whether they be the Islamic State or another bad actor involved in the conflict.

We must only provide support to those groups that both the Department of Defense and State have determined to have the greatest chance of success. While there are no guarantees in this situation, the administration must take appropriate steps to minimize the risk and avoid repeating history.

It must also be made clear that these efforts are not the first step of an ever-escalating conflict ending with widespread U.S. involvement in a combat role. Our allies in the Arab world, both Sunni and Shi'a, must be the leaders of the international alliance to combat ISIS.

Only through a coalition and widespread involvement of Arab nations will these efforts succeed and not be seen as yet another chapter of Sunni on Shi'a violence or another chapter in a war between the Christian West and the Muslim Middle East. Our allies must make significant military commitments to support moderate groups in opposition to ISIS.

Finally, the administration must be able to give a clear view of their long-term strategy and goals going forward. Entering a conflict without clear objectives and an exit strategy is not a situation that any Member of the House wishes to repeat.

I urge my colleagues to support the McKeon amendment.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), my friend and the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Madam Speaker, we face an enemy who poses a grave and growing threat to the United States and our allies, a threat that has been ignored for too long and must no longer be tolerated.

I know that many of us in this Chamber from both sides of the aisle believe that the President's strategy should do more to eradicate those extremists from the Earth, but despite those reservations—reservations that I share—we must support this amendment and take this first step towards a comprehensive strategy to combat these brutal terrorists.

Voting against this request would send a terrible message that America is

unwilling to stand with those who are already fighting a common enemy and confirm the views of many in the region that America is but a paper tiger.

I am not convinced this train-and-equip effort will change the balance of power on the ground anytime soon, and I believe this approach comes with great risks. I am also concerned that airstrikes alone will be insufficient to meet the international threat posed by these terrorists.

Congress must maintain a central role. We must conduct oversight to ensure this program is managed effectively. Under the leadership of Chairman MCKEON, we have taken the President's original request and have added substantial oversight provisions to ensure this program is properly and carefully managed.

Congress must also push the President to craft a comprehensive strategy that recognizes the inescapable reality that ISIL is but a symptom of a broader terrorist threat.

Preventing the next 9/11 requires us to confront the reality that al Qaeda, ISIL, and similar radical terrorist groups are spreading, operating out of sanctuaries across the Middle East, North Africa, and South Asia. These groups pose a grave and growing threat to the United States. Our strategy cannot ignore these growing dangers.

A President who has made ending the war on terrorism the central focus of his foreign policy must now change. He must now make winning the war a priority. The Congress will need to push the President and his administration to do this right; to confront America's enemies; and to restore America's alliances, strength, and credibility.

This institution will be in no position to do that if we block his simple request today. Congress must now vote to support the first steps of what will be a long march toward that victory.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise against this amendment to arm and equip both Syrian rebels and other Syrian groups and individuals.

I want to be clear: we need to take action against the threat posed by ISIL, and I support the President in the use of airstrikes, but our response must also be appropriate to the complexity of the situation on the ground in Syria.

First and foremost, we must make sure that any response to the threat that we face does not plunge us deeper into a complicated and sectarian civil war. I feel that this amendment may lead to that.

With their barbaric attacks against journalists, women, children, and innocent civilians, ISIL is a terrorist group, pure and simple. While they are not now a threat to our Nation, they do have the potential to be one if left unchecked.

I believe that operating with our allies in the region, like Arab nations

and leaders in the newly-formed Iraqi government, we must be part of a broad coalition to address this potential threat, but I do not think this amendment is the right way forward.

Syrian President Bashar al-Assad is a tyrant. He has tortured and massacred his own people for years now. He should stand before the world and be made to pay for his crimes, but, as the very existence of ISIL illustrates, simply arming those who oppose his tyranny will not make America or the region safer.

Syria is a deeply complex situation. It is a nation in the midst of a civil war, splintered between Shi'a and Sunni, authoritarians and al Qaeda, and along countless other points of fractures.

I do not see how we are going to be able to thread the needle whereby we arm those we think are "good guys" in this conflict without inadvertently making the "bad guys" stronger as well.

We need to take action against ISIL, and I support airstrikes and other counterterrorism measures, but I believe that the amendment before us today provides much broader authority, and I cannot support it.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), my friend and colleague.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment. The President took an important step in his address to the Nation last week. He said that he is committed to "degrading and destroying" ISIL. The President should be commended for evolving from his position last month when he indicated that he didn't think ISIL posed much of a threat to America.

Madam Speaker, much, much more must be done. I am concerned that the President isn't fully listening to his military leaders. Reports have emerged indicating that President Obama did not choose to use the recommendations that our military leaders gave him.

Specifically, it has been reported that General Lloyd Austin, the top commander of U.S. forces in the Middle East, advised the President to send in some Special Operations Forces to advise and assist Iraqi Army units while fighting the militants.

Just today, at a Senate hearing, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Martin Dempsey said that the reality of the threat of ISIL might make the hands-off approach that the President is pursuing insufficient to deal with the threat. It is troubling when a Commander in Chief with no military experience chooses to ignore the advice of his military leaders.

On one hand, Secretary Hagel has said that we are at war with ISIL. On the other hand, it appears as if the President may be settling for what may be less than overwhelming force in confronting an enemy that he says

should be destroyed because of the threat it poses.

Again, it was encouraging to see President Obama acknowledge ISIL as the threat that they are to Americans, to our homeland, and our friend and allies; however, I hope, when this authorization expires in December, that President Obama will take the steps that his military leaders propose that will actually accomplish the President's goal of degrading and destroying ISIL.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), and—he insisted I say this—a fellow graduate of Fordham University.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment. We all agonized as to what we should do, but I want to correct the record. At 2:25 this afternoon, through the chair, when we started to pontificate on this floor about Islamists against Islamists, what we do is perpetuate the agony. What we do is stir up the pot when we stereotype who is with us and who is not with us.

Not every Muslim is the same, not every Christian is the same, as we found out in the Balkan wars in 1998 and 1999. In fact, in that war, we assisted Kosovo because it was being totally overcome with Serbs. One was Muslim; the other was Christian.

I think it is not good that the Congress go on record as pitting one group against the other. I don't think it works. I don't think it is healthy, Madam Speaker.

Let's be clear about what this vote is about. This is not an authorization for open-ended war. This is not October 2002 which was an authorization. No one knows that better than the chair and the ranking member who have done a spectacular job, I believe, in keeping this a fair debate and a fair discussion, and I want to compliment both of them.

I believe that ISIL is a threat to our national security, and I support the President's mission to end that threat. While America must lead, we cannot do this alone. We must see a real commitment from our coalition partners in the region, and we must provide the kind of support that is necessary if we are going to be successful.

In 3 months, when we get to December and we have to vote for a CR again and we have to vote whether we are going to continue to go down this path, we better have tangible evidence that those countries who signed sheets of paper that they are going to support us have tangible support out there for us and are not just sending cupcakes for the troops.

We can do our part. We can arm all the properly vetted opposition forces in Syria that we can find and provide air support and training for those on the ground, but we won't be successful in destroying ISIL unless our partners in the region help us cut off their funding, better police their borders, provide

combat troops on the ground, and end the political bickering that causes the chaos and mistrust that groups like ISIL thrive under.

I am pleased that the President has chosen to come to Congress to get our support for his plan. I believe that the provisions of this amendment will allow us to perform the oversight that is constitutionally responsible.

However, as I said before, this is not a blank check. Today, we are voting for a limited mission and ensuring that we properly vet those we are arming.

□ 1445

I am pleased that we will revisit this issue later this year in the intervening months.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. If our coalition partners don't step up to the plate, I don't see how we could be successful in destroying ISIL and why we should continue.

The lesson we learned from the war in Iraq is that American military might alone is not enough to defeat enemies. No matter how murderous and vicious a terrorist organization like ISIL may be, sometimes the American military intervention cannot be the silver bullet that solves all of our problems. And we say this about the greatest air and sea and land troops in the world. It is going to take a broad regional coalition acting as one, both militarily and politically.

Madam Speaker, I close by simply saying this: We need support, not only in the short term, but in the long term to have a government in Syria. We pray to God that they will have a government that can sustain itself.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN), my friend and colleague.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, today 227 years ago on September 17, our Founding Fathers signed our Nation's most precious document, the U.S. Constitution.

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution states: Congress shall have the power to declare war. The President does not have that power, only Congress.

Congress gives our President the power to defend our country; however, that authority remains subject to checks and balances, particularly by this body.

As such, if the President believes a state of war exists between ourselves and ISIL—the comments made by both the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State indicate that he does—then let him make it constitutional by first coming to Congress and asking for that declaration.

Today, the House will vote on the President's request to authorize assistance to train and arm the Syrian

rebels. I have long opposed arming the Syrian opposition out of the fear that these weapons will fall into the hands of Islamic radicals such as ISIL. Rather than supporting relatively unknown opposition groups in Syria to battle these forces, the Islamic State, we must instead turn to our longstanding allies, the Kurds.

The Kurds have shown repeatedly that they have the capacity, the tenacity, and the will to stand up to ISIL. With our support, the Kurdish Peshmerga, together with the Iraqi security forces, will be able to successfully annihilate the evil forces of ISIL.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, if the President wishes to engage this country in military action against ISIL, then I urge him to ask Congress for a declaration of war. Therefore, I ask my colleagues to join me in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I respect all of my colleagues on the tough decisions that we are asked to make today.

I believe that America must use our military might any time that our families face an imminent threat. Though ISIS, like a number of terrorist groups around the world, would like to kill more Americans, our military leadership has made it clear that ISIS does not represent such a threat today. It is a regional threat without the capacity to do the harm it would like to do.

Rejecting this one amendment does not mean doing nothing about ISIS. The President already has the necessary authority to respond to this savagery when Americans are murdered.

Now the President's response, however, has been expanded, and he proposes a full-scale war. This amendment establishes a new objective for this broader war—to end the civil war in Syria that has already consumed almost 200,000 lives.

Approving this amendment is the one vote that has been requested to enable this broader war—but without a declaration by the Congress to approve that war and without knowing what commitment those in the region will really make in order to fight this war.

I got a communication from a constituent of mine in San Antonio. Her name is Gloria Flores, and she tells me this. She poses some questions that are not being answered today in Washington.

"In my view," she says, "ISIS is just one more extreme group which, if destroyed, will be replaced with another group . . . I don't say 'boots on the ground' because that phrase . . . takes away from the terrible toll that will affect a family if its son or daughter is killed. My nephew . . . was killed in Afghanistan, and we are still mourning his death . . . Any armed force should consist of almost entirely Middle Eastern soldiers. Why should American kids," she asks, "carry the load for Saudis, Jordanians, et cetera?"

Why, indeed.

But this purported coalition does not carry its own load. Others may appear in photos. They may cheer from the rear, but nearby countries are not risking their young people in ground combat. In one case, we even have a neighboring country that will not even permit us to launch an attack by air from its soil.

With the number of our U.S. military on the ground already approaching 2,000 in Iraq and with General Michael Hayden, the former NSA and CIA head, expecting 5,000 by the end of the year, the danger of escalation is very real.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. Now, I do find it difficult to understand, with its hostility to Christians and brutal disdain for our American values, how Saudi Arabia can be a place for training anyone—certainly no Syrian women learning to drive there.

Ultimately, I believe that this resolution has to be evaluated on whether it secures our families in a stronger way. I think it entangles us in a conflict that we cannot get out of as quickly as those trained Iraqi soldiers dropped their uniforms and their guns.

Today is Constitution Day. Let us use our constitutional powers to consider a declaration of war before this entanglement.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), my friend and colleague and a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the President's request to train vetted moderate Syrian rebels, as I believe it is only one step in the right direction and it is supported by military experts.

Tremendous oversight is going to be necessary in this effort and, unfortunately, I fear, as do many experienced generals and military personnel, that it is part of a strategy that is insufficient to secure America's national security.

The President's stated objective is to destroy ISIL; however, I believe this overall strategy and the means requested are not enough to meet this objective.

The current strategy relies on U.S. airpower in support of local forces. This is not a counterterrorism effort, and to destroy ISIL it is necessary to have strong coordinated ground troops. The local ground forces the President is planning to rely on appear currently unready, and they will need to operate with a strong central command and control.

The President's strategy does not provide for U.S. Special Forces in the backing of our ground troops, even though our military leaders have repeatedly suggested that exact recommendation.

Our security is too important to base military strategy on political calculations. Our strategy must be firmly rooted in what is necessary in order to complete the mission and to ensure our security.

From Clausewitz to Powell, military leaders have preached the necessity of decisive force. I served in Iraq. We heeded this wisdom and committed to win with decisive force. We acted on militarily reality and not political risk. We can do this again and fulfill the American objective to destroy ISIL, but we must commit ourselves to do what is necessary—not only what it takes, but whatever it takes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank my friend.

Madam Speaker, last week I met with a constituent from Huntington Station on Long Island, and she said to me, "Mr. Israel, war is never the answer."

I would agree with that view that war is never the answer if I believed that ISIL agreed with that view, but they do not. I have thought a lot about my constituent's comments and I have thought a lot about this resolution. There are four things that we do know.

First, ISIL is not just a threat; it is a savage threat. And what message do we send to potential beheaders around the world if we bury our head in the sand?

Secondly, ISIL has filled a vacuum, and if we do not check that vacuum, it will spread, and instability and beheadings and savagery will spread across the Middle East and beyond.

Number three, we cannot, nor should we, do this alone. I believe that the President has helped to organize an important international coalition to ensure that this is not on our shoulders and that we do not have boots on the ground.

Finally, there should be no blank checks. We did that. We gave those blank checks from 2000 to 2008. No more blank checks.

This resolution ensures accountability; it ensures transparency; it ensures reporting. Taken all together, Madam Speaker, this resolution is a restrained, responsible and appropriate response to the spread of ISIL, to beheading, to savagery in the Middle East and potentially around the world, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), my friend and colleague.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, all of us recognize the threat posed to our Nation by the Islamic State. The question before us is whether to arm and train supposedly carefully vetted elements of the Free Syrian Army as a proxy ground force.

I respect the intentions of the supporters, but this proposal runs a great risk of backfiring.

The FSA is a marriage of convenience among many Islamic factions that have a long history of collaborating with the Islamic State. The singular purpose of the FSA is not to destroy the Islamic State. It exists to destroy the Syrian Government that is now actively fighting against the Islamic State.

The equipment we provide to the FSA could easily be turned against the Syrian Government, which, despite all of its despotic tendencies, is at least at war with the IS right now, and we would weaken our overall strategic position. Or this equipment could be turned over to the Islamic State, as we watched carefully vetted Iraqi security forces recently do. In fact, that is the reason the Islamic State is armed to the teeth with American equipment.

Neither we nor the world can afford more blunders or miscalculations in this region. We should have learned by now that alliances in the Islamic Middle East are in constant flux. An ally today is a sworn enemy tomorrow. In fact, often our allies are our enemies.

After I was elected, the first man killed from my district in Iraq, Army Specialist Jeremiah McCleery, died when "carefully vetted" Iraqi soldiers turned their American-provided weapons on him.

The most recent fatality from my district, Marine Staff Sergeant Sky Mote, died when "carefully vetted" Afghan police turned their American-provided weapons on him.

Madam Speaker, our consistent experience in this region should be screaming this warning at us. We are making a big mistake.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Speaker, I stand in opposition to this amendment because this proposed strategy actually reflects a lack of commitment to really destroy ISIL and the other Islamic extremist groups that we are at war with. Here are just a few reasons why I will be voting "no."

□ 1500

First, it is unrealistic. It will take way too long, and the number of fighters trained will be way too small to be truly effective in the fight against ISIL. Over that period of time, ISIL will continue to grow in strength.

Number two, the mission is unclear. The American people want ISIL destroyed, but the primary objective of the fighters whom we train will be to overthrow Assad.

Number three, we don't really know who they are. Presently, they are fighting shoulder to shoulder with al Qaeda and other Islamic extremists and therefore can't be trusted. The weapons and training that we give them may end up actually being used against us and our allies.

Voting to support this proposal is actually a vote to overthrow Assad because overthrowing Assad is the primary objective of the so-called Free Syrian Army.

If we combine the missions of destroying ISIL and of overthrowing Assad, this is not a smart or effective strategy for a number of reasons. We must focus on one mission—to destroy ISIL and other Islamic extremists who have declared war on us. Our mission should not be to topple the Assad regime, which would make the situation in the region even worse and more unstable than it is today.

Madam Speaker, we have heard this story before. We know how it ends. Look at Iraq. Look at Libya. Clearly, our leaders have not learned their lesson. We must focus on taking out our enemies and on investing in our own country here at home.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. My thanks to my friend from Texas for giving me the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of Chairman McKEON's amendment, though I have grave concerns about the President's current plan to train and equip Syrian opposition forces in the fight against ISIL.

In my opinion, Madam Speaker, the plan does not fit the threat. ISIL has made the Middle East into a war zone and an advanced training ground for terrorists who, by their own admission, seek to do Americans great harm. Its stated objectives of redrawing the boundaries of and imposing its will on sovereign nations makes the importance of confronting this organization, in the most profound way possible, critical.

Instead of responding proportionately, President Obama has proposed we outsource the problem to other people, and as a military officer, I am concerned that he actually believes this limited use of military power can achieve the ultimate objective of destroying ISIL—a force that is 30,000 strong and growing by the day.

Madam Speaker, I fear—in fact, I firmly believe—that the problem will not be solved by the actions taken by this Congress today. However, we cannot afford to stand idly by for another day, because a step in the right direction is better than no step at all. So I join my colleagues in support of the amendment. I believe, in short order, we will be asked to do more.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, in 2011, former Secretary Robert Gates, as he was departing office, gave a speech at the West Point academy in which he said:

In my opinion, any future Defense Secretary who advises the President to again send a big American land army into Asia or into the Middle East or Africa should have his head examined, as General MacArthur so delicately put it.

I think Secretary Gates spoke for the entire country in terms of that sentiment, which, after a long, bitter expe-

rience in Iraq and Afghanistan, speaks to the weariness that many feel today in terms of those conflicts, and, certainly, with the motion that is before us this afternoon, it still rings in people's ears. I think it is important therefore to sort of measure what we are voting on with what Secretary Gates, I think, so accurately stated.

The motion before us is to provide for title 10 authorization to allow the U.S. military to train and equip forces in Saudi Arabia to take up arms against ISIL. I checked with the Congressional Research Service yesterday to determine how many title 10 operations over the last 3 years have been conducted by the U.S. military. In 28 countries all across the world, the U.S. military has been involved in training and equipping operations, from the Philippines to Yemen to Poland.

For those who argue that what we are about to engage in is a slippery slope or that this authorization somehow broadly confers on the administration the ability to conduct a land invasion or a large military force, the fact of the matter is that the long and broad experience of title 10 that we have tells us exactly the opposite. In fact, what title 10 seeks to do is to stand up indigenous forces in those nations of allies to avoid what Secretary Gates warned about in 2011, which is to, again, not get this country involved in a large land invasion.

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

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, one healthy thing has occurred over the last few days, which is that folks on both sides of this measure, I think, have come to the realization that we as a Congress need to be engaged in terms of these types of decisions.

To their credit, Mr. McKEON and Mr. SMITH have fashioned a resolution which requires by December 11 our revisiting this motion, to have regular reporting from the Department of Defense, and it requires us, I think, at some point, to take up the broader question of authorization of military force, reaching back to 2001 and 2002, in terms of limiting the scope, which, again, has been supported by this administration and which we have discussed in the House Armed Services Committee. It is also to focus on what exactly is the end game for our efforts in Syria and Iraq.

Again, the measure that is before us today, though, is simply about title 10 authorization between today and December 11. I think people should not overthink and overstate the consequences of this vote. What it provides is for America to stand up with regional allies and European allies to begin the process of degrading and, ultimately, destroying a barbaric force, which threatens stability both in the Middle East and, ultimately, America's national interests.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished

gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my thoughts and, frankly, some concerns about the President's proposal that we will vote on today to train and arm the Free Syrian Army forces to fight ISIL. We are sort of in a "damned if you do, damned if you don't" situation.

I have always said that our country needs a comprehensive plan, policy, and strategy to defeat the radical Islamists terrorizing Iraq and Syria. Certainly, ISIS represents the antithesis of American ideals, and they have gruesomely demonstrated their disgust for our Nation with the beheadings of two American journalists in recent weeks.

What we are considering today is a partial plan, one of which I remain uncertain as to whether it will have the desired outcome. In fact, since 2011, the administration has consistently resisted any major efforts to arm and train the moderate opposition forces in Syria even when, I believe, a window existed to effectively do that some time ago.

At a hearing in the Appropriations Committee in February of 2012, I questioned then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton about why we were not doing more to help the moderate Syrian opposition. She flatly rejected providing support then. Now, however, I fear we may have effectively missed the time in which arming the FSA will impact the barbarism of ISIL in the region. Unfortunately, since 2011 and early 2012, the situation in Syria has become dramatically more complex, and identifying true allies in the fight against ISIS will be exceedingly difficult.

Questions remain about the President's strategy:

How will we effectively vet the opposition forces? How will we ensure that arms delivered will not be sold to ISIS forces or will not be used against already persecuted people in the region, such as the Syrian Christians?

ISIL is a threat to our Nation's security, and, no doubt, it must be destroyed and defeated, but I do have trepidation regarding this initial step in equipping the FSA at this juncture. Those voting on this measure, I suspect, will do so with great reluctance. Those voting "no" will do so with discomfort.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I agree with the last speaker, Mr. DENT, that this is a very difficult vote, and I think everybody should approach it with a tremendous amount of trepidation and concern. I am sure that all of us are doing the best we can to come to the very best decision we can on behalf of our constituents.

Today, I plan on voting for the measure. The reason is that the civil war in

Syria has claimed thousands of lives. Thousands more are now living under the deadly rule of ISIL, and 200,000 Syrians have been killed so far as the world, for 4 years, has not done much to protect them.

Now, the fight in Syria and Iraq can, ultimately, only be solved politically, and I believe that the growing humanitarian crisis caused by conflicts in the region warrants an urgent response from the United States. Any military action against ISIL must be led by Iraqis and Syrians. I believe U.S. troops would be a magnet for a group like ISIL, and therefore this fight must be carried forth by the people most affected—Syrians and Iraqis themselves. I believe that a vetted and better armed, moderate rebel group in Syria can fight ISIL in northeast Syria when an Iraqi Army, perhaps, can push them out of their country and into Syria. There cannot be a safe haven in Syria for ISIL.

I also want to note that much has been said about the fractured nature or the weakness of the Free Syrian Army, but I would remind people who are participating in this debate that, for 4 years, the Free Syrian Army has withstood the onslaught of the Assad government, Hezbollah, Iran, Russian weapons, ISIS, and Jabhat al-Nusra. For 4 years, these people who were dismissed as nothing but bankers and bakers and not real soldiers have stood their ground and have stood for their country.

For these reasons, I urge a “yes” vote.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington State (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS), the chair of the Republican Conference.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the chairman’s amendment, and I stand ready to work with my colleagues and the President on a long-term strategy to dismantle and destroy ISIL.

Last week, the President’s address to the country began to make the case that ISIL is an immediate threat to our allies in the Middle East, Europe and, ultimately, in our homeland. This is a radical and brutal force, opposed to all who do not adhere to their narrow view of Islam and the world. ISIL has declared war on our way of life and the values on which this country was founded and has flourished for over 235 years. In fact, ISIL has made clear that they will not be deterred until they see their flag flying over the White House.

When it comes to protecting the safety and security of Americans at home and abroad, America must lead. As we know, a speech is not a plan. An F-16 is not a strategy. As the Commander in Chief, we need the President to give us an honest assessment and an in-depth strategy to defend the country and our interests around the world.

This amendment responds to the President’s request to use title 10 au-

thority to train and equip vetted Syrian opposition forces. General Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, called it a necessary but not sufficient step. Beyond the amendment and the President’s limited request, the American people need to see a plan clearly articulated with a strategy to dismantle and destroy ISIL.

When we look around the world today, we see instability and numerous threats. The spread of radical Islam throughout the globe is pervasive. Iran continues to move toward a nuclear weapon. Russia continues to take aggressive action toward the Baltic states.

I support this amendment because America must lead. As we have seen, when America sits on the sidelines, there is a leadership void, which is filled by bad actors. I urge my colleagues to join us in taking this action.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

□ 1515

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I will cast my vote to approve the President’s funding request to train and equip the moderate Syrian opposition forces. I do so after long consideration and am mindful of the difficulties of vetting such a force during the middle of a brutal civil war.

Any decision to supply arms to combatants must be weighed carefully. Indeed, for the last several years, I have opposed arming the Syrian rebels out of a concern for our ability to properly vet such troops and the fear that weapons we provide may end up in the wrong hands. Those concerns persist, but they have been overcome by the growing menace of ISIL and the willingness of our regional allies to play a greater—and open—role in the support of these forces.

ISIL now controls about a third of Iraq and a like portion of Syria. It has been unsurpassed in its brutality, committing mass executions, forced conversions, trafficking in women, and beheading its hostages, including Americans James Foley and Steven Sotloff.

If ISIL is allowed to consolidate its territorial gains, or expand them, it will be able to act on its stated intention of serving as the platform for attacks on the United States. The thousands of foreign fighters, including Americans, who have flocked to join its ranks will one day attempt to return to the West and attack our homeland.

Our response must be proportionate to the threat. It does not justify American occupation of Iraq or Syria or the introduction of American ground forces, all of which are likely to be counterproductive. It does justify the use of American air power, intelligence, and financial, diplomatic, and military support. And since air power alone will not be sufficient on the battlefield, it will necessitate the assistance of local ground forces.

In the case of Iraq, those ground forces will be provided by the Iraqi

military and Kurdish Peshmerga. In Syria, with rigorous vetting, training, and support, the rebel opposition may provide the raw material for a credible military force.

There is no guarantee that the Syrian opposition can form a cohesive fighting force, something that has thus far eluded them. But the open support of gulf nations in housing and funding this opposition holds the promise of consolidating regional support behind them.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK of Nevada. I thank the chairman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, over the course of the debate for the past 2 days, I think one thing that most will agree on is that ISIL poses a clear and grave danger to our Nation, our interests abroad, and our allies. And I agree with the President when he stated that we must degrade and destroy ISIL no matter where they exist. And I support many of the provisions that he outlined in the speech he gave just last week: arming the Peshmerga, bolstering the Iraqi security forces, expanding airstrikes, and disrupting the flow of finances and foreign fighters to ISIL.

But the one thing I cannot support, the one thing I will not support is arming the so-called moderate opposition force, the Free Syrian Army. It is a ragtag collection of 100 disparate groups, and, just a little more than a month ago, the President stated that the notion that arming the rebels comprised of former pharmacists, doctors, and farmers would make a difference has “always been a fantasy.”

The Free Syrian Army has no cogent leadership, no organization, no command and control. And without U.S. military advisers embedded with the forces that we train and send back into Syria, we will have no visibility on their effectiveness, their defections, or whether or not our weapons are falling into the hands of our enemies.

This is a plan that is destined to fail for the sake of saying we did something, and that I cannot support.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, while I support airstrikes, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

While there is no doubt that ISIS is a brutal terrorist group that is wreaking havoc in the region, at this time, none of the evidence I have seen, including U.S. intelligence reports, and none of the arguments I have heard convinces me that getting involved in a religious civil war in the Middle East will be successful or effective in keeping our homeland safer.

I cannot support what could turn into a war on three fronts: fighting ISIS in Iraq, fighting ISIS in Syria, and potentially Assad in Syria. Nor can

I support an unprecedented scenario in which the U.S. tries to reinvent a substantially degraded rebel army to act as our boots on the ground against a former ally of theirs, ISIS, all while ignoring their stated objective of overthrowing Assad.

And this entire plan depends on our ability to identify so-called moderates in Syria who would be prepared to die for our agenda. It is not at all clear how we are going to do that.

Trillions of dollars spent, all-out war, and more than a decade of occupation in Iraq and Afghanistan did not produce the peace we sought or the stability we were promised. We spent \$25 billion to train the Iraqi Army to defend their own country, and they were decimated by ISIS in a matter of days and left their weapons to ISIS.

What would make anyone believe that spending a great deal less money to train a rebel army to defend our interests would turn out any better?

Mr. Speaker, this is a well-intentioned effort, but it is not a viable strategy. I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the amendment to intervene in the civil war in Syria.

It is immoral to use the prospect of a government shutdown to pressure Members to vote for involvement in a war, much less a civil war on the other side of the globe. Because the Syrian resolution is contained within the continuing resolution, Representatives and Senators must tacitly approve the President’s aggressive intervention in order to vote to fund all government programs.

It is disingenuous for the administration to tell the American public that we are arming Syrian rebels to fight ISIS when the administration’s stated objective is to topple the secular government of Syria, a government, I might add, that has not committed aggression against the United States.

If the goal of arming and training so-called moderate Syrian rebels is to eliminate ISIS, this plan will not work. Military experts know this, as does the President. He acknowledged as much 5 weeks ago when he stated that the idea that arming rebels would have made a difference has “always been a fantasy.”

What is our endgame? What is our long-term strategy? What will this ultimately cost? What are the unintended consequences that may come about? Will we follow this with boots on the ground? Who has these answers? The American people deserve these answers.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment. I also urge the same Members to stand strong and vote “no” on the underlying bill.

If this amendment should pass, there is no way to avoid culpability for a military action that is destined to cost innocent lives and will ultimately fail.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentle-

woman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership in helping us all uphold the oath that we take when we become Members of Congress to protect and defend the American people. I believe that the McKeon amendment that is on the floor today helps us to do just that as well.

Last week, the President presented to the American people a forceful strategy to degrade and destroy ISIS, a strategy built on a firm foundation of nonmilitary action.

The President is to be commended for his strong leadership and humanitarian, political, and diplomatic components that must be part of any successful mission. In a humanitarian vein, for acting to help assist those impacted by ISIS and avert the genocide of religious minorities. Who could ever forget those people isolated on the mountain until the United States and others came to the rescue? Politically, for insisting and pushing for an inclusive government in Iraq.

And I commend the Vice President, as well, for his leadership. Without a change to an inclusive government that respects not only Shia, Sunni, and Kurds but also the religious minorities in the country as well, military actions would not be so productive.

And, again, in a nonmilitary vein, the President bringing together NATO allies, a coalition, as well as regional partners, to assist in degrading and destroying ISIS. This comprehensive strategy includes increasing our intelligence, disrupting ISIS’ finances, and interdicting the flow of foreign fighters.

I have said in the past, in my view, the President already has the authority to do what he is doing. And, I will add, this House has voted overwhelmingly that should the President’s actions go farther comprehensively, then Congress should vote on that authority.

Today we are called upon to authorize a discrete but critical component of the overall plan: the President’s request to train and equip moderate, vetted Syrians outside of Syria to fight ISIS.

This is not an authorization for use of military force, as we had in 2001 and 2002. I do not support, nor will I support, combat troops on the ground. That is not what this is about.

I believe that the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and those who have worked so hard to put this amendment together took many precautions and set a high standard in terms of the criteria and standards that the administration must meet with this training: where it would occur, who would be trained, extensive vetting of the moderates and the rebels. That is probably the most frequently asked question: “How do we know?” Well, we can do the best we can to vet, to ensure that we are doing what we set out to do.

The brutality of ISIS, ISIL—whatever they call themselves on any given day—is outside the circle of civilized human behavior. We wish that this action that we are called upon to do today was not necessary. But it is really hard for us to uphold our oath of office all the time to protect and defend. It is not always easy. And most of the time, it is hard for anything that takes us down a military path.

But the fact is that with the diplomatic, political, and humanitarian foundation that the President has laid, with the narrowness of the request that he is making to us, it is not pleasant, it is not easy—it is hard, but it really is necessary for the House to approve this.

We all wish, again, that it wasn’t necessary. But we will approve it to help the Syrian people take responsibility for building peace and stability in their country, to stem the threat that ISIS can pose to U.S. interests abroad and to our national security.

Now, I have frequently quoted Hannah Arendt, who said, “Nations are driven to an endless flywheel of violence because they believe that one last, one final gesture of violence will bring peace, but each time, they sow the seeds for more violence.”

I would hope that what we are doing today takes us in a different direction, one that is predicated on a nation of inclusion in Iraq, one that defeats ISIS by the moderates in-country defeating ISIS, because ISIS is now cross-border—in Iraq and in Syria, and who knows where they may try to go next.

So this is important. It is urgent. And I hope that it will have the support of our colleagues.

As with all votes, I have never asked a Member to vote with any vote of use of force or, in this case, training of moderates. But I just wanted you to know why I am proud to support the President and salute him for his efforts.

I thank Mr. MCKEON for his leadership in shaping this resolution, and I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) for bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment, as I believe it is a plan which will not be successful.

Ronald Reagan reminded us to carry “a banner of no pale pastels, but bold colors which make it unmistakably clear where we stand” on the issues.

No offense, but I believe the plan before us is one of pale pastels when the world needed bold action by the leader of the free world.

Who will we be supporting by arming unknown rebels in Syria? Will we not be getting involved in a Syrian civil war?

□ 1530

If the fight is with ISIL—and I believe there must be a fight against

these genocidal extremists—then let's take it to them in Iraq, begin by assisting the Kurds who have been doing the heavy lifting against ISIL after the Iraqis cut and ran.

I could support boots on the ground once again in Iraq, reclaiming the ground for which so much American blood and treasure has been expended to liberate, but not arming unknown rebels.

Do you remember Benghazi? We armed and assisted rebels there; and, now, al Qaeda controls Libya from Benghazi to Tripoli, even swimming in the U.S. Embassy swimming pool in Tripoli.

We should not send \$500 million or \$1 to rebels in Syria, especially at a time when the Department of Defense and National Guard budgets are being cut here at home.

I believe even the war-weary Americans are looking to support a plan from President Obama that is decisive, lethal to the enemies of freedom, and definitive. This plan is not it.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the McKeon amendment that would grant the President the authorization that he seeks to identify, train up, and equip moderate Syrian forces to stand up to ISIL in their backyard.

I do so because I believe this is the best of the bad options that we face that could halt the advance of ISIL in that region and begin degrading their capability and guard against the rising threat that they pose to us and to those in the region.

I do so for three reasons. I believe that the President needs a strong bipartisan hand coming out of this Congress this week that would help him continue to build the coalition of opposition to ISIL in the region. It is going to be one of the keys to the outcome—the successful outcome—of degrading ISIL's capability. We can't do this alone, and it will be determined by those in the region to stand up against this evil force.

Secondly, I believe this is the best plan to help us avoid putting our own boots on the ground and our own men and women in uniform in what is, in essence, an ongoing sectarian civil war that has gripped that region for centuries between the Sunni and Shi'a.

There is a lot of concern, especially from Guard and Reserve units in my congressional district in Wisconsin who have been activated, called up, and deployed multiple times to Iraq and Afghanistan. When I talk to them today, I can see in their eyes and hear in their voices how tired they are. They are concerned about another military intervention in this region.

Finally, I believe this resolution under title 10 will enhance congressional oversight of the mission that is taking place there and, therefore, bring

greater accountability but also bring a greater say of the American people in addressing this rising threat in the region.

We are going to move away from the intel agencies running the show now and move it into the Pentagon, which brings us into the oversight capabilities which I feel has been lacking for some time in this endeavor.

This is not an easy decision. I believe the steps that we can take with this comprehensive plan now can avoid further military intervention in the future. Again, I think it is the best option we face amongst a lot of bad options.

May God bless our military personnel who will be in charge of carrying out this mission, and we all hope and pray for their success and safe return.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Members are reminded to not traffic the well while another Member is under recognition.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER).

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the McKeon amendment before us that authorizes the administration to arm and train vetted moderate Syrian rebels in their fight against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, or ISIL. This amendment also contains strong reporting requirements that the administration must follow to fulfill Congress' oversight authority.

ISIL has made territorial gains militarily in Iraq and Syria and announced the establishment of a caliphate in areas under its control. They have terrorized and killed members of minority groups, including Christians in northern Iraq, and have invaded Kurdish-controlled regions.

Minority groups are not the only victims being targeted. ISIL is also targeting Muslims. Last, but certainly not least, ISIL has beheaded two American journalists and a British aid worker. This type of radical, evil behavior must be wiped off the face of the Earth.

This amendment ensures that ISIL is not only confronted kinetically in Iraq but also in Syria. Providing the means for rebel groups to aggressively attack ISIL in Syria denies them sanctuary just across the Iraqi border, as is the case with the Taliban on the Afghanistan-Pakistan border.

An armed and trained Syrian rebel force, with assistance from the U.S. and partner nations, will open up a northern front to attack ISIL. Iraqi security forces and the Kurdish Peshmerga will be the claws in the south to squeeze this radical group. American airpower will no doubt be a force multiplier for these indigenous ground forces.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one country in the world willing and able to build a coalition of nations that includes Arab countries to defeat this radical threat, and that nation is the

United States of America. The United States has an obligation to lead and respond whenever the innocent are being massacred.

Our enemies should never underestimate our resolve. Yes, we may argue and disagree on many issues; but, when it comes to protecting America, our allies, and our interests, we are united. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a mother, I can see those who are now mourning because they have lost their babies, their family members. I can see the Yazidis in the mountains in Iraq fearful, and I can hear the cries of mothers whose sons were viciously beheaded by a terrorist group that most cannot understand the level of its viciousness.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to say that doing nothing is not an option, and I want to say to my friends and to my colleagues, ISIL has been here, for in 2005 Ayman al-Zawahiri, deputy head of al Qaeda, had a killer idea, and that was to establish an Islamic State.

It percolated for a number of years. In 2014, now, we have voices being raised across the world knowing that ISIL exists, and that is exactly what they want us to do, be terrorized. I refuse to be terrorized, and I also refuse to do nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I do not stand here today to vote for an authorization to use military forces. I will not vote to send our precious treasure again to that region, but I do believe that the President has a strategy, unlike some of my colleagues, a systematic campaign of airstrikes, increased military assistance, regional political effort and humanitarian aid, changing the face of the Islam religion that people believe is the Islam religion, and looking to those who support the core values of Islam.

That is a strategy; yet we have to address ISIL. There are 20,000 to 31,000 fighters making their way across the land; so I believe that an existing provision under section 10, provision 10, simply to train and to provide instruction to those individuals who can be in the fight in the region, train them with the expertise of the United States but not put our precious treasure on the ground.

ISIS has no restraint, and we remember the names of James Foley, Steven Sotloff, British aid worker David Haines, and 40-some members of the Turkish diplomatic corps held by ISIS and many others; so I believe it is important to note what we are doing here today.

In the McKeon amendment, it provides an opportunity for Congress to be advised 15 days before action. We should hold the administration to that. We should also say that any authorization for military forces, it must be a

debate on the floor of the House. I will not vote for that today. I will not vote for that.

I do believe, again, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot stand and do nothing. I think it is extremely important that we do something, and I hope others will look at the resolution that I have and the no fly for foreign fighters, H.R. 5488, which I have introduced.

I would like to add something else to the McKeon amendment. It indicates that appropriate committees will be advised. The legislative history of this debate should reflect that the Homeland Security Committee is an appropriate committee and should be one of those that is appropriately advised.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, today, we had a hearing in Homeland Security with the Secretary of Homeland Security. There is no doubt that what we are doing today is to protect the homeland.

What Americans say is they want the homeland protected. They want no more of their journalists beheaded by this heinous group.

Mr. Speaker, I close by simply saying we organized this Nation to form a more perfect Union. The Constitution says that Congress must declare war even as the President indicates that he has the authority under article II.

I believe if Congress is to do its job, we must have another debate on the authorization for military forces which we do not approve, but this is responding to the viciousness of ISIL, building up those regional forces, and making a difference.

I ask my colleagues: Can we do nothing? I think not. We must rise in support of this resolution today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee to H. Res. 124, the resolution making continuing appropriations for Fiscal Year 2015.

Specifically, the "McKeon Amendment":

1. Authorizes 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;

2. Purports to strengthen congressional oversight by requiring detailed reports, including progress reports, on the plan, vetting process, and procedures for monitoring unauthorized end-use of provided training and equipment;

3. Require the President to report on how this authority fits within a larger regional strategy;

The McKeon Amendment does not authorize additional funds, but it would allow the Department of Defense (DOD) to submit a reprogramming request to Congress should the President request Defense Department funds to execute this authority and permit the Secretary of Defense to accept foreign contributions.

Finally, the McKeon Amendment states that nothing in it is to be construed to constitute a specific statutory authorization for the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations wherein hostilities are clearly indicated by the circumstances.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, to be clear about what the McKeon Amendment does and does not do.

The amendment does not authorize the use of military force or deployment of United States combat forces to Syria.

Let me be clear: I am not voting today to authorize the use of military force or to put American combat boots on the ground.

Let me also be clear on this point: Before American armed forces may be deployed to conduct combat operations in Syria or elsewhere in the region the President must come to the Congress and request and receive from it either a declaration of war or resolution authorizing the use of military force.

This is not a political nicety but a constitutional requirement, clearly specified in Article I, Section 8, clause 11 of the Constitution, which by the way, was approved by the Constitutional Convention in 1787, 227 years ago this very day, September 17.

The McKeon Amendment simply authorizes the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to provide assistance, including training, equipment, supplies, and sustainment, to appropriately vetted elements of the Syrian opposition and other appropriately vetted Syrian groups and individuals for the following purposes:

1. Defending the Syrian people from attacks by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), and securing territory controlled by the Syrian opposition;

2. Protecting the United States, its friends and allies, and the Syrian people from the threats posed by terrorists in Syria; and

3. Promoting the conditions for a negotiated settlement to end the conflict in Syria.

The McKeon Amendment cannot be construed as giving the Administration a blank check or carte blanche in achieving these objectives.

Rather, the McKeon Amendment requires that not later than 15 days before providing assistance to a vetted group for the first time, the Administration shall provide a report to the Congressional leadership and committees of jurisdiction describing in detail the assistance to be provided and the bases for the determination that the action contemplated are consistent with the objectives stated above.

Additionally, the McKeon Amendment requires that not later than 90 days after the Secretary of Defense submits the first report required by the McKeon Amendment, and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall provide the appropriate congressional committees and leadership of the House of Representatives and the Senate with a detailed progress report.

In short, the McKeon Amendment only authorizes the Administration to identify, vet, and provide assistance to those opposition Syrian forces that can be relied upon to defend the Syrian people from attacks by the murderous ISIS jihadi.

Mr. Speaker, there is little doubt that the Islamic State of Iraq and al Sham (ISIS), is a violent extremist movement. It grew out of the remnants of Al Qaeda in Iraq and the Syrian

civil war—which has claimed the lives of 191,369 persons, tens of thousands at the hands of ISIS—and has spread its reach across the border between Iraq and Syria and is now seizing military bases and holding territory throughout the region.

In response, and at the request of the Iraqi government, President Obama has sent over 1,500 military advisors into Iraq and conducted over 150 airstrikes there to break the ISIS momentum, to protect U.S. personnel and save thousands of Iraq's religious minorities.

In his September 10, 2014 address to the nation, the President announced a four-part strategic plan to degrade and defeat ISIS.

The strategy outlined by the President involves the following elements:

1. a systematic campaign of airstrikes against ISIS;

2. increased military assistance and training for allied forces on the ground;

3. a regional political effort to work with allies; and

4. a humanitarian assistance to populations targeted by ISIS.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the President, Ranking Member SMITH, and Chairman MCKEON that ISIS poses a significant threat to American interests, requiring an effective response.

I also believe that the President should be commended for the forceful but deliberate and steady but calm leadership he has displayed to date.

But we must act in a careful, measured, balanced, and limited way to assist the Iraqi and Syrian people most directly and immediately threatened by ISIS because left unchecked, ISIS will grow to threaten the United States.

ISIS presently controls about 13,000 square miles (about the size of Massachusetts), spanning territory in Iraq and Syria, and a fighting force estimated to be between 20,000 and 31,500 fighters.

ISIS also commands substantial resources, including cash reserves estimated to be in the hundreds of millions of dollars and daily revenue of \$3 million from largely criminal activities.

Mr. Speaker, after its gains in Syria and Iraq, ISIS stands as one of the most dangerous jihadist groups. It was formed in April 2013, growing out of al-Qaeda in Iraq (AQI), which has since condemned and disavowed the group for its barbarity.

It speaks volumes about any group that is too barbaric to be associated with al-Qaeda in Iraq!

Unlike other rebel groups in Syria, ISIS aims to establish an Islamic emirate that straddles Syria and Iraq. Since March 2013, ISIS has seen considerable military success, beginning with its takeover of the Syrian city of Raqqa—the first provincial capital to fall under rebel control.

In January 2014, ISIS took control of Fallujah, the predominantly Sunni city in the western province of Anbar. It also seized large sections of the provincial capital, Ramadi, and has a presence in a number of towns near the Turkish and Syrian borders.

However, it was its conquest of Mosul in June that captured the world's attention because with the conquest of Mosul came control of oil fields in northern Iraq and Mosul's branch of Iraq's central bank, from which ISIS took hundreds of millions of dollars.

The international community received a wake-up call on August 2, 2014, when ISIS

fighters pushed further into northern Iraq, overwhelming lightly-armed Kurdish Peshmerga forces that had moved into areas abandoned by the Iraqi army and seized the strategically important Mosul Dam, which supplies water and electricity to much of Iraq.

Knowing ISIS's reputation for unmatched brutality, tens of thousands of people fled their homes, particularly members of religious minorities, and 50,000 of them were trapped on Mount Sinjar without food or water, until their rescue was secured by the air strikes ordered by President Obama providing cover for the Kurdish forces who wrested back control of the Mosul Dam.

Mr. Speaker, ISIS derives significant revenues from the oil fields it controls in eastern Syria and from the sale of antiquities it looted from historical sites.

Today, ISIS is considered to be the most cash-rich militant group in the world, controlling assets estimated to exceed \$2 billion.

ISIS has shown no restraint in dealing with civilian populations, acting with heinous violence and savagery. ISIS fighters have murdered and kidnapped civilians throughout the territory under its control, including the grisly beheadings of two American journalists, James Foley and Steven Sotloff, and British aid worker David Haines.

More ominous, Mr. Speaker, is the fact many fighters recruited by ISIS have European or American passports, making it easier for them to return home. That is also why I introduced H.R. 5488—No Fly Foreign Fighters Act to protect the homeland.

To his great credit, President Obama has not rushed to judgment. He has been thoughtful. He has consulted with the Congress and the international allies.

And the President has been adamant that the planned assistance and training to rebels fighting ISIS will not involve, or lead to, American ground forces fighting a war that must be fought by the Iraqi people and Syrian rebels.

The threat posed by ISIS in Iraq presents the United States with a conundrum about what to do about ISIS in Syria. On the one hand, we do not want to strengthen the barbaric Assad regime that is opposed by Syrian rebels and opposition parties and by ISIS. On the other hand, if we provide assistance only to anti-Assad opposition forces, we indirectly strengthen ISIS.

The challenge is to identify, vet, and support those pro-democracy forces in opposition to both the Assad regime and ISIS.

The defeat of ISIS should be prioritized over the removal of Assad, though the latter should remain a long-term U.S. objective. And U.S. assistance to opposition groups should be designed and delivered with this sequencing in mind.

Finding, vetting, and equipping capable and reliable Syrian partners who are poised to fight ISIS and the Assad regime is the central strategic challenge facing the United States in countering the rise of ISIS.

On June 26, and again on September 10, the Obama administration announced additional assistance to vetted moderate opposition forces that are fighting both the Assad government and ISIS and asked Congress to authorize \$500 million to train and equip these fighters.

But a major effort to arm, train, equip, and enable possible U.S. partners inside Syria is no easy task because potential partners are

weak, causing the Obama administration to hold back additional meaningful support.

But part of the reason these potential moderate alternatives to Assad and ISIS remain weak is because they do not have organized and well-coordinated assistance. These potential partners include the Syrian National Coalition; the interim Syrian government; the Supreme Military Council; the Free Syrian Army; and the Syrian Muslim Brotherhood.

The necessary vetting to find capable and reliable partners must be thorough, rigorous, and meticulous because we cannot afford to provide training, equipment, and materiel to opposition forces that in turn combine, or enter into a non-aggression pact, with ISIS.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time for the Members of this body to be thoughtful, deliberate, and wise. This debate today is healthy and reflects and enduring strength of our democracy: open debate, deliberation, and decision.

I urge all members to reflect carefully on the threat posed to the United States by ISIS and to vote their conscience on the McKeon Amendment, guided by their best judgment as to what is the best course of action to take to protect our homeland and keep our nation and its people safe.

For my part, I will not vote to authorize the use of military force or to deploy American combat forces in Syria. Instead, I will vote for the McKeon Amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, a week ago, the President asked this House to include very narrow language in the continuing resolution that would allow the United States military to train and equip the Free Syrian Army individuals to defend themselves.

I can understand why any soldier in any country would want training from the United States military. They are the best-trained, best-equipped, best-disciplined, and best moral fighting force in the history of warfare. Many members of this body and of the administration have asked, for months, for greater training of the Free Syrian Army.

If we had not previously trained and equipped the Iraqis and the Kurds, ISIS would have already overrun Iraq and would have already moved against our allies in the region.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice the concern though of the people of Oklahoma. We believe this administration has the habit of twisting every bill into what they want it to say rather than what it actually says; so I want to clarify this amendment.

This is not an authorization for the use of military force in Syria. The President has not asked for that authority, and the Congress has not extended it.

Mr. Speaker, in 2001, this body gave specific authorization to President Bush to "use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines"—now get this—who "he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001."

The fighters currently on the battlefield with ISIS were about 8 years old on 9/11. The leaders of ISIS were teenagers. Unless this administration is able to show evidence that a group that did not exist on 9/11 or that 8-year-olds in Syria planned, authorized, committed or aided in the terror attacks on 9/11, the AUMF is not in effect from 2001.

This body is willing to deliberate and to engage with the American people in the sobering question of the use of military force, but we are not willing to abdicate our constitutional responsibility.

No one in this administration should understand this vote as a request to negotiate with Iran for their cooperation, offering to turn a blind eye or to turn our head while they advance their nuclear weapons program for their help and their cooperation. The world should not have to choose between ISIS or a nuclear Iran. Both are unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, this vote is also not an acknowledgement of the President's plan to defend our Nation from ISIS. We have not seen a plan.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, this vote is not an acknowledgement of the President's plan because we have not seen the plan. Bombing some of ISIS' facilities and training 5,000 foreign fighters is not a plan.

If ISIS is a direct threat to the United States, we should treat them that way. Do not make the American people second-guess the threat by saying that the American people will be protected by the Free Syrian Army.

While I stand in support of this amendment today, the conversation must not end here. I look forward to the conversation in how the administration intends to constitutionally seek authorization to accomplish the strategy today for the American people and this body.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and my ranking member for their leadership on this issue and for the exhaustive discussions and briefings we have had. I also commend all of my colleagues for their thoughtful statements.

This is, indeed, a tough decision, but we are elected to make tough decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this amendment to equip and train the Syrian rebel forces. After countless briefings and the President's speech, I am left with more questions than answers. At a briefing today, former U.S. generals have opined that

training 3,000 to 5,000 members of the Free Syrian Army will be lame—in fact, totally inadequate.

Why would we train an inadequate number of FSAs to contain ISIL? How do we identify and vet a sufficient number of Syrians who can fight a long, protracted conflict to effectively degrade ISIL? How do we compel the Free Syrian Army to focus on ISIL instead of Assad, the brutal dictator they took up arms in the first place to destroy?

What will prevent Assad from continuing to attack the FSA? And what will we do in response? How do we avoid arming individuals that would rather do harm to the United States than ISIL? How do we create a true coalition that will share the burden of this conflict when some only agree tacitly behind closed doors?

Jordan has ISIL on both borders but cannot commit publicly to providing boots on the ground. How does a plan that relies primarily on airstrikes truly degrade ISIL's capability?

□ 1545

What I have heard in response to these questions simply doesn't add up.

We should have our eyes open wide enough to know that we are being asked to support today something much more than just training 3- to 5,000 members of the Free Syrian Army. There are consequences of what we have supported in the past, and there will be consequences today.

What happened when we spent billions of dollars to train and equip the carefully vetted Iraq military over almost a decade? They folded in the face of ISIL, many taking arms up with ISIL and others stripping their uniforms from their backs.

The plan before us is unrealistic and insufficient. None of the military experts outside the government believe that this strategy will topple ISIL. General Dempsey conceded yesterday that if this plan is insufficient, which I believe it is. He may recommend ground forces. He also said that there is no military solution to ISIL.

We should be frank with ourselves and the American people. We are not facing a limited engagement but a new war that will only escalate. We are setting out on a path to send our own troops to the ground. This is an amendment and a debate to start yet another war in the Middle East with a very uncertain future.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by Chairman MCKEON. We are way past any good solutions in Syria, but doing nothing would be the worst solution of all.

I understand and, in fact, share many of the reservations expressed by my colleagues today. This is not an easy choice. Yet we cannot ignore the threat of ISIL. They are determined to

bring war to America's shores. We must respond.

The President's request to train and equip certain Syrian opposition forces is a necessary step toward defeating ISIL, so I will support it. I will also urge the President to do more to explain the true nature of this crisis to the American people.

This will not be an easy fight. Airstrikes alone are unlikely to destroy ISIL and diminish its ability to threaten America. Americans are understandably war weary, but we did not pick this fight. Our Nation always answers the bell to defend our way of life and protect our freedom. This time will be no different.

May God bless our military personnel who will be involved in this effort. May God continue to bless the United States of America.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE).

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for his leadership and the chairman for his on this very difficult issue.

I want to make one point clear to my colleagues. We are essentially declaring war through an amendment to a budget resolution.

Let's make no mistake. We are not simply training rebels in another country, Saudi Arabia, which, by the way, has been the most successful exporter of extremism and extremists in the world. We will reinsert those trained and equipped rebels back into Syria, and we will then be their air force. We will, through all intents and purposes, be a co-belligerent in a civil war.

So, if we are declaring war right now, I think we should do it with our eyes wide open, as my colleague just said, with a full debate, and only through the power vested in Congress through the U.S. Constitution.

The logical conclusion of our participation in this war, if successful, is to depose the Assad regime and replace it with one of our own making in concert with these rebels. That will be the third country in 13 years whose regime we have deposed and whose government we have replaced with one of our own choosing. It is the fourth that we have been involved in, if you include Libya, in whose government we have successfully deposed. In not one of those instances can I say that this has been a success.

We also have no Muslim-majority countries contributing ground troops to this operation. I think we owe wide deference to the President in matters of foreign affairs, but when it comes to declaring war, our Founding Fathers reserved that power for the people through their representatives in Congress.

This amendment to a budget resolution, which would enter us into this war in a formal manner, makes a mockery of that and does not do justice to the servicemembers who will be asked to put their lives on the line for this U.S. policy.

For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The terrorist Islamic State, or IS, is a grave threat to our friends and allies in the Middle East and to our homeland. There is broad bipartisan agreement that this threat must be confronted and destroyed.

It is important for the President to work with Congress to address this terrorist threat. The President should continue airstrikes and support Kurdish and Iraqi forces in their fight.

The amendment under consideration will expand the President's authority to conduct military operations in the Middle East through the training and arming of allegedly moderate Syrian rebels.

I have serious reservations about this amendment. There is simply not enough information about these rebels. Indeed, not even 2 weeks ago, the President admitted he did not even have a strategy to confront IS. I am looking to the administration to provide additional information about the rebels it is proposing to train and arm.

Several administration officials have stated that the rebels may be fighting both the Assad regime and IS. But against whom will the rebels first turn their weapons we give them? IS or the Assad regime?

I also have very serious reservations about including this expanded military authorization in the continuing resolution, a short-term funding bill. This authorization raises very serious issues.

Make no mistake. It will ultimately involve United States servicemembers, men and women from our cities, towns, and countryside, who will leave their families behind at home. Such a measure deserves consideration in a completely separate resolution.

The President should never have asked for such a serious matter to be added to a short-term spending bill.

I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment under consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, Ms. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the care that has gone into the preparation of the amendment before us.

I have perhaps more reason to be involved than most Members because my district, the Nation's Capital, is a perpetual high-level target for terrorists like ISIL.

Today I am compelled to come to the floor to convey the indignation of the residents of the District of Columbia that the Congress would even approach another period of war where participation of residents of the District of Columbia is virtually inevitable while

they have no vote whatsoever on this preeminent matter of war and peace.

District residents pay \$12,000 annually, per capita, more in Federal taxes than residents of any other State, to support our government in war and peace. Regardless of what is decided on this amendment, Mr. Speaker, District residents will be there for America as they have been during every war our country has fought.

The Nation, however, should not ask D.C. residents to fight another war without consent of the governed who participate with taxes and live in the District of Columbia, the Nation's Capital.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, we will be debating an amendment which would not guard our Nation from terrorist infiltration nor even authorize our Armed Forces to eliminate ISIS personnel, equipment, and bases. Instead, the amendment authorizes President Obama to train and equip, with U.S. weaponry, members of the Syrian mujahideen, the so-called moderate rebels.

The amendment states that training and equipment can only be provided to "vetted" rebels, but who are those rebels? It says they can't be affiliated with ISIS, al-Nusra, and al Qaeda, which is good, but it would allow President Obama to arm other Islamist fighters who do not meet the threshold of being terrorists, including Harakat al Hazm fighters from the Muslim Brotherhood, the Syria Revolutionaries Front, and the Army of the Mujahideen.

Now, Mujahideen fighters in Syria are not moderates nor are they pro-American. They will take our arms and use them as they see fit, most likely to fight Assad in pursuit of installing a Sunni shari'a state in Syria. They cannot be counted on to vindicate our interests, which is why it is a mistake to subcontract our American national security to Islamist fighters.

Half measures like this, will not suffice. There are no shortcuts when it comes to our national defense.

So I constantly hear people say that Americans are war weary, and I disagree with that. I think Americans are willing to do what it takes to defend our people and our Nation. I think they are weary of missions launched without a coherent strategy and are sick of seeing engagements that produce inconclusive results rather than clear-cut victory. I think they are weary of a President that consistently proves himself unwilling to do what is necessary to win.

I have heard some colleagues say that arming the Syrian Mujahideen demonstrates strength and resolve. I think it is evidence of a lack of resolve. The President's strategy rests on wishful thinking. It is not sufficient to defeat the Islamic State.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I know the scourge of violent Islamic terrorism all too well. I represent the World Trade Center area in New York that was attacked on September 11, 2001. So I agree with the President that we must work together to combat ISIL.

Today, however, ISIL cannot project military power beyond the Middle East. ISIL is a direct military threat to our allies and to our interests in the Middle East. Perhaps we should help bolster the defenses of our allies, such as Jordan, Israel, Saudi Arabia, and the Emirates.

The current threat to the United States is from Europeans and Americans who may train with ISIL in the Middle East and then return to the United States to do us harm. This threat cannot be fought by military means in Iraq and Syria but by counterintelligence, appropriate surveillance, and border control here and abroad.

When it comes to ISIL operations in the Middle East, those very same operations that threaten our allies, we must ask why we do not see these threatened countries offering troops on the ground. Why are we more interested in their defense than they are?

These are some of the questions we in Congress should debate before we vote to go to war. Make no mistake; the offensive campaign of air attacks against ISIL that President Obama recently announced clearly constitutes a war within the meaning of the Constitution.

The Constitution very deliberately places the decision to go to war with the American people acting through Congress, not with the President. The decision to go to war against ISIL and to expand our efforts into countries like Syria requires congressional authorization.

The Authorization for Use of Military Force of 2001 cannot be relied upon for congressional authority for acts of war in circumstances completely unforeseen then against an enemy that did not exist then. Identification of ISIL with al Qaeda with the planning of the attacks on September 11, 2001, is specious. The Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 was, similarly, not about ISIL.

Congress must assert its constitutional power to authorize or reject the use of force in Iraq and Syria. We are not being asked today to authorize a new conflict with ISIL, even if that is implied by our vote today, and therein lies the danger. This vote without a vote on the wider Authorization for Use of Military Force will be taken by the public, the media, and perhaps even the courts as a de facto authorization of military force in Syria. This would undermine our ability to seriously debate the very real questions before us.

How deadly is the threat we are facing, and what is the best way to eliminate that threat?

What will happen when American fliers are shot down over Syria and perhaps beheaded on television by ISIL? Will the demand for revenge be overwhelming?

Just how steep is the slippery slope we are embarking upon?

How long will the conflict last?

Is there an exit strategy?

What does victory look like?

How much will it cost?

How many U.S. lives will be lost?

Whom will we be arming in Syria?

Do they share our long-term interests?

What are the odds those arms will be turned against us or allies?

It is precisely these types of questions that should be asked when Congress debates the Authorization for Use of Military Force. Until we have that debate in Congress and answer these questions and make a decision on an AUMF, we should not step foot on the slippery slope to another long war. Approving this amendment would be a big step onto that slippery slope, and so I must vote "no."

□ 1600

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding and for working so hard with the Armed Services Committee through Chairman MCKEON to bring forth this amendment that ultimately lets the President start a process that he laid out in his speech last week.

Mr. Speaker, the threat of ISIS is real and growing. It is not just limited to the Middle East, though. Americans know this is ultimately something that we will have to confront if we don't address it now with swift action.

If you look at the legislation that has been brought forward, there were some important protections that were put in place over the course of the last few days in negotiations with the White House that, I think, are very significant and lay out clear benchmarks for President Obama over these next 3 months that this authorization would last.

The first thing the President has got to do under this authorization is to go and build that coalition. This is not a go-it-alone strategy. That is not going to be the kind of strategy that is going to work. The President has got to go and put those countries together to carry this out. He has got to get firm commitments, not only on amounts of resources that will be put in place, but also the number of troops that those countries would put in place.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, any transfers of funds that would be needed to carry this out would have to first come back to Congress before they can move forward. Any plan for vetting

Syrians who we would train, which is going to be an incredibly important process, has to come back to Congress, and those plans have to be laid out.

I think that is so important that those protections are in place because, ultimately, Mr. Speaker, the President is the Commander in Chief. He has asked for this authorization. But there has got to be a give and take and, ultimately, a role that Congress plays where the President is letting us know each step of the way that he is carrying out the mission as he laid it out, he is building that coalition that he said he would put together. And over these next 3 months, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be important that he does those tasks.

And ultimately, as we come back here to deal with this again, it is going to be important that the President lay out the broader strategy, because so many of our Members know this is not the final step that is going to eliminate the threat of Islamic terrorism. This is the very beginning. I think not only Members here in this body—Republican and Democrat alike—but I think people all across the country want to, ultimately, see that broader strategy by the President for how he is going to take on this challenge and eliminate these terrorists from the face of the Earth.

I rise in support and urge my colleagues to vote “yes.”

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), my friend and colleague.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the amendment is to train and equip Syrian rebels. Well, let us see how that has worked in the past when America has trained and equipped individuals.

The United States has spent billions of dollars in Iraq to train and equip Iraqi soldiers. The first time they came in contact with the ISIS members, they cut and ran.

This is ISIS propaganda that was on the Internet.

This is an American tank now in the possession of ISIS when the Iraqis cut and ran.

This is a Humvee going through a parade; also, four Humvees that, apparently, have never been used that are now in the possession of ISIS when the Iraqis cut and ran.

Now we want to arm Syrian rebels to keep them fighting for America. Well, let us see how that has worked in the past.

In September 2013, The Wall Street Journal reported that ISIS raided a Free Syrian Army weapons depot, taking small arms and ammunition provided by the CIA.

In December 2013, Free Syrian Army weapons warehoused on the Syrian-Turkey border were seized by the Islamic Front. They, like the Iraqis, cannot keep up with American arms.

Second, some say in this amendment we will support the Free Syrian Army because they are going to be examined and we will make sure that they are vetted very well. But let us understand and see how that is working out.

What is a Free Syrian Army rebel today is an ISIS member tomorrow. It looks like, in December of 2013, Saddam al-Jamal, the northeast commander of the Free Syrian Army, announced his defection to ISIS and condemned those who worked with the West.

A Washington Post article, August 18: A high-level security commander of ISIS said that there is no more Free Syrian Army in eastern Syria because they have all joined—yes—ISIS. Isn't that lovely?

It is not a good strategic plan to arm Syrian rebels. If ISIS is a national security threat, then relying on rebels in a Syrian civil war will not protect American security interests.

The United States should have a strategy to defeat the barbarians of ISIS, but we should have that debate on this House floor and not rely on mercenaries to fight American national security interests somewhere overseas.

And that is just the way it is.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today, I join many of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in support of giving the President the initial authority needed to confront ISIS and Syria.

I am actually surprised and disheartened by the opposition that some here in this Chamber have towards the amendment. To be clear, I have been as vocal a critic of this administration's lack of strategy in Syria as any other person. But that does not excuse us from what, I believe, is the right thing to do, which is to give the Commander in Chief the tools necessary to confront this evil.

I don't remember many of my colleagues from this body stepping forward a year ago, or even a few months ago, urging the President to do more in Syria. In fact, at the beginning of this year, I called for bombing ISIS targets as they moved into Fallujah and Iraq. By many I was called a warmonger or somebody eager to start another war in Iraq.

It is easy to come up with any excuse not to support an amendment. Some say it doesn't go far enough. I have heard from a lot of people here that say it doesn't go far enough. Some people say that it goes too far, it is too much. It doesn't include an authorization of military force, it doesn't include an overarching strategy for ISIS or Syria.

I reject those calls for a perfect strategy from a perfect President for a per-

fect outcome in Syria. That is simply not possible given the circumstances we now face, due to our previous inaction.

Mr. Speaker, to those who believe that the Assad regime is a partner in the fight against ISIS, I would remind them this regime has slaughtered nearly 200,000 of its own people. In fact, in Iraq, when we were fighting al Qaeda in Iraq, the Assad regime gave AQI safe haven in Syria to fight American forces. And look no further than Hezbollah—one of the greatest enemies of the West and one of the greatest enemies of Israel is strongly supported and enabled by the Assad regime. The Assad regime created the ISIS problem, gave them safe passage through regime-controlled territory and, ultimately, attacked only Free Syrian Army targets until the West looked over, and now they look like the savior of the West by attacking only ISIS. Let's not get sucked into that argument.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. I support this amendment, not because it is part of a larger strategy in Syria that we would like to see from this administration but because it is a first step in addressing ISIS in Syria.

I ask my colleagues to support this first step that many have been calling for to train the FSA before it is too late. What would our enemies and allies think if we rejected the President's authority to do this?

I urge support of this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member SMITH. I appreciate your leadership and your courtesy.

In Iraq and Syria, we are facing an excruciating set of circumstances where there is no clear path forward.

Our challenge in the face of the atrocities perpetrated by ISIS is to reduce the suffering of innocent citizens and our allies, and to protect our security at home.

To do nothing is an option, but it is likely the worst choice.

If ISIS were only a potential threat, I would feel differently. However, ISIS is a well-funded, heavily-armed militia whose strength is increasing and whose ranks have swollen to over 30,000 and counting by some estimates. They control an ever-expanding area across Iraq and Syria's border.

To stand by, allowing ISIS to expand and strengthen its hold in Iraq and Syria, we will encourage accelerated deterioration of the security in the region that will become more difficult to address and will, ultimately, become a threat to the United States.

We must also confront those in the region who say they oppose ISIS but

have yet to take action. Those regional players have an even greater stake in this struggle than the United States.

I think the “least bad” option is the McKeon amendment, which does not provide for an authorization for the use of military force.

I didn’t support wars in Iraq or the later surge in Afghanistan, and I certainly would not support legislation that would expose us to another open-ended broad commitment.

This proposal strictly limits the use of United States ground forces in the region and would prevent an open-ended engagement in Iraq or Syria because the authority provided in this legislation sunsets December 11.

Any airstrikes or aid would come at no additional cost to our country, which has already spent hundreds of billions of dollars on war in the region, and requires the Department of Defense to reprogram existing funds or find regional allies to pay for our efforts.

This proposal to empower the President for 3 months is the most reasonable course of action at this point. It is not going to settle the long-simmering collection of conflicts in the region. Authorizing the President to train and equip highly vetted Syrian opposition fighters and strike a narrow set of ISIS targets, however, may degrade ISIS in a meaningful way.

These 3 months will give the administration an opportunity to show the progress and enlist support of other countries. Congress will then reassess these efforts in December.

In the meantime, we are not undercutting the diplomatic and military efforts of the administration. Helping the administration respond, allowing the situation to clarify, making some progress, and galvanizing support are the most we can hope for over the course of the next 3 months.

I remain open to alternatives, but after listening carefully to the debate, briefings from experts, and reviewing the materials, I see no better course at this point than the limited short-term initiative this amendment provides.

I plan on supporting the amendment and I appreciate the gentleman’s courtesy.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for this opportunity.

The President spoke last week and he presented nothing that could be remotely considered a strategy, and yet, the American people understand the destruction of radical Islamic terrorism is mandatory. It is not mandatory for creation of democracy around the world, it is mandatory for keeping people safe in places like Omaha and Denver and Wichita, Kansas, the place that I represent.

Today, the world is watching what we will do here, what Congress will do. There are folks watching this in bunkers, there are people from Hamas

watching how we will vote today. They are looking at how this Congress will respond to a President who has not laid out a strategy, who has now asked us to provide one arrow in the quiver, one small piece that doesn’t amount to hardly anything remotely close to a strategy. They are looking to watch and see how we will respond.

And, today, we should respond by telling the President of the United States we will support his efforts to train and equip, but that we are going to watch and demand that he develop a strategy for the destruction of ISIL and for containment in the region as well.

Remember, it is not just ISIL that is the threat. The threat extends from Damascus to Tehran, it threatens Lebanon and Jordan, it threatens all the Middle East, and, indeed, if that territory is allowed to remain inflamed, will threaten us here in the United States.

Today, we take a very small action, a measured action, one that is necessary but hardly sufficient.

I urge my colleagues to support the McKeon amendment, and I urge the President of the United States to take action in a way that will defeat ISIL and defeat radical Islam and keep us all safe here in the United States of America.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is not a perfect plan. What America wants is a plan that guarantees success, and that success should be total destruction of ISIS immediately and without U.S. casualties. But the plan is a reasonable approach. It is the only approach on this floor. The alternative is to do nothing. No one has brought a better plan to this floor.

□ 1615

For those who say, “Let’s do nothing,” reflect what we have accomplished through the President’s action. The Yazidis have been saved from genocide. The Turkmen who otherwise would have been slaughtered in the many thousands are no longer besieged. The Mosul and Haditha dams are no longer under the control of ISIS. None of that would be true if the President had already not begun to take action.

I now yield to the gentleman from California for a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, all the authority provided in this amendment will expire no later than December 11, 2014. Is that correct?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McKEON. Or the passage of the NDAA, whichever comes first.

Mr. SHERMAN. Whichever comes first. So it could even be sooner than December 11.

Second, the administration has stated that it will use this authority to train Syrian fighters outside Syria. I

have a fact sheet, which I will enter into the RECORD, provided by the administration, stating that the training will take place outside Syria and that the Saudis have agreed to host facilities.

Mr. Chairman, can you confirm that it is, indeed, the administration’s plan to do the training outside Syria?

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. SHERMAN. Is it your understanding that the training bases will be outside Syria?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his answers.

Attached, please find a fact sheet on the Title X program, as well as a Q&A your boss may find helpful. I stand by ready to answer any questions.

—Robert

ROBERT N. MARCUS,
Special Assistant to the President, White
House Office of Legislative Affairs.

IMPORTANCE OF TITLE 10 TRAIN AND EQUIP IN DEGRADING & DESTROYING ISIL

The President has outlined a comprehensive approach to degrade and ultimately destroy ISIL. Part of this approach involves building an international coalition and working with and supporting local partners.

The Syrian opposition can serve as an effective, local counterweight to extremist elements in Syria, particularly ISIL. That is why we have provided a variety of types of support to strengthen the Syrian opposition since the conflict began in 2012.

In his speech at West Point in May, the President announced his intention to seek Congressional approval of a Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund that would allow us to empower and enable partners in their fight against shared terrorist threats. As part of this Fund, and as described in his Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) budget request in June, the President requested authority for a Department of Defense (DOD)-led program to train and equip (T&E) vetted members of Syria’s moderate opposition.

The T&E program can advance our counter-ISIL goals in Syria as well as our goal to work towards a political solution to the broader crisis in Syria. But ISIL’s aggression in the region, paired with Saudi Arabia’s new willingness to assist with this effort and impending expansion of our air campaign against ISIL, means that we must expedite the program’s implementation. As ISIL is degraded and destroyed, a ground force capable of holding territory and taking advantage of gains is needed. The Syrian opposition can serve this critical role.

The T&E program will train vetted fighters, outside of Syria, to defend the Syrian people against extremists like ISIL as well as regime attacks; stabilize areas under opposition control; and help a subset of the trainees to go on the offensive against ISIL. Ultimately, the opposition will be able to hold territory from which ISIL is removed and help provide for a negotiated end to the broader conflict in Syria. We would provide lethal and non-lethal assistance to enable trainees to accomplish their missions and advance U.S. policy goals.

Initially, the program will rely on other U.S. government agencies and partner-nations that currently provide support to the vetted opposition to assist with the recruiting, vetting, and sustainment of the U.S.-trained fighters. Saudi Arabia has agreed to host and support the training facilities. Additional allies are expected to contribute to the effort in the future, as well.

Q&A ON SYRIA T&E

1) Question: We spent billions training the Iraqi Security Forces who melted away the moment they faced ISIL, why would this force be any different?

Answer: Unfortunately, since the departure of the United States, years of leadership from former Prime Minister Maliki turned a competent force into a sectarian one, removing qualified leaders and severing normal lines of authority and communication, while alienating the broader Sunni community. The new inclusive government is committed to reforming Iraq's security forces and building a National Guard responsive to the needs of individuals communities. Syrian Opposition fighters are highly motivated to defend their homes and families from ISIL. What the opposition lacks is the resources to successfully resist and counter ISIL. That is precisely what we will work with our regional partners to give them. And, as a comprehensive approach and use of air power starts to change the momentum away from ISIL, the opposition will gain in confidence.

2) Question: How does the Syria T&E program fit into the Administration's strategy to degrade and ultimately defeat ISIL?

Answer: Building partner capacity—both the capacity of Iraqi partners and vetted opposition partners in Syria—is a key to denying ISIL safe haven, limiting its access to recruits, to include foreign fighters, and disrupting the group's finances. A multi-mission force will be trained to defend opposition-controlled areas from ISIL advances and enable the opposition to challenge ISIL's control of territory in Syria. Bolstering the vetted opposition also will increase their credibility and influence within Syria and pull potential recruits away from extremist groups.

3) Question: How can you ensure that Syrian fighters trained and equipped by DOD will not pass U.S.-provided weapons to extremists?

Answer: All participants in the T&E program will be subject to a rigorous vetting process led by our Intelligence Community, consistent with U.S. law and policy, including to ensure that they are not affiliated with extremist groups. They will undergo vetting to determine their eligibility for the program as well as after they have completed training to ensure that they will be eligible for additional U.S. assistance. We also will work closely with regional partners, including the Saudis, on our vetting process in order to capitalize on their knowledge of dynamics among the armed opposition. While we cannot guarantee that U.S. assistance will never fall into the wrong hands, we will take extensive measures to reduce the possibility that our trainees will pass weapons to extremists.

4) Question: How does the counter-ISIL strategy relate to the Administration's other goal of pressuring the Asad regime?

Answer: The T&E program is one component of our counter-ISIL strategy, but our investment in this force is not just for a counter-extremist role. As the President has said, Asad has lost all legitimacy, and Syria will not witness lasting stability so long as he is in power. Asad continues to present a false choice between radical Sunni extremists and his regime, but we know that there

is a Syrian opposition. Strengthening the opposition provides the best counterweight to extremist elements within Syria as well as to the Asad regime.

5) Question: Why is the T&E program so urgent now?

Answer: Saudi Arabia has recently agreed to host and support the training facilities for this program. Their active support is a critical element of a broad coalition of countries combatting ISIL. Other Sunni countries are also getting on board. If they see us hesitate, they may back away and we will lose the momentum we are building against ISIL. In order to degrade and ultimately destroy ISIL, we need the authority to increase our efforts to strengthen the Syrian opposition.

6) Question: What is the timeline for the program? How soon will trained fighters return to the battlefield?

Answer: This is a long-term investment, and one that will require some time on the front end for infrastructure development, planning, and logistics. We anticipate that initial trainees could complete training roughly four to six months after authorization and funding. We will work to expedite this timeline.

7) Question: Given the immediate threat posed by ISIL, shouldn't we have the T&E program focus entirely on ISIL?

Answer: The Syrian opposition continues to face threats from ISIL and the regime, which is why we must train them to be able to defend themselves against both enemies.

8) Question: Has ISIL negotiated a ceasefire with any element of the Syrian opposition?

Answer: We are looking into these claims as well as reports suggesting that one local brigade in Hajar al-Aswad may have reached a 24-hour agreement with ISIL that quickly broke down but that was intended to allow both sides to retrieve the bodies of their fighters who had been killed.

We would note that the Syrian Revolutionaries Front (SRF)—which is the group that the article claims has signed a ceasefire with ISIL—has issued a statement indicating that it has never ceased hostilities with ISIL and will continue to fight ISIL and the regime.

We will be thoroughly vetting any potential recipient of US assistance and, of course, any collusion with ISIL would be automatically disqualifying. Trainees will undergo additional vetting once they return to the battlefield. This vetting process will involve multiple US agencies and regional partners, and we have been using it to determine recipients of our non-lethal support to the Syrian opposition since early in the conflict. The training process will include the need to adhere to the law of armed conflict and respect for human rights.

A critical reason for our training and equipping the vetted, opposition is precisely to ensure they are capable of standing up to and countering ISIL at the local level. We are certain a vast majority of the Syrian opposition rejects ISIL, have been fighting it, and will be even more successful with our increased support. Again, we will only work with those opposition groups and members who reject ISIL and we are confident in our rigorous, layered vetting operation.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The threat of ISIL is beyond anything in the last 13 years since the hor-

ror of 9/11. We see there are no limits to gross brutality. They are a terrorist threat to the region, to the United States, and to our allies.

This rushed amendment to arm and train vetted Syrian rebels is not the answer. This Chamber needs to have an informed, robust discussion and debate about the U.S. role in combating and dealing with ISIL and other extremists in Syria and Iraq.

It is a debate that should take place on its own. This issue and this amendment should not be attached to the continuing resolution or any other matter before the House.

This amendment authorizes the training and equipping of vetted Syrian opposition forces, but we still aren't clear on who these forces are and how these rebel groups will be chosen and vetted. How do we ensure that our weapons, training, and knowledge won't be used by ISIL or other terrorist organizations in the future?

Additionally, this amendment only highlights a piece of the President's plan for addressing ISIL, a plan that includes significant long-term bombing campaigns and military escalation in Iraq and Syria.

If the House leaves for the next 8 weeks without addressing the already expanding scope of U.S. military operations in Iraq and Syria, I fear that we will return in November to find the U.S. sliding down a slippery slope toward full military engagement in those countries.

We have been there before. We have seen before how mission creep can expand a limited mission into a full-blown U.S. armed response. I will not let this happen or let this country be dragged into another conflict once again without an informed discussion.

Congress needs to debate a new authorization for the use of military force before any expansion of military operations. I support the President's call to dismantle ISIL through robust regional and international partnerships, support for local capacities on the ground, and expanded humanitarian assistance.

Arming and training Syrians and Iraqis and perhaps eventually supporting them with airstrikes may push back ISIL's gains, but it will not defeat extremism. There is no lasting military solution to extremism. The only lasting solution is a political solution, one in which the rights and concerns of all groups are respected.

The U.S. must focus on building partnerships in the region and around the world to encourage moderate Sunni groups in Iraq and Syria to move away from ISIL and towards an alternative and inclusive future. We also need to have a plan for the development of this region beyond our confrontation with ISIL.

I have deep reservations and important lingering questions that need to be debated on this floor. I am concerned about exposing our soldiers once

again to a protracted conflict with unclear objectives and no clear exit strategy.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HONDA. I cannot support this rushed amendment that allows the U.S. to wade back into another conflict without a serious, informed discussion of the United States' military role in combating ISIL. We need to fully debate and discuss actions we as a Nation take against this vicious foe.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, ISIS poses a savage threat to the world, to Muslims and Christians in Iraq and Syria, to our allies, and to the United States. It has executed heinous acts of terror and violence and, tragically, will continue to do so. Allowing it to thrive unchallenged is not in the national interest of the United States of America.

Today's vote is not a blanket authority but a thoughtful, detailed, and limited effort to confront ISIS. We cannot and should not do this alone. We need tangible support from a global coalition and will evaluate the commitment level in 3 months. The administration must continue to work to ensure that Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and other Islamic nations are involved in this multinational effort.

Despite reservations and questions, in my judgment, we must take action. The threat is real, and ISIS must be confronted now. I support the McKeon amendment because it is thoughtful and it provides the experts here in Washington the authority they need to put together a clearly-defined, realistic strategy.

This amendment does not authorize the use of military force; indeed, the amendment includes language that makes it explicitly clear that this is a train-and-equip authority and not an authorization for force.

Mr. Speaker, I support this amendment, and, in the weeks and months to come, the House of Representatives must use its oversight powers under the Constitution to monitor this strategy and to demand changes as necessary.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, does the gentleman have any additional speakers?

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, yes, we do have additional speakers.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman from Texas for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the McKeon amendment and in support of the continuing resolution.

I want to say this: I have heard a lot of people say this process isn't good and that we haven't had enough hours of debate, but I would say to Members of Congress: Have we not, in fact, had days and weeks of debate? How is it that you are a Member of Congress if you haven't thought about ISIS and the situation?

In fact, have we not had 13 years to debate this very subject internally, externally, on the floor, in committee, and off the floor? We certainly have had a lot of time for deliberation on this.

Secondly, I want to say this: I am not certain that the President needs further approval from Congress, as I have gone back and read the resolutions of 2001 and 2002. I would also say, though, we should have a formal resolution. It would be good for the country, it is good for Congress, it is good for the education process, and it sends a very strong signal to our enemies.

Perhaps when the President sends it to us—and I hope he will in November or December—we will have an opportunity to have the debate again, and we can review how effective these airstrikes have been at that time, how effective is the training program, how well is it going, and what allies have actually stepped up and what have they contributed. Right now, we do not have the answer to those questions.

I will say another thing, Mr. Speaker: If we are going to fight this war because it is worth fighting, then it is well worth winning, and, speaking for myself, I want the Commander in Chief and our armed services to have all the tools that are available to them.

If that means having ground troops on the table, then I want to be sure that we send that signal because the last thing we need to do right now to our enemies abroad is say we are not going to do this or we are not going to do that.

We can't have a half-pregnant war. We have got to fight to win and wipe out this terrorist surge.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach the end of 6 hours of debate on this amendment, I think it has been a good and healthy discussion. According to our count, we have had more than 90 Members of the House come to the floor and express their opinion about this situation with ISIL and Syria and Iraq.

I think part of that is it has given all Members an opportunity to express their opinions and concerns and hopes about what we can do as a country going forward, but it seems to me, through the course of these numbers of hours, that most Members agree on at least three things.

One of the things that most everybody agrees on is that ISIL is a significant threat. It seems to me they are clearly the best-equipped, best-trained,

best-financed terrorist organization we have ever faced.

In addition to that, as the ranking member noted at the beginning of the debate, there are thousands of people who have Western passports who are fighting with ISIS who can easily come to the United States and Europe to launch their attacks.

The second thing I think most people agree upon is that this is a very complex situation. We have the Syrian civil war underway. You have the change of government in Iraq. You have the situation with the Kurds.

There are many players—Iran—that make this a very complex situation. All of those Members who go down and say there is no good alternative, I think I agree with that. There is no perfect alternative to deal with this.

The third thing about which there is a lot of agreement, Mr. Speaker, is there are a lot of doubts about the President's plan, a lot of doubts about whether it is going to be enough to defeat ISIL, a lot of doubts about the commitment of the administration to follow through on the plan and to persevere over time; but, in addition to that, even if it is well-done and implemented perfectly over time, no one knows for sure how this is going to come out.

With those broadly agreed-upon facts, Members have reached different judgments and different conclusions, but it just seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that approving this amendment to give the military—the Department of Defense—the authority to train people in Syria as part of that fight makes sense.

Just to briefly review what is in the amendment—because during these 6 hours of debate there has been a lot of discussion, some of it about things that are not in the amendment—but what is in the amendment is that the amendment authorizes the Department of Defense to train folks in Syria as part of the fight against ISIL, and it is absolutely true that the Department of Defense has done this very thing in at least 40 countries.

Now, for all those people who say this is a slippery slope to war, I just note we are not in war in 40 countries. We train people around the world every day, and the military does a very competent job of it. That is what this authority does—that is it—train folks to defend themselves.

□ 1630

This amendment has an expiration date, as you just heard, either December 11, 2014, or the passage of the NDAA, whichever happens first.

There is a broad array of oversight, beginning 15 days before anything is done, and then every 90 days thereafter specific requirements of information that has to come to this Congress.

There are limits on the funding. If U.S. taxpayer dollars are used, then the Congress has to be notified and basically, through the transfer authorities, Congress has to approve.

Finally, it is absolutely clear, because it says so, this is not an authorization to use military force.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

All of those people who are concerned that it is not an Authorization for Use of Military Force may have a very good point, but that is not what this is about. This is about a narrow train-and-equip authority that would provide the Syrians the ability to get into that fight against ISIL.

So the bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that I think another thing most everybody agrees upon is you can't defeat this group from the air. You have to have folks on the ground. We have folks on the ground with the Kurds. We have folks on the ground who will be more competent with the Iraqis. We need some folks in Syria to be on the ground.

That is what this amendment does. It is narrow. It has oversight. It has limits. It has a time limit. But as General Dempsey told all Members, it is necessary, but, in and of itself, it is not enough. But it is necessary.

I believe that the House ought to take this step today to begin this training, and then it is up to the President to make his strategy work.

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

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

I think one of the things that makes this difficult is there are so many issues swirling around here: the desire; the need that I think, as Mr. THORNBERRY said, that everyone agrees on to confront and contain ISIL.

Their savagery is just unimaginable. They are clearly a threat to us and to the region, and we need a plan for confronting them, for stopping them and, hopefully, ultimately defeating them.

Now, part of that plan is what we are doing in Iraq. Part of that plan is trying to figure out how to deal with them in Syria.

But aside from all of that, this amendment is far more basic and simple, and I think Mr. THORNBERRY explained it. It is a train-and-equip mission. This is something that the Department of Defense does all over the world in a variety of different places. We have had a great deal of success training armies in Ethiopia and Kenya and Uganda to help deal with the situation in Somalia. We have had considerable success training forces in Yemen to help confront AQAP. The goal of this is to reduce the requirement for a robust U.S. military presence to advance our interests.

I have heard a number of folks, particularly on my side of the aisle, express that concern, that we don't want to go down the slippery slope of committing U.S. forces to a large-scale war, and I completely agree with them. But this amendment does not authorize

military force. In fact, it is quite the opposite. It authorizes us to train local forces so that they can do the fighting.

I have also heard a number of people express the frustration which I share: we shouldn't be over there fighting these battles; we need the local populations there to stand up and fight for themselves. But that is precisely what Mr. McKEON's amendment enables us to do. It enables the military to train local forces to fight ISIL on our behalf. And this is important, not just because it keeps us out of the fight, but because it gives us a far greater chance of being successful.

If this is perceived as the U.S. coming in against the Muslim group, then that gives ISIL a powerful propaganda message to say that they are simply defending themselves against Western aggression. If, on the other hand, they continue to do what they have been doing, which is killing Muslims and fighting Muslims, then we can recruit and get greater support from the local Sunni population to stand up against them.

This is what was successful about the Anbar Awakening back during the Iraq war, when Sunni tribesmen rose up against al Qaeda, with our support, and were able to turn the tide in Iraq at that time. That is why this is so important.

Now, the big issue of concern is what is going to happen within Syria. Are there truly moderates?

There are, unquestionably, moderates in Syria. Now they have been under a lot of pressure for the last couple of years from the Assad regime, but also from al Qaeda-affiliated groups like al-Nusra and also from ISIL. So they are clearly there. We know this because they are already, in some instances, fighting against ISIL. They are just not properly trained. They are not properly equipped, and they haven't been doing particularly well for the last couple of years. So if we can train them, they have a chance to survive.

And that is the last point that I will make. I think people can legitimately say: Is this really going to turn the tide of the war? Is this really going to defeat ISIL and give us success? This alone, absolutely not. But what it does is it gives us a chance, because if ISIL is allowed free rein in Syria, if they are not confronted by anybody but Assad, then we have no chance of defeating them.

We can do our best in Iraq, but if they can just go right across the border into Syria, as we have experienced trying to fight the Taliban in Afghanistan as they go across the border into Pakistan, if they have a safe haven where they can go without being pressured, then it is going to be very, very difficult to ever defeat them. The only way we can take away that safe haven is to find a local force that will fight our fight, and we can't get there if we don't train them.

This is about enabling the moderates in Syria enough space to survive. They

survive, we slowly build from there to get us the force that we need to defeat them in Syria and, ultimately, beat back ISIL in both Syria and Iraq.

This is not a perfect plan. This is not going to solve all problems. Believe me, it wouldn't take too long to find difficulties and challenges in any plan that was put out there, but I think this is a good and prudent step that gives us the best chance of advancing U.S. national security interests in a reasonable way.

I urge this body to support this amendment. I thank Mr. McKEON for bringing it.

I also want to join Mr. THORNBERRY. This has been an excellent debate. It is great to have so many Members come down and so articulately explain their positions. I urge support for the amendment.

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

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

I want to thank ADAM SMITH, my ranking member and partner for the last few years in this effort. I think he was very eloquent. He did a good job in working this debate. I think we have heard from both sides of the aisle, both positions, and it has been a strong debate.

I want to thank Mr. THORNBERRY. He has been my vice chairman, sidekick, for the last couple of years, carried a heavy load. He is a vice chairman of the committee, but he is also chairman of a subcommittee and also serves on the Intelligence Committee and a strong, strong Member, as you can see. He did a great job of explaining the bill, laying it all out in summary form after this long debate.

There is just one other point I want to mention, and that is that there is no new money in this bill. The President did not need additional money, and any money that is needed will be reprogrammed from money that already exists. They have to come back to the Congress and go through the process to make that change. But there will be nothing added to the top line.

I want to thank our staff who worked so hard on this. This came late in the process. The President sent us language last week. It wasn't something that we could support.

I want to thank leadership for giving us the time to work this issue, that, instead of voting on it last Thursday, we had time to work. The staff worked all weekend, both sides of the aisle. Thank you. Thank you for your strong work.

We hear sometimes about government workers and they are kind of just at the government trough. I want to tell you, these people work hard, long hours, and they are devoted to their jobs. Most of them could leave here and make more money, but they are committed to what they are doing, and I want to thank them for it.

Finally, I would just like to say, as a final wrap-up, this letter that I put in earlier, where Ambassador Crocker,

Ambassador Ford, who have spent years in this area, really understand the people, understand what is going on in that area, and then General Keane, General Petraeus, who both have spent a lot of time on this issue, the four of them have signed a letter that they sent over to us this morning that they support this amendment.

I agree with, I think, probably everybody that spoke that this will not do everything, but it is an important step at this time, and I urge our colleagues to support this amendment to give our Commander in Chief the authority that he needs to protect us in this area.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I agree with President Obama that the destabilizing and destructive actions of ISIL demand an American response. While I am supportive of President Obama's targeted actions against ISIS to date, I believe our government must be mindful of the unintended consequences inherent in training and equipping fighters in a highly complex foreign conflict. For this reason, I authored a successful bipartisan amendment to the House's Defense Appropriations bill this summer, prohibiting the transfer of dangerous shoulder-fired antiaircraft missiles known as MANPADs to parties in the Syrian civil war. As President Obama uses any authority granted by Congress to train and equip Syrian rebels, I hope he honors the will of the House of Representatives to prevent the dissemination of these and other dangerous weapons in the Middle East and beyond.

We must remain cognizant that military force is not the solution to the strife afflicting Iraq and Syria. I continue to oppose the presence of U.S. ground troops in the region. We must do all we can to eliminate funding sources for ISIL and to support inclusive governance and vigorous dialogue while respecting Iraqi sovereignty. We must also do what we can to promote a peaceful settlement in Syria and to invest in employment-focused economic development throughout the region.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the H.J. Res. 124, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution of 2015 with the McKeon Amendment, which would allow for the training and equipment of Syrian opposition. Should a clean continuing resolution to provide funding to the United States government come to the floor, I would support it. However, I cannot support an authorization for war.

Since this body did not pass a budget on time, our only option is to vote to keep the government open and operating until December 11, 2014. Funding our government should not hinge on a controversial amendment added at the last minute that provides the opportunity for an open-ended war.

I am not in favor of unilateral action or troops deployed to the region and I am committed to resolving this conflict through diplomacy. I fully support any efforts by our country to provide humanitarian aid to the countless innocent civilians displaced and injured by this conflict.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and push for a clean continuing resolution.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the terrorist organization known as the Is-

lamic State of Iraq and Levant (ISIL) is a growing regional threat that presents greater instability and turmoil across the Middle East. Today ISIL does not pose a credible strategic threat outside of the Middle East. So the U.S. response must reflect that reality. We cannot allow the Dick Cheney's of the world to use the horrific beheadings by ISIL as a call to war, just like the Gulf of Tonkin incident or the alleged weapons of mass destruction capabilities of Saddam Hussein. I am voting against this authorization to equip and train as yet unknown, perhaps non-existent "moderate" Syrian opposition forces to combat ISIL.

The three most successful ground forces fighting in Syria are ISIL who has ties with Saudi Arabia, the Syrian army backed by Iran, and Al Nusra which has ties to Hezbollah. The alliances between these forces are constantly shifting. One day ISIL and Nusra make common cause against the Syrian army and the other day they are all fighting each other. These sectarian wars are based on thousands of years of history and the U.S. has no role in sorting them out.

Congress is being asked to vote today on arming Syrian rebels that are yet to be vetted by the U.S. In fact, the text of this authorization requires the administration to report to Congress within 15 days on the plan for providing this assistance. Congress should know what the plan is before we vote on it. We should come back in 15 days or however long it takes for the administration to determine the scope and plan of this operation and who it is that the U.S. is going to arm in Syria. It is an abdication of our constitutional duties to vote on a vague authorization today instead of waiting and passing judgment on a more detailed assessment on this operation and an updated authorization for use of military force (AUMF).

If you turned to any of my colleagues today and asked the basic question who are the 5,000 fighters that the U.S. will train and equip in Syria, they could not give you an answer. Not even our intelligence agencies know who we can trust. Before granting authorization, Congress should at least know who it is we are giving U.S. weapons to and what their ideology and political goals are. This is a complex mess of various actors, many of whom cannot be considered trustworthy allies. The Syrian opposition is made up of hundreds of thousands of fighters from various factions that are also fighting amongst each other.

In Iraq, the U.S. is looking to form an alliance with a new government whose current Prime Minister has yet to prove he will bring Sunnis back to their proper place in an inclusive society. At the moment the Iraqi army barely exists on paper. It is extremely disturbing that the main Iraqi force currently fighting ISIL, Asaib Ahl al-haq, is incredibly hostile to the U.S. and was attacking our troops up to the last day of the U.S. occupation of Iraq.

That is why it is so critical that Congress be presented with a detailed plan of this "train and equip" operation including who it is that we are arming before we vote and this amendment fails to do that.

Most importantly what we are voting on today is a small part of President Obama's larger strategy to go to war with ISIL. No President can declare war without Congressional authorization. If the U.S. is going to war with ISIL as it appears that we are, then my colleagues need to stay here and debate and

vote on an AUMF. It is our constitutional duty and to leave town without a vote on the overall military strategy is disgraceful. The American people did not elect us to punt the responsibility for matters of war and peace to the President. The purpose of an AUMF is to lay out in detail the scope, plan, purpose, and duration of a military operation and to provide both classified and non-classified briefings to Congress and allow them to debate and express their opinions on the merits of this. Absent an AUMF from Congress, we are committing ourselves to an open ended war, declared by the President about which we have little to no details.

Lastly, history has shown that U.S. involvement in sectarian as well as civil wars raging in the Middle East does not benefit our interests. ISIL would not exist today if it were not for the unnecessary U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003, which I voted against. ISIL is a regional threat and it is time for Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Jordan, and other so-called "partners" to step up and fight this war themselves. They have no incentive to do it if we keep fighting it for them. Additionally, arming Syrian rebels could drag the U.S. into the Syrian civil war. General Martin Dempsey said yesterday in his testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee that he would put U.S. troops on the ground if he felt it was necessary despite the President's numerous statements that he would not put boots on the ground. Already you can hear the march to war. In fact, it is easy to argue that continued U.S. military actions in the Middle East only create more hatred directed at our nation and increase the risk of terrorism both here and abroad.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

There is not a member of this body who does not share the view that the terrorist organization known as the "Islamic State in the Levant" (ISIL) is a threat to the people of Iraq and Syria. ISIL's acts of barbarism are well known. The question before us is whether arming an amorphous and largely unknown Syrian opposition is the proper response to ISIL's rise.

The idea of arming the Syrian opposition has been discussed and even debated in this body over the last several years. And until now, Congress has rejected military involvement with Syrian opposition groups because we did not truly understand the size, composition, and intentions of the various opposition groups, and were concerned that the unforeseen consequences of our involvement could easily ruin any advantages there might be. The fact that ISIL emerged unexpectedly out of the Syrian fighting and surprised us with their military success in Iraq illustrates well America's lack of understanding of the situation. Furthermore, just this week, the head of the Free Syrian Army was quoted as saying if his group received U.S. aid, he would use it against the Assad regime, not against ISIL. As I have pondered this question and discussed it with experts and with citizens in New Jersey, I have come away with more and more questions about the wisdom of the proposed action we are debating today.

The President's proposed strategy seems very similar to the one we have pursued in previous conflicts: arm and train local forces in the region and plan to turn over responsibility for the fight to those governments. That strategy failed spectacularly in Iraq. Earlier this

year, U.S. trained-and-equipped Iraqi security forces melted away in the face of ISIL forces. We have been told the reason was because of the Iraqi government under former Prime Minister al Maliki. With a new Iraqi government in Baghdad results would be better. That is hardly a believable or a reassuring argument.

The American public was told the same thing years ago after the South Vietnamese generals ousted Premier Diem in late 1963. If only we had the right leadership in Saigon, they argued, we could win the war. In the wake of that U.S.-sponsored coup, the political chaos in South Vietnam only deepened, and the Viet Cong and their North Vietnamese allies benefited from and exploited the situation to their political and military advantage, and less than a year after Diem's ouster President Johnson began committing large numbers of American ground troops to Vietnam in a vain effort to roll back the rising tide of support for the Viet Cong. Of course, the situation today in Syria and Iraq is not exactly like Vietnam under Diem or Iraq under Saddam, but we are slow to learn lessons.

Proponents of this resolution argue that a newly trained and equipped Iraqi security force may be in the field in a few months. If history is any guide, it is unlikely that schedule will be met, and in any case, Administration officials have made it clear they believe the Iraqi security forces will require significant external help for years in order to retake ISIS-controlled territory in Iraq.

In Syria, the Administration now proposes to arm an amorphous collection of Syrian opposition groups in the hopes that they can become a viable combat force. Arming Syrian rebels brings to mind our experience with the Afghan mujahedeen a generation ago. Can we have any confidence that our weapons will not be used against us eventually? The amendment before us explicitly acknowledges—through its reporting requirements—that American advisors may be killed by supposedly friendly Syrian opposition fighters, just as American advisors have been killed by Iraqi and Afghan turncoats in those nations. This amendment also recognizes—again through its reporting requirements—that American military aid may be diverted to Islamic militants through Syrian opposition traitors. If we can already see that this proposed action will lead to dead American advisors and pilfered American military aid, why are we continuing down this road?

It was telling that during his trip to the region earlier this month, Secretary of State Kerry came up empty when he sought concrete military commitments from other countries—even countries directly threatened by ISIL and its ideology. In the 1991 Persian Gulf war to oust Saddam Hussein's army from Kuwait, each of those nations contributed significant military forces or allowed the use of their bases for Coalition forces. If the governments most threatened by the march of ISIL refuse to commit combat forces against it while American pilots are risking their lives daily in airstrikes against ISIL in Iraq, why should we put more American lives at risk on the ground in Iraq and Syria? I must vote no.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the McKeon Amendment because I believe training and equipping moderate Syrian rebels to fight ISIL will increase the likelihood of success in our effort to rid the world of this threat.

We have seen that ISIL will ruthlessly slaughter anyone who does not adhere to their

horrific ideology—including Muslims, Shia and Sunni alike. ISIL, with large numbers of Western fighters, is a threat not only to the Middle East but to Europe and America as well. We have seen their disgusting brutality with the beheadings of two brave American journalists, as well as others of diverse nationalities.

We must be clear about what this amendment is and what it isn't. It is not an authorization for the use of force against ISIL in Iraq and Syria. The Administration has stated that it believes it already has the authority to conduct a military campaign against ISIL, and they are proceeding pursuant to this authority. I would support a reexamination of the 2001 authorization by this Congress so we can fully debate its applicability to current threats. Thirteen years after its passage, it may be wise to refine it to empower the President to go after ISIL and other groups that pose a danger to America. This is our constitutional duty.

But this amendment is much more limited. It would simply authorize the training and equipping of Syrians to fight ISIL. Again, it does not authorize an American invasion of Iraq or Syria. If it did, I would not support it. In fact, I support this amendment precisely because I oppose an American ground war and believe we must eliminate the threat from ISIL without putting thousands of American troops in harm's way.

I oppose another American ground war not only because I believe that we have sacrificed enough already in two wars in the Middle East, although this is certainly my belief I oppose another American ground war primarily because for our campaign against ISIL to have sustained success, the combat troops driving out ISIL need to be Iraqi and Syrian, and in particular, they need to be Sunni. We actually defeated ISIL in their previous incarnation as Al Qaeda in Iraq. We were successful in doing so because we built political support among Iraqi Sunnis. Unfortunately, former Prime Minister Maliki's sectarianism alienated the Sunnis, and this, combined with Bashar al-Assad's brutality against Sunnis in Syria, allowed ISIL to emerge without really being challenged by the moderate majority of Sunnis, who saw them as the lesser of two evils.

Given this reality, the best way to eliminate the threat from ISIL is to empower moderate Sunnis in Iraq and Syria to drive them out of the areas they control. The development of a nonsectarian government in Iraq is a step in the right direction in that country, and this limited amendment is a step in the right direction in Syria. It cannot be the only step; we must continue to work with Sunni Arab countries so that the Sunnis of Iraq and Syria know that there is a much better future for them than the destructive brutality of ISIL.

The fight against ISIL will not be short, and it will not be easy. This should not, and will not, be the last time this body addresses this international challenge. Today we are asked to take a reasoned, sensible step on the path to ridding the world of ISIL's scourge. It is a step that we would be wise to take.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I support the McKeon Amendment to the Continuing Resolution.

As a nation, we have faced many threats to our national security over the 238 years of our existence. But the danger presented by the Islamic State may be unique in its hostility, raw hatred, and dedication to eliminating the United States from existence.

Less than a week ago, we observed the anniversary of the devastating attacks of September 11, 2001. Then, as today, we are reminded of the true nature of this enemy. They will attack at will, without provocation, and without regard for the lives of any innocent people who stand in their way. In fact, the more innocent the lives they take, the better—for their purposes.

I am pleased that President Obama has finally acknowledged the threat the Islamic State presents to our national security. Not content with wreaking havoc in their own corner of the Middle East, these terrorists have conquered territory, beheaded innocent Americans, forged allegiances with al Qaeda, threatened to strike us at home, and pledged to raise their flag over the White House. They are a muscular and growing menace that must be dispatched.

After our briefings on the situation in the region and the President's proposed strategic outline, I will be supporting his efforts on behalf of the nation. But I do so with some reservations.

With what we know now, this is not a perfect plan by any means, and I trust the President will listen to the counsel of his military advisers. American military strength will be evident in powerful air strikes, but on the ground, we will be relying on a fighting force trained quickly by American personnel. These are not seasoned fighters. These are just regular people—doctors, pharmacists, plumbers, or laborers. They are not soldiers, although very shortly we will be asking them to be.

These rookie ground forces will be entering into what the President has called an anti-terrorism operation, which is, in reality, a war. The administration and its representatives have been reluctant to use that word, but when our enemies have declared war on this country, there is no other terminology that is appropriate. And it will be a two-front war—on one side they will be fighting in Syria, and on the other, in Iraq. This will not be an easy fight, and I pray that they meet with more success than their military qualifications and experience suggests they might.

Another issue that I find troubling is that we do not know exactly who we will be assisting. While we trust and depend on their courage and determination in defeating what we perceive to be our common enemy, we truly do not know what their core loyalties are. This is a situation that will require constant monitoring.

The international coalition the president says he is assembling will be key, as other countries will be called upon to fund much of the effort, and, we hope, ground troops. Though the president has pledged significant air strikes, I find it hard to believe that many nations will be convinced to enter into the conflict with full commitment, while our own president has made it clear that the United States has firmly defined limits on what it will and will not do. That is another concern that I have—that the President has broadcast to the world, and the enemy, exactly what will not be in his war plan.

In the end, the President is the Commander in Chief, though I believe it is right that Congress vote on matters as important as this. The bottom line for me, Mr. Speaker, is that today we are all Americans. We are not Republicans or Democrats.

Throughout our history, presidents from different political parties have come to Congress

asking for our blessing for moving forward with armed conflict. With what I know now, and with the chance to continually examine this endeavor, I am prepared to give my consent.

That is why, despite my reservations and my concerns about the effectiveness of the somewhat vague strategy the president has outlined, I will be supporting the amendment to the Continuing Resolution. We must present a united front. It is vital that we show the world that all of us, as Americans, are together in fighting this common enemy.

Absolutely essential in gaining my support for the amendment is the requirement that the administration provide detailed and regular reports on the effectiveness and status of the ongoing training and equipping efforts. We must know that what we are doing is having the intended effect.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a perfect plan. And I worry that moving forward in such a way can be described as somewhat less than a full effort to defeat an evil that has pledged to exterminate us.

But sitting by and doing nothing was never an option.

While we take this vote, I am reminded that even with the most careful planning, any armed conflict is inherently perilous for the men and women in our military. My thoughts and prayers go with them and their families as they head toward danger.

I urge my colleagues to support the McKeon Amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Defense Secretary Hagel stated, "We are at war with ISIL." He also said, "this will not be an easy or brief effort."

The current debate on the McKeon amendment does not address the "war with ISIL," but rather solely training, arming, and supporting Syrian fighters. The CIA is already training and arming Syrian fighters in Jordan, without congressional approval. How well has that worked? We are not discussing that as a body because this is a policy debate that has been rushed. The Republican majority in the House is determined to adjourn on Friday so their Members can return home and campaign for re-election.

Yes, Congress needs to pass a continuing resolution to keep the federal government funded and prevent another government shutdown before the start of the new federal fiscal year on October 1st. But, a "must pass" continuing resolution should not be the legislative vehicle for sanctioning the training of Syrian fighters in what is certainly to be a long war against the Islamic State's terrorist army.

Over and over during the debate on this amendment we have heard how ISIL is a threat to the United States, expanding its reach into Iraq and strengthening its hold in Syria, while committing brutal and widespread acts of extreme violence. All Members agree that ISIL has grown into a vicious terrorist army that must be stopped and destroyed. Yet, this chamber's response is to vote on the McKeon amendment to train and arm Syrian fighters, and then leave town for seven weeks?

I have heard over and over again Republican colleagues condemning ISIL and then going on to disparage President Obama's efforts. Based on this rhetoric it appears that before this House can become fully engaged in authorizing a military campaign to defeat ISIL, campaigning against our President prior to Election Day comes first.

Yes, the mid-term election will take place on November 4th and many of us are on the ballot. But until then, we have an obligation to do our jobs which in this case is a matter of committing to U.S. military operations in Iraq and Syria based on an authorization that is outdated and demands Congressional action.

I want President Obama to conduct airstrikes against ISIL—in Iraq and in Syria if need be. I want Iraqi forces trained and equipped so they are confident and competent to take the fight on the ground to remove ISIL from Iraq. I want a broad coalition of nations sharing intelligence, working to stop the flow of foreign recruits into Syria, and cutting off the financing of ISIL.

All of this should be done based on an updated authorization approved by this Congress for the use of military force against ISIL. I voted for the 2001 authorization following the attacks on September 11th and I opposed the 2002 authorization which took the U.S. into Iraq. But today more than half of the Members in this House were not in Congress for those votes. The war against ISIL is not the war against Saddam Hussein. This Congress has an obligation to define the scope, duration, and oversight of what will require a significant and long-term use of military force and resources.

With regard to the McKeon amendment, I have serious misgivings about training and arming some thousands of Syrian fighters with the belief that they will defeat ISIL while they are also intent on removing the Assad regime from power. The New York Times on September 11, 2014 ("U.S. Pins Hopes on Syrian Rebels With Loyalties All Over the Map") said the plan to train Syrian rebels "leaves the United States dependent on a diverse group riven by infighting, with no shared leadership and with hard-line Islamists as its most effective fighters." This description of the fighting force at the foundation of our anti-ISIL policy leaves me profoundly disturbed.

The Government of Germany is training and arming the Kurdish pesh merga forces in Iraq, but refused to train the Syrian forces. They are concerned that providing arms to the Syrian rebels could end up in the hands of ISIL. According to Germany's ambassador to the United States, "We can't control the final destination of these arms."

Secretary Hagel is aware of this danger and assured Congress yesterday that, "We will monitor them (Syrian forces) closely to ensure that weapons do not fall into the hands of radical elements of the opposition, ISIL, the Syrian regime, or other extremist groups. There will always be risks in a program like this, but we believe the risks are justified." While I respect Secretary Hagel immensely, I must disagree with him. The risks in this instance are significant and out weight the prospects of success.

The McKeon amendment's concept of vetting focuses solely on ensuring that recruits are not known terrorists themselves. That is hardly a standard of conduct the U.S. should be proud of. No one should be naïve about this, there is no mention of human rights or international standards of conduct because these recruits will be sent back to a war in which they will likely be committing barbarous acts of violence. And how is this in the interest of U.S. national security?

Another issue that profoundly concerns me is the porous border between Syria and Tur-

key in which foreign fighters and recruits are allowed to pass freely. A New York Times report on September 15, 2014 in an article entitled, "ISIS Draws a Steady Stream of Recruits From Turkey", highlights this serious problem.

ISIL has grown into a force of between 20,000 and 30,000 fighters according to published CIA estimates and it appears their numbers will continue to grow, far outpacing the modest numbers to be trained by agreeing to this amendment. Unless Turkey, our NATO ally, shuts off the flow of fighters and commits to preventing the stream of new recruits from crossing into Syria, ISIL will only grow stronger in numbers.

Yesterday, in testimony before a Senate committee, General Martin Dempsey said that if airstrikes were not effective against ISIL he would recommend to the President the deployment of U.S. troops on the ground. Now, as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Dempsey has an obligation to make recommendations that will allow U.S. policy goals to be achieved. In this case that means the destruction of ISIL.

We should all expect that there will be some U.S. boots on the ground in Iraq and quite possibly Syria. Special operations forces, military trainers, and spotters to direct air strikes may all be required to enter the battle field at great risk. They need our support to achieve their missions. But a full commitment of U.S. troops on the ground to directly engage ISIL is unacceptable. This fight needs to be won on the ground by Iraqis and the Arab allies who know the risk ISIL poses to the entire region.

There is no reason why Congress cannot work with the administration, military leaders, and intelligence experts over the coming weeks to develop and approve the necessary authorization for the use of military force to demonstrate to the American people that we are united in this fight against ISIL and there are clear limits to our engagement in Iraq and Syria.

I want our Commander-in-Chief to have Congress' full support for a strategy to destroy ISIL, but I will not write a blank check to any president. Unfortunately, this amendment and the decision by Republican leadership to prioritize campaigning for re-election rather than passing a clear authorization to take the fight to ISIL should give the American people great concern about the priorities of this Congress.

Right now millions of people in Iraq and Syria are living under the oppressive, violent rule of ISIL. It is in our national interest to join the fight to stop their reign of terror. But we need real, credible allies with military forces willing to take on the fight, the fight on the ground. This amendment does not require a commitment by any other allied nations, only desperate Syrians and U.S. taxpayers. That is not enough to earn my support.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I will cast my vote to approve the President's funding request to support the training and equipping of moderate Syrian opposition forces. I do so after long consideration, and mindful of the difficulties of vetting such a force during the middle of a brutal civil war.

Any decision to supply arms to combatants must be weighed carefully; indeed, for the last several years I have opposed arming the Syrian rebels out of a concern for our ability to properly vet such troops and the fear that weapons we provide may end up in the wrong

hands. Those concerns persist, but they have been overcome by the growing menace of ISIL and the willingness of our regional allies to play a greater—and open—role in the support of these forces.

ISIL now controls about a third of Iraq and a like portion of Syria. It has been unsurpassed in its brutality, committing mass executions, forced conversions, trafficking in women and beheading its hostages—including Americans James Foley and Steven Sotloff. If ISIL is allowed to consolidate its territorial gains, or expand them, it will be able to act on its stated intention of serving as the platform for attacks on the United States. The thousands of foreign fighters, including Americans, who have flocked to join its ranks will one day attempt to return to the west and attack us on the homeland. The longer ISIL can draw new recruits, the longer the United States will have to confront the threat that these fighters will return home, many with visa-free travel to our shores.

Our response must be proportionate to the threat. It does not justify American occupation of Iraq or Syria, or the introduction of American ground forces—all of which are likely to be counterproductive. It does justify the use of American air power, intelligence, financial, diplomatic and military support. And since air power alone will not be sufficient on the battlefield, it will necessitate the assistance of local ground forces. In the case of Iraq, those ground forces will be provided by the Iraqi military and Kurdish Peshmerga. In Syria, with rigorous vetting, training and support, the rebel opposition may provide the raw material for a credible military force. There is no guarantee that the Syrian opposition can form a cohesive fighting force, something that has thus far eluded them, but the open support of Gulf nations in housing and funding this opposition holds the promise of consolidating regional support behind them.

The threat posed by ISIL is an outgrowth of the disastrously sectarian policies of the Nouri al-Maliki regime in Baghdad and the ruthless dictatorship of the Bashar al-Asad in Damascus. Our military efforts and those of our allies alone cannot succeed without addressing the political fractures created by both. I applaud the Administration for its role in urging the Iraqis to form a new and more inclusive government and look forward to the day when a representative government can take shape in neighboring Syria and this carnage can come to an end.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the McKeon Amendment to H.J. Res. 124. This is a difficult decision because there are no good options for American intervention in Iraq and Syria. However, ISIL is a barbaric group that poses a direct threat to our national interests and it is our obligation to respond in an appropriate fashion to this new threat. I believe the counterterrorism strategy laid out by President Obama represents the best way to combat ISIL without committing our country to another costly, deadly ground war in the Middle East.

This amendment is not a declaration of war, or an authorization for the use of military force. Rather, it is a limited effort to train and equip members of the moderate Syrian opposition who have been vetted by our government. I am confident that the limitations and the reporting requirements in the resolution will ensure sufficient oversight, ensuring the

mission does not expand beyond congressional intent.

Americans are weary of war. Any efforts to expand our role in this conflict should be openly debated in Congress. Yet, we cannot turn our back on the threat ISIL poses to our allies in the region, and the humanitarian catastrophe they helped create. I will be closely watching this mission as it unfolds to ensure it remains limited in scope and in line with our national interest.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the Amendment to H.J. Res. 124, the Continuing Resolution, that supports training and equipping the so-called Syrian Opposition.

After attending briefings on the President's proposal, I do not believe that this Amendment has a reasonable chance of achieving his goals. Worse, it could embroil America in another endless war. I hate ISIL and the other terrorist organizations that are plaguing Syria, Iraq and eventually the U.S.; the question is whether this Amendment will "degrade and destroy" them, to use the President's words. I do not fault President Obama's intent; I doubt this particular Amendment will work. Most obviously, it expires in 90 days, according to the very terms of the CR. And even if, under authority granted outside of this Amendment, an air strike killed ISIL's leader, it would not stop ISIL.

First, remember the budgetary context of this train-and-equip mission. Remember that military spending cuts called "sequestration" will last another seven years under current law. The readiness of our military is already threatened by these cuts. Necessary long-term investments in future weapons systems are being shortchanged. Until advocates of this train-and-equip mission are willing to fully fund the U.S. military and stop sequestration, they have no business adding extra responsibilities. America's credit-card hawks must not continue to hollow out our military while pursuing questionable foreign ventures.

Second, the Syrian Opposition is not like the Peshmerga. It is a number of disorganized, unreliable and shifting groups that face three hostile armies at once within Syria itself: Assad's army, ISIL, and the Al-Nusra Front. Each of these hostile armies has demonstrated the ability to conduct advanced military operations. They are years ahead of any possible effective counter-attack by the Syrian Opposition, unless they start fighting each other or Assad's entire military defects. We are not even sure that the people we train would remain loyal. Although the Amendment talks about vetting Syrian Opposition forces, it acknowledges that there will be "green-on-blue" violence against us. The Amendment also anticipates that some of the weapons we supply to the Opposition will be given or sold to ISIL.

Third, we are entering a series of civil wars. They are notoriously difficult to stop without years of bloodshed. The idea that U.S. Army training, guns, and bullets will facilitate a negotiated Syrian settlement is highly implausible. Another factor is the 1,400-year-old Sunni-Shia schism, giving our Muslim allies their own religious agendas. They make excuses for their failure to commit their own forces in their own backyards, even when their inaction floods their nations with refugees. Several of these nations have large militaries with advanced weaponry, which they refuse to use except for very limited, anonymous air-

strikes. They want U.S. soldiers and airmen to do their dirty work.

Fourth, ISIL was created by wealthy Sunnis in nations like Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and Kuwait who wanted an attack dog, a proxy army, to fight the Shia threat posed by Iran, Syria, Hamas, and Hezbollah. They got more than they bargained for: a pit bull that might turn against its masters. Nevertheless, they are not muzzling ISIL, or even yanking its leash. How does ISIL continue to get its funding? Aside from rape, pillage, kidnapping, and taxing infidels, it is known for its slick corporate appeals, even an annual report on its atrocities. Have the Sunni nations punished ISIL's benefactors, refused to purchase ISIL's oil, or taken other measures to cut off its funding? No. In the case of Saudi Arabia, they offer us unused training bases for no more than 10,000 of the Syrian Opposition. That is far from enough.

Fifth, how many times must the U.S. try to rebuild Muslim nations? We've tried for years, often just inflaming them. Syria will be the eighth Muslim nation we have tried to repair in the last three decades: Kuwait, Bosnia, Kosovo, Somalia, Iraq, Afghanistan, and Yemen. In most cases, we have not succeeded. The U.S. military is ill-suited for nation-building. As General Bob Scales pointed out in the Wall Street Journal recently, the Pentagon has trouble dealing with today's asymmetric wars.

Sixth, ask yourself what your reaction will be if an American airman—God forbid—is captured and beheaded on live television. Will this Amendment, that so carefully denies authorizing military force, suddenly become the prelude to American "boots on the ground" as Gen. Martin Dempsey has already predicted? And who believes that our trainers and equippers—and special forces and intelligence officers—are not already "boots on the ground"? The language of the Amendment is surreal: it contains no "authorization for the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations wherein hostilities are clearly indicated by the circumstances." Unless our military operates entirely outside of Syria or northern Iraq, they are in imminent danger. And if they are training in Saudi Arabia, they will be working in a nation that beheads more people for minor crimes than ISIL could dream of.

Lastly, is there a better way to degrade and destroy ISIL? Americans, with our wonderful optimism that all problems have a quick solution, have a lot to learn about the nature of the enemies we face. Unfortunately for us, our enemies do not measure action by the clock, but by the calendar. They outwait or outlast us. They use social media against us, to dare America to fight or to recruit the West's disaffected youth with dreams of martyrdom. They will laugh that this Amendment lasts only 90 days, particularly when other sections of the CR extend much longer.

America needs to understand the threats we face from radical jihadists and to fully fund effective strategies for dealing with them. Sadly, this Amendment does neither. Therefore, I oppose it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

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

Mr. MCKEON. 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 on adoption of the amendment will be followed by 5-minute votes on a motion to recommit, if ordered; passage of H.J. Res. 124, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 273, nays 156, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 507]

YEAS—273

Bachus	Delaney	LaMalfa
Barber	DelBene	Lamborn
Barletta	Denham	Lance
Barr	Deutch	Langevin
Barrow (GA)	Diaz-Balart	Lankford
Bass	Dingell	Larsen (WA)
Beatty	Ellison	Latham
Becerra	Ellmers	Latta
Benishek	Engel	Levin
Bera (CA)	Enyart	Lipinski
Billirakis	Farenthold	LoBiondo
Bishop (GA)	Fattah	Loebsack
Bishop (NY)	Fitzpatrick	Long
Bishop (UT)	Fleischmann	Lowe
Black	Flores	Lucas
Blackburn	Forbes	Luetkemeyer
Blumenauer	Fortenberry	Lujan Grisham
Boehner	Foster	(NM)
Bonamici	Foxx	Lynch
Boustany	Franks (AZ)	Marchant
Brady (PA)	Frelinghuysen	Marino
Brady (TX)	Galleo	Matheson
Braley (IA)	Garcia	McAllister
Brooks (IN)	Gardner	McCarthy (CA)
Brown (FL)	Gerlach	McCarthy (NY)
Brownlee (CA)	Gibbs	McCaul
Buchanan	Goodlatte	McHenry
Bucshon	Granger	McIntyre
Bustos	Graves (GA)	McKeon
Butterfield	Graves (MO)	McKinley
Byrne	Green, Al	McMorris
Calvert	Green, Gene	Rodgers
Camp	Griffin (AR)	McNerney
Capito	Griffith (VA)	Meehan
Cardenas	Grimm	Meeks
Carney	Guthrie	Messer
Carson (IN)	Hall	Mica
Carter	Hanna	Miller (MI)
Cartwright	Harper	Miller, Gary
Cassidy	Hartzler	Moran
Castor (FL)	Hastings (WA)	Mullin
Castro (TX)	Heck (WA)	Murphy (FL)
Chabot	Hensarling	Murphy (PA)
Chaffetz	Herrera Beutler	Murphy (PA)
Chu	Higgins	Noem
Clay	Hinojosa	Nunes
Clyburn	Holding	Olson
Coble	Horsford	Owens
Coffman	Hoyer	Pascarell
Cohen	Hudson	Paulsen
Cole	Hultgren	Pearce
Collins (GA)	Israel	Pelosi
Collins (NY)	Issa	Perlmutter
Conaway	Jackson Lee	Peters (CA)
Connolly	Jenkins	Peters (MI)
Conyers	Johnson (GA)	Peterson
Cook	Johnson (OH)	Pittenger
Costa	Joyce	Pompeo
Cotton	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Courtney	Kelly (PA)	Quigley
Cramer	Kildee	Rahall
Crawford	Kilmer	Reed
Crenshaw	Kind	Reichert
Crowley	King (IA)	Renacci
Cuellar	King (NY)	Rice (SC)
Culberson	Kingston	Richmond
Daines	Kinzinger (IL)	Rigell
Davis (CA)	Kirkpatrick	Roby
Davis, Rodney	Kline	Roe (TN)
DeGette	Kuster	Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)	Schweikert	Veasey
Rogers (MI)	Scott (VA)	Vela
Rokita	Scott, David	Wagner
Ros-Lehtinen	Sessions	Walberg
Roskam	Sewell (AL)	Walden
Ross	Sherman	Walorski
Roybal-Allard	Shimkus	Walz
Royce	Shuster	Wasserman
Ruiz	Sinema	Schultz
Runyan	Smith (MO)	Waters
Ruppersberger	Smith (NE)	Waxman
Ryan (OH)	Smith (TX)	Webster (FL)
Ryan (WI)	Smith (WA)	Wenstrup
Sánchez, Linda T.	Southerland	Wilson (FL)
Sarbanes	Stewart	Wilson (SC)
Scalise	Stivers	Wittman
Schakowsky	Thompson (PA)	Womack
Schiff	Thornberry	Woodall
Schneider	Tierney	Tiberi
Schock	Turner	Yarmuth
Schrader	Upton	Yoder
Schwartz	Valadao	Young (AK)
	Vargas	

NAYS—156

Aderholt	Heck (NV)	Pastor (AZ)
Amash	Himes	Payne
Amodei	Holt	Perry
Bachmann	Honda	Petri
Bentivolio	Huelskamp	Pingree (ME)
Bridenstine	Huffman	Pitts
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga (MI)	Pocan
Broun (GA)	Hunter	Poe (TX)
Burgess	Hurt	Polis
Campbell	Jeffries	Posey
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Price (GA)
Capuano	Johnson, Sam	Rangel
Cicilline	Jolly	Ribble
Clark (MA)	Jones	Rohrabacher
Clarke (NY)	Jordan	Rooney
Clawson (FL)	Keating	Rothfus
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Cooper	Kennedy	Salmon
Cummings	Labrador	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	Sanford
DeFazio	Lee (CA)	Scott, Austin
DeLauro	Lewis	Sensenbrenner
Dent	Lofgren	Serrano
DeSantis	Lowenthal	Shea-Porter
Doggett	Lujan, Ben Ray	Simpson
Doyle	(NM)	Sires
Duckworth	Lummis	Slaughter
Duffy	Maffei	Smith (NJ)
Duncan (SC)	Maloney,	Speier
Duncan (TN)	Carolyn	Stockman
Edwards	Maloney, Sean	Stutzman
Eshoo	Massie	Swalwell (CA)
Esty	Matsui	Takano
Farr	McClintock	Terry
Fincher	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Fleming	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Frankel (FL)	McGovern	Tierney
Fudge	Meadows	Tipton
Gabbard	Meng	Titus
Garamendi	Michaud	Tonko
Garrett	Miller (FL)	Tsongas
Gibson	Miller, George	Van Hollen
Gingrey (GA)	Moore	Velázquez
Gohmert	Mulvaney	Visclosky
Gosar	Nadler	Weber (TX)
Gowdy	Napolitano	Welch
Grayson	Negrete McLeod	Westmoreland
Grijalva	Neugebauer	Whitfield
Gutiérrez	Nolan	Williams
Hahn	Nugent	Wolf
Hanabusa	O'Rourke	Yoho
Harris	Palazzo	Young (IN)
Hastings (FL)	Pallone	

NOT VOTING—3

Barton DesJarlais Nunnelee

□ 1707

Mr. RANGEL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. STIVERS, CONYERS, and HINOJOSA changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mrs. BUSTOS. I am opposed to it in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Bustos moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 124 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 21, lines 4 and 5, strike "June 30, 2015" and insert "September 30, 2021".

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

SEC. _____. (a) The provisions of the following bills of the 113th Congress are hereby enacted into law:

(1) H.R. 377, as introduced in the House of Representatives on January 23, 2013 (the Paycheck Fairness Act).

(2) H.R. 1010, as introduced in the House of Representatives on March 6, 2013 (the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2013).

(3) H.R. 4582, as introduced in the House of Representatives on May 6, 2014, except sections 3 and 4 of such bill (the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act).

(b) The provisions of an Act enacted in subsection (a) shall be effective, notwithstanding any other provision of such Act, as of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

(c) The provisions of an Act enacted in subsection (a) shall have no force or effect after December 11, 2014, and, effective after such date, the provisions of law amended by such Act shall be restored as if such Act had not been enacted.

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this joint resolution 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.

Mrs. BUSTOS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not delay or kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will proceed immediately to final passage, as amended.

This amendment reinforces our commitment to the middle class and making sure that jobs are created right here in America, not overseas, by taking five key steps.

First, it would extend the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank for 7

years. Illinois companies like John Deere and Caterpillar, as well as large and small businesses across our country, deserve the certainty that a long-term reauthorization would provide.

Second, it would help ensure that employers provide equal pay for equal work. Equal pay is not simply a women's issue. It is an issue for all in the middle class. With households being led by women, equal pay will help those families get further ahead. Boosting women's earnings also will increase the purchasing power of families and will help our economy.

Third, my amendment will make the minimum wage a living wage. The cost of living has skyrocketed in recent years, but wages have remained stagnant. Working full time, year round at Illinois' \$8.25 minimum wage will earn a worker only \$16,500 per year, a salary that is below the Federal poverty line.

Raising the minimum wage would not only lift many families out of poverty, but it would also increase the earning power of households across the country, leading to an increase in overall economic activity.

Fourth, my amendment would allow students with outstanding student loan debt to refinance their loans at the lower interest rates that are currently offered to borrowers. Student loan debt not only harms young people and prevents them from reaching their personal financial potential, such as purchasing a home and starting a family, but it is deadweight, pulling down our entire economy and preventing economic growth.

Fifth, and finally, my amendment would prevent government contracts from going to companies that have moved their operations overseas. The government should not be giving taxpayer dollars to companies that ship jobs overseas and take advantage of corporate inversions to avoid paying their fair share.

These five commonsense elements would strengthen the middle class and help create jobs right here in America. Too many families are struggling, and enough is enough. For too long, lawmakers have been looking out for themselves instead of looking out for the middle class.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion to recommit.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, this is a clean, straightforward continuing resolution that has bipartisan and bicameral support. It is our best, most clear path forward to keep the lights on in our Federal Government before the fiscal year ends.

The American people rely on the Federal Government to provide certain

vital programs and services, and they expect the Congress to come together to ensure these programs continue.

Now, I would prefer to be standing here, presenting a bill that finalizes the hard work of this body to fund the entire government for the entire fiscal year. Unfortunately, the other body has refused to live up to their end of the equation.

They have yet to pass or even consider a single appropriations bill through their Chamber. Because the Senate leaves us with no alternative, we must replace politics with responsibility and pass the CR before us.

□ 1715

This motion to recommit only increases the possibility of a government shutdown, ignoring the tireless efforts of Members on both sides of the aisle to keep that from happening.

The motion to recommit would also put our national security at stake. With the addition of the McKeon amendment, this bill now provides authority to train and equip Syrian rebels to help degrade and destroy the terrorist organization ISIL.

Sadly, the minority is trying to hijack the process at the eleventh hour. They have reached deep into their grab bag of partisan agenda items in an attempt to attach, without fair consideration, sweeping policy changes that could place undue burdens on our economy, an effort that is designed to do nothing but score political points.

Funding our government and defeating ISIL are of grave national importance, and they are too important to risk over political maneuvers like this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to vote "no" on the motion and "yes" on final. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 228, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 508]

AYES—199

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

Conyers	Keating	Peters (MI)
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Peterson
Costa	Kennedy	Pingree (ME)
Courtney	Kildee	Pocan
Crowley	Kilmer	Polis
Cuellar	Kind	Price (NC)
Cummings	Kirkpatrick	Quigley
Davis (CA)	Kuster	Rahall
Davis, Danny	Langevin	Rangel
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Richmond
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Roybal-Allard
Delaney	Lee (CA)	Ruiz
DeLauro	Levin	Ruppersberger
DelBene	Lewis	Rush
Deutch	Lipinski	Ryan (OH)
Dingell	Loeb sack	Sanchez, Linda
Doggett	Lofgren	T.
Doyle	Lowenthal	Sanchez, Loretta
Duckworth	Lowe y	Sarbanes
Edwards	Lujan Grisham	Schakowsky
Ellison	(NM)	Schiff
Engel	Lujan, Ben Ray	Schneider
Enyart	(NM)	Schrader
Eshoo	Lynch	Schwartz
Esty	Maffei	Scott (VA)
Farr	Maloney,	Scott, David
Fattah	Carolyn	Serrano
Foster	Maloney, Sean	Sewell (AL)
Frankel (FL)	Matheson	Shea-Porter
Fudge	Matsui	Sherman
Gabbard	McCarthy (NY)	Sinema
Gallego	McCollum	Sires
Garamendi	McDermott	Slaughter
Garcia	McGovern	Smith (WA)
Grayson	McIntyre	Speier
Green, Al	McNerney	Swalwell (CA)
Green, Gene	Meeks	Takano
Grijalva	Meng	Thompson (CA)
Gutiérrez	Michaud	Thompson (MS)
Hahn	Miller, George	Tierney
Hanabusa	Moore	Titus
Hastings (FL)	Moran	Tonko
Heck (WA)	Murphy (FL)	Tsongas
Higgins	Nadler	Van Hollen
Himes	Napolitano	Vargas
Hinojosa	Neal	Veasey
Holt	Negrete McLeod	Vela
Honda	Nolan	Velázquez
Horsford	O'Rourke	Visclosky
Hoyer	Owens	Walz
Huffman	Pallone	Wasserman
Israel	Pascrell	Schultz
Jackson Lee	Pastor (AZ)	Waters
Jeffries	Payne	Waxman
Johnson (GA)	Pelosi	Welch
Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter	Wilson (FL)
Kaptur	Peters (CA)	Yarmuth

NOES—228

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

Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger

NOT VOTING—4

Barton
DesJarlais

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1723

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 319, noes 108, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 509]

AYES—319

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Billirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
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
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy

Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Royce
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Nugent
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doyle
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Loftgren
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)

NOES—108

Amash
Bachmann
Bentivolio
Blackburn
Bridenstine
Broun (GA)
Capuano
Chabot
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)

Kelly (PA)
Kildeer
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsock
Lofgren
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Marino
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeke
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci

Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—4

Barton
DesJarlais

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1731

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently voted on rollcall 509, H.J. Res. 124. I intended to vote “yes” on rollcall 509, H.J. Res. 124.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEWART). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.