

Hezbollah is now involved in supporting the Iranian-supported Houthi takeover in Yemen. Hezbollah is a model; and as you heard the debate recently on the Internet, should the Hezbollah model be replicated not only among the Shia Houthi but in other parts of the region, we must remember that any sanctions relief that we provide to Iran for a nuclear agreement will have an impact on Iran's ability to further support Hezbollah and the ability of that organization to carry out future attacks on Americans, on our allies, or on other unfortunate souls who oppose an Iranian takeover of that region.

Yet Hezbollah and their sponsor remain vulnerable. They are still reliant on Iran's largesse and on proceeds from Hezbollah's illicit activities. It is precisely those illicit activities, those vulnerabilities, that we must target. So, Madam Speaker, passing the Iran and the Hezbollah bills today will be a one-two punch against terrorists backing Iran's nuclear weapons drive.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of the Members to support this measure. Again, I thank Mr. ELIOT ENGEL for his work and the other cosponsors of the bill as well.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2297.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1735, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 260 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 260

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes. No further general debate shall be in order.

SEC. 2. (a) In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-14.

That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived.

(b) No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

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

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

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

SEC. 4. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1430

##### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, H. Res. 260 provides a structured rule for consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. It is my privilege to present this rule to the House as a member of the Rules

Committee. It is also my privilege to do so as a member of the committee of jurisdiction over this bill, the House Armed Services Committee.

The Rules Committee received a record number of amendments to the bill; heard nearly 6 hours of testimony from our colleagues; and, in this rule, have made in order 135 amendments for consideration on the House floor.

As is traditional, the rule gives the chair of the Armed Services Committee authority to offer such amendments en bloc to facilitate consideration of such a large number of amendments.

This is a good rule that helps pave the way for the passage of the National Defense Authorization Act. This law, this bill, governs the defense of the United States of America, provides for the servicemen and -women that defend this country. It is the single most important function of this House.

We are going to hear spirited debate today, but we need to make sure, as we hear this debate, that we focus on what we are here about, and that is to defend the people of the United States. While there are other things that may be brought up that are important and good, they are not about the defense of the United States and would not be in order for this bill.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have followed this bill from the start. Counting the Rules Committee hours and the hours in committee, I have personally spent over 25 hours in debate on this bill.

This has been an incredibly open process: 335 amendments were filed at the Armed Services Committee level; 211 amendments were adopted by the House Armed Services Committee in markup, including 96 Democrat amendments; 135 amendments were made in order by the rule—69 of those are Democrat or bipartisan amendments. That is over 450 amendments that have been considered since we started this process.

The National Defense Authorization Act has a history of bipartisanship, which is only appropriate on the single most important thing that we do, defending the people of the United States.

It passed out of the Committee on Armed Services on a vote of 60-2. It has been completed every year since 1962 on a bipartisan basis. That is 53 straight years, and we need to make it 54.

This bill is vitally important to our country. For the first time in a long time, Americans are ranking national security as their number one concern, even ahead of the economy.

Former CIA leader Mike Morell said he has never seen more threats to our country at any other time in his 33 years in the business. Most alarmingly, he says that we are at risk of another attack here in the United States. Our military men and women need this bill to do their job and help keep us safe.

The administration has issued a Statement of Administration Policy and indicated in there that the President's advisers would recommend a veto of this bill. I sincerely hope the President would not do so, given the bipartisan effort to pass a bill so critical to the security of our Nation.

President Obama requested authorization for \$612 billion in military spending, and this bill matches that request dollar for dollar.

Now, some of my colleagues quibble with that, and they quibble with that because, as you can see in this light blue area at the very top, in the President's recommendation, there is a certain amount of money that he wants to be in the categorization of overseas contingency operations, OCO.

The bill does the same thing except it increases OCO by a small amount—that you can see here—and increases the base by a larger amount. In essence, what we have done here is gotten to the same place as the President by making a very small alteration to the OCO.

Some of my colleagues are trying to use our military men and women as pawns in an effort to boost nondefense discretionary spending. That is plainly wrong and reprehensible.

Those other issues are important to our country, and it is important that we debate them, but we should never hold up this piece of legislation that is historically bipartisan to make a point on something that has nothing to do with the defense of the United States of America.

This bill is for the men and women who are keeping our Nation safe. They have elected to serve our Nation. The least we can do is give them the resources and the policy they need to do their job. Now, some of my colleagues want to use them as political bargaining chips. That is hard for me to believe that anyone would consider doing that in this House.

This bill is complex. It deals with a number of very complicated issues. There are a couple that I know we are going to talk about today that I briefly want to touch on now.

The first one is this whole issue of the overseas contingency operations account and how it affects this whole issue of sequestration. Long before I got here, there was this deal within Congress that was proposed by the President that, in essence, resulted in this artificial sequestration of funds that would otherwise be appropriately sent to the military, and we are operating under the artificial constraints of that sequestration law today.

I don't know what the rationale was back then because I wasn't here, but that rationale, whatever it was, doesn't make sense today when the number one concern of the American people is defending the United States of America, when experts on this issue are telling us, over and over again, the American interests abroad—and, yes, here at home—are threatened.

Why should we feel that we should be limited to that at a time when we need to be stepping forth and defending the American people?

Now, there may be a time and a place to revisit the sequestration law, but that time and that place is not on this law. This law is for us to do what we must do to defend the United States of America, and this bill does that.

Another issue that we will be hearing a lot today is a proposed amendment by my colleague from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS), and that deals with the issue of immigration. Now, you may ask: Why are we talking about immigration in regard to a bill on national defense? That is a good question. We should not be.

During the Armed Services Committee's consideration of this bill—and it went for 18 hours late in the process—one of our members offered an amendment to insert the immigration issue into this bill. It was unfortunate, and it was inappropriate.

The Brooks amendment proposes to take it out, and we are going to have spirited debate during this rule, I predict, and during the debate on the bill; but make no mistake about it, however important you think or I think the immigration issue is, however much we think that that should come to this floor for consideration, this bill, a bill on the defense of the United States of America, is not the right bill for us to consider it in.

There are other committees of jurisdiction that are supposed to do that—Homeland Security, for example. Those committees need to go through their process and make sure they do what they need to do, and then it can come to this floor, but it should not come to this floor to confuse this bill that deals with the defense of the United States of America.

This rule, Madam Speaker, is an extremely fair rule made after a lot of debate, allowing an enormous number of amendments, and I urge its support.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Madam Speaker, 355 amendments were submitted to the House Rules Committee on a wide variety of issues relevant to the National Defense Authorization Act. Of those, only 135 were made in order, or about 38 percent. That means that the Republican majority of the Rules Committee rejected over 60 percent of amendments submitted by their House colleagues.

This is a very exclusive structured rule. The amendments included under this rule are important amendments, worthy of the time and attention of

this House, but I believe that all the amendments submitted merited debate and should have been included under an open rule.

Further, each amendment included under this rule only receives 10 minutes of debate maximum, equally divided. That is no way to treat debate of significant issues regarding our national security.

Madam Speaker, I have served in Congress long enough that I remember when it used to take 4 or 5 entire days to debate the NDAA. Amendments that would significantly affect our defense policies and operations were provided with enough debate time so that all Members had the opportunity to speak and air their views.

Of course, that was back in the days when the House actually worked 4 or 5 full days each week. That simply doesn't happen anymore. There are fewer and fewer Members in this Chamber who remember when matters of substance were given the time, attention, and debate that they deserve.

There is much to admire in the FY 2016 defense authorization bill, but there is also much to be concerned about, from dangerous spending to increase our nuclear arsenal, to continuing to tie the hands of the administration on how to handle the transfer of prisoners out of Guantanamo who have been cleared of all charges.

One of the most blatant and egregious demonstrations of excess spending in the NDAA is what the bill has done to the President's overseas contingency operations fund, the so-called OCO fund.

This bill adds \$38 billion to the OCO fund on top of the \$51 billion requested by the President to fund our various wars. This \$38 billion will not be spent on war-related costs, but instead, it transfers money from the operations and maintenance account to the OCO to fund what should be base bill requirements, all as a ruse to evade the Budget Control Act caps.

In the coming weeks, my House colleagues will see at least four appropriations bills come to the House floor that are prepared to cut more than \$20 billion in urgently needed domestic programs, all in the name of staying within the caps set by the Budget Control Act; yet, when it comes to the Pentagon, nearly twice that amount is added to the OCO as a slush fund in order to avoid those very same caps. This is madness, Madam Speaker, absolute madness.

The strength of our Nation—the health, welfare, and prosperity of our people and our communities—requires that we invest in our transportation and infrastructure; in our urban and rural development; in science, engineering, and technology; in medical research and our healthcare and education systems; in our children, our families, our workers; in our local businesses and new entrepreneurs.

Our national and economic security is based on so much more than just our

force of arms. It is based on the role of the Federal Government in supporting strong quality of life for each and every one of our people, regardless of age, income, geography, or political affiliation. No one is offering them a slush fund; instead, we are cutting those programs to the bare bone.

When it comes to helping the neediest among us, Madam Speaker, the majority in this House has, once again, prevented debate on this critical issue. I am disappointed that an amendment offered by my friend from California (Mr. VARGAS) was not made in order for debate under this rule.

Under current law, military servicemembers who do not live on base are provided with a basic allowance for housing. Because this stipend is offered to military families in lieu of on-base housing, it is exempted from Federal taxes and from being considered as income when determining eligibility for certain tax credits. Unfortunately, there is still a lack of uniformity in how the allowance is treated for various basic needs programs.

For example, the basic housing allowance is being considered as income for the purpose of calculating SNAP benefits, which results in eligible households receiving a lesser SNAP benefit or being cut off from the program altogether. These are families who are struggling, and it makes absolutely no sense that receiving housing assistance means our military families should receive less food assistance.

It is shameful that an ever-increasing number of military families are struggling to make ends meet. More and more of these families are relying on SNAP benefits to put food on their tables, and we need to be having a larger conversation about how to make sure that our servicemen and servicewomen and their families who have sacrificed so much for our country have economic security.

Military families have unique needs, and we must make sure that they are receiving all the necessary assistance that they deserve.

□ 1445

Mr. VARGAS' amendment would have simply excluded the basic housing allowance from any calculation of income or resources for any purpose under Federal, State, and local law. It is a good amendment, and it is a commonsense amendment, and this House should have had the opportunity to debate this important amendment; but while we shortchange the American people, local communities, and our neighbors living in poverty, we have plenty of time to add to the national deficit and debt by funding a myriad of wars on the national credit card.

Speaking of the many wars in which the U.S. is currently engaged, last night in the Rules Committee, Congressman WALTER JONES of North Carolina, the distinguished ranking member of the Armed Services Committee—Congressman ADAM SMITH of Wash-

ington—and I offered an amendment that would do one simple thing: it would have the President tell Congress next year what our mission is in Afghanistan and how much longer our servicemen and servicewomen would continue to be deployed over there. Then Congress would have 30 days to vote on whether or not to authorize or to modify that mission.

We have been in Afghanistan for nearly 14 years. It is the longest military engagement in U.S. history. Over the past few years, the mission of our Armed Forces has been constantly altered. Supposedly, we ended combat operations at the end of last December; yet our forces still engage in combat. We are now supposed to be engaged in training the Afghan military and police forces and be out of Afghanistan by the end of 2016; but every day, I open up the newspaper, and I read how we are going to need to remain in Afghanistan for much, much, much longer.

In the underlying bill, this NDAA says that the U.S. should remain engaged in counterterrorism and special operations after 2016. All the President is required to do is let us know if he wants to keep our troops in Afghanistan to continue training Afghan forces until they can stand on their own.

Is it too much to ask for the President to tell us next spring what the plan is for keeping our uniformed men and women in Afghanistan and then having a vote on that plan? Don't our troops and don't their families deserve much more from us?

I guess it is too much to ask because this Congress—once again, the majority on the Rules Committee—decided not to make the McGovern-Jones-Smith amendment in order.

So U.S. engagement in Afghanistan—our blood and our treasure—simply continues on and on and on and on. It is a long, endless war that Congress barely pays attention to anymore, not even as members of our Armed Forces come home in coffins or wounded in body, heart, and mind. One of my constituents was the first to fall this year under our new post-combat operations mission in Afghanistan. Who will be the last U.S. servicemember to die in Afghanistan?

These are brave and honorable men and women. This House, however, is a disgrace.

This House—this Congress—is incapable of being accountable for the wars we so easily send our servicemembers to fight and die in, and it is completely incapable of carrying out its constitutional responsibilities to specifically and explicitly authorize these military operations.

It has been over 8 months since the United States began sustained combat operations in Iraq and Syria against the Islamic State. Last year, the Speaker said that it was not right for the 113th Congress to vote on this new war started on its watch. It should be up to the next Congress—this Congress, the 114th Congress—to authorize the

war. Then the Speaker complained that Congress couldn't act until the President sent us an AUMF. Madam Speaker, the President sent Congress an AUMF on February 11. That was over 3 months ago. It is not an AUMF that I would support, but the President did his job, and still Congress fails to act. Why? Because the leadership of this House says it can't find its way to 218 on an AUMF.

I am sorry, Madam Speaker, but that is not how it works. The job of the Congress is to take a vote on an AUMF—period. If you don't like what the President's proposal is, then change it, vote against it, or bring another version to the House floor. Congress has the constitutional obligation to authorize the use of military force to combat the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria or elsewhere. Congress has the responsibility to specifically debate and authorize sending servicemen and servicewomen into hostilities in Iraq and Syria. The party in charge of the House and the Senate has a responsibility to legislate. We don't have the right to say, "Oh, this is just too tough of a job, and we don't want to deal with it."

If you want to be in charge, then you have to govern. Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, I don't see the leadership interested in governing on this most serious matter.

Once again, reluctantly, Congressman WALTER JONES, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, and I will be introducing a privileged resolution under the provisions of the War Powers Resolution to force a debate on whether our troops should remain engaged in combat operations against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria or whether they should withdraw.

We have been patient. We have waited and waited and waited for the Republican leadership of this House to tell us when it would act on an AUMF for Iraq and Syria, but it has now become clear that this House has no intention of debating an AUMF on the fight against the Islamic State. It is perfectly happy to just drift along and not take any responsibility whatsoever for the lives that we are putting at risk in Iraq and Syria and for the millions of taxpayer dollars that we are spending each and every day.

Madam Speaker, I oppose this rule, and I oppose this underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

In listening to the remarks that we have just heard from the gentleman from Massachusetts, I was struck by the fact that so much of it had to do with things other than national defense. I said in the very beginning that this is the authorization of the defense of America. Those are important issues—health care, education, transportation—and we need to debate those, but not in this bill. That is why those sorts of amendments were not made in order.

Madam Speaker, we are here today to debate the defense of the United States of America.

I did hear the gentleman criticize the President's policy in Afghanistan, and I do think that we should consider at some point in time an appropriate AUMF for the conflict in Iraq. This House has been asking the leadership for briefings and other information about the proposed AUMF that we got from the administration, and we haven't received them yet, so we can't have the sort of deliberative-type review of his AUMF until we receive that information.

I would say, as important as those issues are, they are not in order under this bill. This is a bill that we have historically adopted in a bipartisan fashion. Let's stay focused on the defense of the United States of America in this bipartisan bill and not wander off onto other things that we are either not prepared for or that are not in order under this bill.

At this point in time, Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS), my colleague.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, the NDAA, as amended by Congressman RUBEN GALLEG0, undermines America's border security and ratifies parts of Obama's illegal amnesty for illegal aliens.

During the early morning, sleep-deprived portion of the Armed Services Committee NDAA hearing, the Gallego amendment, which encourages the Secretary of Defense to take military service opportunities from Americans and from lawful immigrants in order to give them to illegal aliens, passed on a close 33-30 vote. As Members ponder my amendment to strike the Gallego amendment, we should consider how much American families are struggling in an anemic job and wage market and how much the Gallego amendment makes job and income prospects for Americans even worse.

From 2000 to 2014—and although the American economy gained 5.6 million jobs in the 16 to 65 age bracket—American-born citizens suffered a net loss of 127,000 jobs. These job losses, combined with population growth, mean that there were 17 million more jobless American-born citizens than there were 14 years earlier. Hispanic Americans, African Americans, Caucasian Americans—American men and women—all lost economic ground. While American-born citizens suffered economic hardship, job losses, and wage suppression, foreign-born persons gained 5.7 million jobs.

In the context of this anemic economy, GALLEG0's amendment to take military service jobs from Americans and from lawful immigrants in order to give them to illegal aliens is outrageous and unconscionable. I encourage Members to represent the interests of Americans and lawful immigrants by voting to strike the Gallego amendment from the NDAA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

I just want to respond to something that my friend on the Rules Committee said when he said that this bill is all about issues that have to do with the national defense of our country.

I don't know what we are doing in Afghanistan or what we are doing in Iraq again or what we are doing in Syria now if it isn't supposedly in the name of the national defense of our country. I mean, this is the bill considered by the Armed Services Committee. If this is not an appropriate place to talk about war and about all of the military equipment we are sending halfway around the world, then I don't know what bill is appropriate. We are told over and over and over again that these are inappropriate vehicles in which to talk about war. This is the Armed Services Committee. This is the National Defense Authorization Act. This is the bill. This funds the wars.

There is this notion that it doesn't belong here. Well, where the hell does it belong? This is important stuff, and we treat war as if it is nothing.

We have men and women in harm's way, and we don't even debate whether or not the mission is something that we support or not. This is ridiculous. This is disgraceful. It is outrageous that amendments that are germane to this bill—that the Parliamentarian tells us are germane to this bill—are denied over and over and over again. These aren't just mine. Ms. LEE has amendments on repealing the old AUMFs from 2001 to 2002—denied, denied. They are germane, but no one wants to talk about it. We are going to force you to talk about it. We are going to have a privileged resolution. We are going to force this debate.

Just one other thing on the Gallego amendment. I have to tell you that I am always amazed at the anti-immigrant rhetoric on the other side of the aisle. The notion that we can't allow the Secretary of Defense to make decisions on whether or not DREAMers can actually serve our country in the Armed Forces to defend our Nation is ludicrous.

Just so people understand this, unlike a lot of things that my friends on the other side of the aisle do, this was not snuck into something. This actually went through regular order. It was actually debated and voted on by the House Armed Services Committee. They voted "yes" to accept it. By the way, the Army has already allowed almost 50 DREAMers to enlist in our Armed Forces.

What are you going to do—go and try to find these people and tell them that they have now been discharged?

I feel a great kind of sense of pride that there are people in this country who have been mostly raised in this

country and who want to serve this country. That is something, I think, that every American takes pride in. That the rhetoric is so nasty and so demeaning, I think, is beneath what this House is about.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN).

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, I rise against the rule that we are considering to the National Defense Authorization bill.

I was extremely disappointed late last night, as you can imagine, when the Rules Committee decided not to make my amendment in order for today.

My amendment would have provided a token thank-you to the World War II merchant mariners. These brave men suffered the highest losses of any military branch in World War II, and they did not receive veterans' benefits under the GI Bill.

Time is running out. These merchant mariners are now in their eighties and their early nineties. There are only 5,000 living today. We can't continue with the slow wheels of bureaucracy. We can't do a study to see if they deserve it or if we can afford it. Congress should act swiftly and with a sense of urgency.

As President Eisenhower said:

When final victory is ours, there is no organization that will share its credit more deservedly than the merchant marine.

It is too late for this bill today, but it is sad, as we are about to vote on a bill that authorizes our defense of this country, that we couldn't take a moment to give a token thank-you to those who were involved in the defense of this country.

□ 1500

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by my friend and colleague, MO BROOKS. The Brooks amendment is simple. It keeps the immigration debate out of the national security debate. That is it.

My colleague, Mr. GALLEG0, inserted language during the markup to require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review under section 504 of title 10, United States Code, relating to whether or not those who have received amnesty under President Obama's DACA initiative should be able to enlist in the services, but that very statute already provides the Secretary of Defense the authority he or she needs to make such a determination if there is a readiness crisis. It is already there.

Specifically, paragraph (b)(2) entitles him to "authorize the enlistment of a person . . . if the Secretary determines that such enlistment is vital to the national interest."

Now, while the Gallego language may appear to be simple, a sense of Congress to some, in function it will be

cited by the lawyers arguing on behalf of the President's executive overreach. Those lawyers will say, you see, even the House of Representatives has passed language that recognizes DACA.

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

Mr. BYRNE. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. The Center for Immigration Studies agrees the Gallego language is unnecessary and is simply meant to undercut the ongoing litigation about the legality and unconstitutionality of DACA.

If the Brooks amendment is not accepted and this language is left in the NDAA, it potentially jeopardizes passage of critical legislation. My colleagues, I have fought the President on his executive actions and will fight here again. It is our purview. Once again, I said, the House has moved three times to demonstrate that DACA is illegitimate. This should be the fourth time. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Brooks amendment, stripping the Gallego language.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ).

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the latest efforts by leadership to appease hard-liners on immigration. Today, this body is allowing their loudest anti-immigrant voices to overrule the adoption of the Gallego amendment by none other than the Republican-controlled Armed Services Committee, controlled by the Republican majority. Not only are they throwing their highly touted regular order out of the window, they are taking one more dive down the anti-immigrant rabbit hole.

The amendment by my friend from Arizona simply expresses a sense of the House that the Secretary of Defense should review whether recipients of deferred action should be allowed to serve in the military. It doesn't say the military must allow them to serve. It says, let's do a review, a study, a sense of Congress. We woke up today and this is how we feel. Remember that these same 700,000 recipients who grew up here in America, passed a criminal background check, and now have a legal work permit to reside in the United States, they are ready to risk their lives to defend the only country they know. It just says, Hey, do you guys want to take a look?

Meanwhile, you totally missed the Veasey amendment calling for a similar study of how executive actions of President Obama and prosecutorial discretion could expand the pool of potential military recruits and how enlistment of DACA applicants would impact military readiness. They missed that one. I guess NumbersUSA didn't give you a call over on the other side or Heritage Action forgot to tell you about that provision.

So, Republican hard-liners fixated on the Gallego amendment. Seeing the

word "review," all they heard was the word "amnesty." If the majority party is unable to allow a nonbinding study approved by the committee of jurisdiction where they are the majority because it includes the word "immigrants" without slapping the amnesty label on it, how on Earth will you be able to fix our broken immigration system or win over the fastest-growing group of voters in this country?

It is clear to me that the candidate who is ready to embrace immigrants and protect DREAMers and their families may as well start measuring the drapes at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, and I think I know what her name is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), my friend.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would say, first of all, that neither the gentleman from Massachusetts nor the one from Chicago can quote any anti-immigrant statements from anybody over on this side. That is their tired rhetoric. It is not a fact.

What is a fact is we initiated a lawsuit called *Crane v. Napolitano* clear back when these first unconstitutional acts were delivered by the President. He clearly has violated the Constitution. I don't actually think there is any worthy debate to the contrary, and this Congress has voted three times—three times—to shut off the funding or to eliminate the President's lawless, unconstitutional actions, Mr. Speaker. That includes June of 2013, King amendment, and very similar language in August of 2014 and January of 2015.

So I wanted to announce to this Congress that we will stand on the Constitution. This Congress cannot send a message to ratify the President's lawless actions. We must defend the Constitution because that is our oath, to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. His oath is to take care to faithfully execute the laws, and instead, he has done the opposite. So we have pro-amnesty people on the other side.

I will support the rule, the Brooks amendment, but I will not support the NDAA if the amendment fails.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding but also for his tremendous leadership on the Committee on Rules and also just in terms of making sure that we, as Members of Congress, do our job. So thank you very much.

I rise in strong opposition to this rule and to the bill. I offered three bi-

partisan amendments to H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act, and I am very disappointed to say that, once again, two of my amendments to address the Authorization for Use of Military Force were not made in order. The first, offered with Representative WALTER JONES, would have repealed the 2001 blank check for endless war, which has been used more than 30 times, mind you, to justify military action around the world.

The other, that I also offered with Representative JONES, would have removed the unnecessary 2002 Iraq Authorization for Use of Military Force that continues to be on the books. This is years after the White House has said they no longer needed it and encouraged Congress to repeal it.

Mr. Speaker, it is past time for Congress to live up to its constitutional obligations in matters of war and peace. We need to rip up that 2001 blank check for endless war, and we need to repeal the unnecessary 2002 Iraq AUMF instead of leaving it on the books indefinitely.

I do want to thank the committee for making in order a commonsense, bipartisan amendment offered by Representatives BURGESS, SCHAKOWSKY, and myself that would require the DOD to rank all departments and defense agencies in order of how advanced they are in their audit readiness. As the only Federal agency that has yet to complete an audit, the Pentagon has never been held accountable for the potential loss of billions of dollars to waste, fraud, and abuse; so we need to bring vital congressional oversight and accountability to the Pentagon and to ensure that the Pentagon follows the law.

Let me also just address a few more troubling provisions in this bill. This bill authorized \$715 million to train and equip Iraqi forces and an additional \$600 million for Syrian opposition forces. That is more than a billion dollars for the now 8-month-long war against ISIL.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Let me go back and remind you how much that is. That is more than a billion dollars for the now 8-month-long war against ISIL. That is a war that Congress has yet to debate and authorize.

Again, I call on Speaker BOEHNER to make Congress do its job and to schedule this critical debate.

I want to thank Congressman MCGOVERN for offering a privileged resolution. It is really a shame that we must do this, but we must take our heads out of the sand here and be responsible to our constituents and our country.

This bill also funnels \$89 billion into the Pentagon slush fund known as the overseas contingency account; \$38 billion of this would go back into the base

budget to avoid the budget cuts. This is simply unacceptable. Instead of continuing to use budget gimmicks to further bloat the Pentagon budget, Congress should be working to ensure accountability and transparency by forcing an audit of the Pentagon.

I urge my colleagues to support the Burgess-Schakowsky-Lee amendment and to oppose the underlying bill. It is time for Congress to stop the policy of endless war and to bring some accountability to the Pentagon.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) for the time.

I rise today with mixed feelings on this important legislation, the FY 2016 National Defense Authorization Act. I appreciate the leadership of Chairman THORNBERRY for bringing a transformative bill to the floor that will strengthen our armed services and provide stability to the brave men and women of our military.

I am also grateful for section 841, which includes the text of the SESO Act, a bill I have introduced that ensures small entrepreneurs have a fair seat at the table.

But on the other side of this dichotomy is what I fear to be a truly unfortunate path for this body to take. Included in the underlying text of this bill is language that would request the Defense Secretary study the feasibility of allowing young men and women who were brought to this country as children the opportunity to serve in our armed services.

I am very supportive of this sentiment, Mr. Speaker, and let's keep in mind, this is a nonbinding sense of the House. However, there are Members of this body who are threatening to vote against final passage of the NDAA if this sense of Congress isn't stricken from the bill.

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

Mr. BYRNE. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, these young men and women were brought to our great country very early in life, often by no choice of their own. They have grown up in our neighborhoods and attended the same schools as our own children. For most of these young people, the United States is the only country they have ever called home. Allowing the Secretary of Defense to consider their service in our military should be something our country is proud to support, not something that will kill this bill.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Brooks amendment and look forward to working with my colleagues to pass this bill that will benefit all those who serve.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say I want to commend the

gentleman for his very sensible remarks, and I appreciate it.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to ask my esteemed colleagues to stand with me in declaring, Let our DREAMers serve. Let the young men and women who were brought here as children, through no fault of their own, serve their country. Let them serve the country that educated them. Let them serve the country they love. Their ability to serve benefits us all. It provides an expanded pool of willing and capable applicants helping to uphold and even increase the rigorous standards to enlist in our military. The Army recently tripled its pool of immigrant applicants, and DREAMers should be a part of that pool.

To those who claim that this is amnesty, I have a simple message. As a Marine Corps combat veteran, I can assure you, Parris Island ain't amnesty. As my late father, a career soldier, told me, serving your nation in uniform is the highest expression of American citizenship. From German immigrants serving in the Continental Army at Valley Forge to over 100,000 who have been naturalized through the military since 2002, immigrants have always been a part of our fighting forces.

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

Mr. BYRNE. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. COFFMAN. If DREAMers want to put their life on the line for this Nation, we should give them the opportunity and honor their willingness to serve.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Brooks amendment, which would strip this provision from the NDAA.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the gentleman who just spoke as well. I think we wouldn't be having any of this debate if my friends on the other side of the aisle would have allowed us to vote on a comprehensive immigration reform package last year, the one that the Senate passed in a bipartisan way. Anyway, they chose to deny us that ability to even have a debate and a vote on that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

□ 1515

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, the rule before us today allows for an amendment that touches on a matter very personal to me, an issue that impacts our Nation on the battlefield and for families struggling with an immigration system that is certainly dysfunctional.

November 12, last year, right there in that seat, I was sitting by my grandson's side when I was sworn in as

a Member of this House, one of the proudest days of my life. Certainly, my grandson was looking forward to it.

If the Gallego amendment on DREAMers that we are debating here later today were in effect, my grandson wouldn't be here. My granddaughter wouldn't be here.

My son was serving in the Army in South Korea when he met a girl who was serving our great Nation. They fell in love and got married. They moved back to Fort Hood, Texas, serving our country, where they had my first grandchild, one of the proudest days I have ever seen. They continued to serve our great country, raising their child, when I got a call late one night with my son crying, saying: "They are going to deport my wife."

We didn't know she wasn't an American. She volunteered to lay down her life for our country. My son didn't know she wasn't an American citizen; yet she is that DREAMer that we are talking about. She is the American Dream, one who comes to this country and decides to serve it.

This brings us forward to today. My grandson is here; yet we are still debating. For the people that volunteer, the greatest thing they can do is lay down their lives for our country, and we are denying them an opportunity for them to serve our country.

Where are we as a nation, that great melting pot? The strength that makes our country is where we all come from.

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

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

Mr. NORCROSS. My daughter-in-law only knew America. As far as her memory went, she was here. She went to school with all the other kids, as you heard other people speak about. That is why I am urging us to reject what I think is one of the most cruel things we can do to those who come to our country and want to be American citizens.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment and not deny those people who want to serve our country that ability to serve.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Rules Committee for allowing Mr. BROOKS' amendment to be in order. I want to also address these concerns about allowing people to join the military.

I fought with my own leadership against a bill that would allow sequester, allow the gutting of our Defense Department. I said it was a mistake. I was told it would never happen. Well, it did.

If both sides of the aisle want to find cuts in other programs so we can rebuild our military and let anybody that wants to join the military that is qualified, I am for it, but right now, we are gutting our military. We are telling people who have put their lives in

harm's way for us that they are going to have to leave.

This language basically can be taken up as judicial notice by the appellate courts to tell Judge Hanen in south Texas Federal court: You were wrong. We are lifting the injunction, the very injunction that our Republican leader said we were relying on in breaking our promise.

We need this language removed, and then let's work on building the military back up.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman that we are not cutting the military. My friends created a slush fund so they can get around sequestration, with regard to the Pentagon.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman. I know a lot of hard work has gone into the preparation of the underlying bill. We are approaching Memorial Day and then celebrating Veterans Day, as we acknowledge our soldiers on the front line.

I hope my colleagues will support the Jackson Lee amendments dealing with the outreach to small businesses and minority-owned businesses with the Department of Defense to deal with HBCUs, which are very, very important in equalizing the research opportunities and working to ensure the protection of the DOD software.

I am hopeful that we will have an opportunity to address my issue dealing with post-traumatic stress disorder. I put the first center that was not in a veterans hospital in Houston. I believe we need to realize how devastating PTSD is and ensure that we have the opportunity for more funding.

The overseas contingency fund needs to be restrained and brought in.

I want to support the amendment by Mrs. DINGELL to assist those American citizens who are stuck in Yemen. We must address that.

I also want to make sure that we do not strike the very favorable language dealing with our DREAMers who want to serve their country.

We should have comprehensive immigration form. We should not vote for the MO BROOKS amendment.

Finally, let me say, Mr. Speaker—although not dealing with this—let us acknowledge with sadness those who lost their lives in Pennsylvania and do a better job in infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the rule for H.R. 1735, the "National Defense Authorization Act of 2015" and the underlying bill.

I would like to thank both Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for their dedication and hard work on the 2015 NDAA.

The U.S. war on terror has been waged for over a decade and the lesson is clear: our adversaries adapt very quickly because they are not constrained by geographic limitations.

In the beginning it was only Al Qaeda—now the list includes Boko Haram, Al Shabaab, and ISIS/ISIL.

The message is clear—the United States must expand its capacity to meet the terrorist threat where it emerges.

At the same time, we must be constantly searching for innovative ways to utilize defense technologies and resources for the betterment of the American people.

The National Defense Authorization Act of 2015 takes important steps toward achieving these goals, and I am proud to have authored several amendments which were made in order on this bill.

Jackson Lee Amendment #55 calls for outreach for small business concerns owned and controlled by women and minorities prior to conversion of certain functions to contractor performance.

Contracts issued by the Department of Defense represent a substantial portion of.

These same concerns drove the proposal and adoption of Jackson Lee Amendment #64, which provides guidance to the Secretary of Defense on identifying HBCUs and minority serving institutions to assist them in developing scientific, technical, engineering, and mathematics capabilities.

Knowledge of STEM fields will be integral in the coming years, both for a powerful economy and for the Department of Defense to operate at its maximum potential.

By identifying and engaging HBCUs and other minority serving institutions, such as Houston's own Texas Southern University, which have strong science and engineering programs, the DOD can greatly expand its pool of qualified applicants.

The final Jackson Lee Amendment which was made in order is #125, which ensures that changes made to DOD computing systems using software bought and modified for agency operations will not result in the disruption of DOD operations.

Increasing cooperation between the DOD and other agencies has resulted in incredible breakthroughs in operations and efficiency.

However, given the importance of DOD functions for the security of our nation, it is imperative that steps be taken to ensure those functions will continue unhindered by any changes to their computing systems.

Although I am proud to have these amendments included in the NDAA of 2015, several of my other amendments were not included, each of which would have a substantial impact on the well-being of the men and women of the armed services as well as veterans who bravely serve our nation.

Jackson Lee Amendment #76 calls for increased collaboration between the DOD and the National Institutes of Health to combat Triple Negative Breast Cancer.

TNBC is a rare form of breast cancer which is highly difficult to detect, and which disproportionately affects African American and Hispanic women.

TNBC is especially difficult to treat, because it is unaffected by what are normally the most effective and targeted treatments, as well as being extremely aggressive.

70% of women with metastatic triple negative breast cancer do not live more than five years after being diagnosed.

In addition, according to the Army Times, 874 military women were diagnosed with breast cancer between 2000 and 2011.

As a breast cancer survivor myself, I believe that we should commit all available resources to combating this horrible condition, including those from the DOD.

Jackson Lee Amendment #77 seeks to relieve the terrible realities of post-traumatic

stress disorder by authorizing an additional \$2.5 million in funding specifically for this purpose.

Post-traumatic stress disorder is a devastating condition that affects an estimated 20% of veterans.

Less than 40% of individuals suffering from PTSD seek assistance, and those who do often receive care that is only "minimally adequate".

When untreated, PTSD can cause veterans to lose their jobs, their homes, and even their own lives.

Conservative estimates place the suicide rate for veterans at approximately 5,000 per year, and male veterans are more than twice as likely as civilians to attempt suicide.

In the State of Texas we have 1,099,141 veterans under the age of 65 and 590,618 who are over the age of 65. There are over 1,689,759 veterans living in our State.

These statistics are especially concerning for me, since Houston is both the third largest military retirement community in the United States and the second largest recruiting district among all the armed services.

It is clear that our veterans deserve more from us, and we must do everything in our power to ensure that they receive the proper care.

A final issue regarding the NDAA is the concerns expressed by the White House over the spending levels and other provisions included in the bill as written.

The administration has expressed its objection to funding levels that it considers too low and incapable of adequately providing for necessary force structure and weapon systems reforms, leading senior advisors to recommend that the President veto the bill if it leaves Congress in its current state.

I hope that the amendments proposed by myself and by my fellow Members of Congress, as well as by the leaders in the Senate, will address the President's concerns, and that we can resolve this impasse quickly and effectively.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

No greater love is there than to lay down your life for another. It is a paraphrase. It is biblical, secular.

Here, we have individuals, the DREAMers, who are American in every way possible. They have been schooled here in America, raised here in the United States. Their dream is to become American citizens, and they want to give back to a nation that has helped make them who they are.

I want to congratulate Mr. GALLEGO for his amendment and his success in committee. I want to congratulate the bipartisan Rules Committee that saw this amendment through here to the floor. I want my Republican colleagues to question the motivations of those who would try to strip this out.

No greater love—we hope that it never comes to actually sacrificing one's life, but please don't deny those who want to help serve and protect the

interests of our country and deny them the opportunity to serve in some capacity and to sacrifice maybe their lives for this country, the country that we love, the country that they love, the only country that they have ever known.

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

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Don't deny the best, the brightest, and the bravest the opportunity to serve in our Nation's Armed Forces.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as I said, there is a lot in this bill that we all support, and there is much in this bill that many of us find very objectionable.

I still have a tough time understanding why this House refuses to deal with the fact that we are engaged in a number of wars around the world and this Congress refuses to live up to its constitutional responsibilities to deal with it.

The gentleman tells us that this is not the place. Well, the OCO account is in this bill. It funds some of the wars, so the bill that funds wars seems like the place you would go to talk about these wars; yet not only the amendment that I offered, along with the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. SMITH, and WALTER JONES of North Carolina, but the amendments that my colleague BARBARA LEE of California offered on the AUMFs, we were told we can't debate them—no debate.

We have got men and women in harm's way, but we are not going to debate the wars. We are not going to talk about whether this is a good mission. We are not going to talk about the future of the missions. We are not going to talk about how much it is going to cost. We are not going to talk about anything. We are going to make believe that that is not part of our national defense discussion. It is unconscionable.

For the life of me, I can't quite understand why the leadership of this House and the leadership in the Senate refuse to do their job. If you can't handle it, then maybe it is time to leave.

The second thing is this debate over the Gallego amendment. I remind my colleagues it is germane to this bill. This is not some extraneous thing that has nothing to do with this bill. The Parliamentarian said it is germane. The Armed Services Committee, the committee of jurisdiction, debated it. That is what committees are supposed to do. They even voted on it, which is what committees are supposed to do, and they voted "yes" in favor of it.

If you don't like it, fine; you can strike it, but save all this anti-immigrant rhetoric, this nastiness. Stop belittling these men and women who came to this country as children, who

know no other country than this country, who want to serve this country, who want to put their lives on the line for this country. Please don't diminish what they want to do or what some of them are already doing.

My colleague says this bill is not about immigration. It isn't about immigration. This is about the military. The only people that are making this about immigration are my friends on the other side of the aisle, the ones that are saying: If we don't strip the Gallego amendment from this bill, we are going to vote against the whole NDAA.

This resentment, this contempt for immigrants has resulted in this kind of knee-jerk reaction that we can't support anything because of that. It is ludicrous.

The bottom line here is that I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle vote against the Brooks amendment and vote for the Gallego amendment. We can do better than this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

As I predicted in my opening statement, we have heard a lot about a number of things that don't have to do with the defense of the United States of America.

For 53 straight years, the Congress of the United States and the Presidents of the United States have worked together in a bipartisan fashion to pass a National Defense Authorization Act to provide for the defense of the American people, the number one job we have under the Constitution; yet we find ourselves here today literally tearing ourselves apart as a body over issues that don't have anything to do with defending America.

I want to urge people on both sides, however they feel about all these issues, to understand that whether you win or lose your amendment on the committee or the floor, at the end of the day, we come together as Americans, and we defend our country. That is what our constituents send us here to do. If we can't come together on that, then we are truly lost as a nation.

I don't think we are lost, but we wander off in places we shouldn't go when we have debates like we have had today. It is unfortunate.

I am the descendant of immigrants. I dare say virtually everybody in this body is a descendant of immigrants. It is not even debatable that immigration is good for this country, or the vast majority of us wouldn't even be here. That is not the point of this bill. The point of this bill is to defend the country.

We heard a lot about the OCO account. It was called a slush fund. This President and Presidents before him have asked for an OCO account every year since it was first created. Not once has it been a slush fund. It has been used to defend the United States of America, as the OCO account that is in this bill will be used to defend the United States of America.

The gentleman from Massachusetts has been around here longer than I have, but I am sure he knows that the primary jurisdiction of the House for an AUMF—and this Congress—is with the Foreign Affairs Committee, not with the Armed Services Committee that was the committee of jurisdiction on this bill.

The Foreign Affairs Committee is working on an AUMF, but they are waiting for information from the White House, which they haven't gotten yet.

Maybe we can get that information from the White House, get to work on the AUMF, and get it to this floor in the appropriate vehicle, but the National Defense Authorization Act is not the appropriate vehicle and so ruled the Rules Committee, and that is what is in this rule.

I have heard a lot of talk about what is germane to the bill and what is not germane to the bill. This is not about germaneness. This is about a central function of the Federal Government. It is about defending the American people.

As I stand here today during this debate, I am reminded of the great sacrifices our men and women in uniform and their families make on a daily basis so that we may continue to debate and deliberate in an open way.

□ 1530

Debate and discussion have been the foundation of our democracy, and we owe that to our Nation's military. The least we can do is honor that tradition of service and sacrifice by continuing the bipartisan tradition of passing an NDAA for the 54th straight year.

Whether there are people on one side that want to vote against the bill because there is something in there they don't like about immigration or people on the other side are trying to make a partisan point by telling their side, "Don't vote for the bill because of OCO," or because we are worried about what it might do to domestic policy programs, we need to put that out of our minds.

At the end of the day, whatever amendments are added or not added to this bill, it is our job to pass this bill to defend the country.

There will be plenty of opportunity for partisan disagreement down the road, but not on this issue. At this time, we need to come together, not as Democrats, not as Republicans, but as Americans.

Let's pass this rule. Let's debate these amendments, all 135 of them, but most importantly, let's pass this act. Let's give our military men and women the resources they need to do their job.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 1191; and the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2297.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 181, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 225]

YEAS—243

Abraham	Granger	Noem
Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Nugent
Allen	Graves (LA)	Nunes
Amash	Graves (MO)	Olson
Amodei	Griffith	Palazzo
Babin	Grothman	Palmer
Barr	Guinta	Paulsen
Barton	Guthrie	Pearce
Benishek	Hanna	Perry
Bilirakis	Hardy	Pittenger
Bishop (MI)	Harper	Pitts
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Poe (TX)
Black	Hartzler	Poliquin
Blackburn	Heck (NV)	Pompeo
Blum	Hensarling	Posey
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Price, Tom
Boustany	Hice, Jody B.	Ratcliffe
Brady (TX)	Hill	Reed
Brat	Holding	Reichert
Bridenstine	Hudson	Renacci
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Rice (SC)
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Rigell
Buchanan	Hultgren	Roby
Buck	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Bucshon	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Hurt (VA)	Rogers (KY)
Byrne	Issa	Rohrabacher
Calvert	Jenkins (KS)	Rokita
Carter (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Rooney (FL)
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Chaffetz	Jolly	Ross
Clawson (FL)	Jordan	Rothfus
Coffman	Joyce	Rouzer
Cole	Katko	Royce
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Russell
Collins (NY)	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Comstock	King (NY)	Salmon
Conaway	Kinzinger (IL)	Sanford
Cook	Kline	Scalise
Costello (PA)	Knight	Schweikert
Cramer	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Crawford	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Sessions
Culberson	Lance	Shimkus
Curbelo (FL)	Latta	Shuster
Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Simpson
DeFazio	Long	Sinema
Denham	Loudermilk	Smith (MO)
Dent	Love	Smith (NE)
DeSantis	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Diaz-Balart	Lummis	Stefanik
Dold	MacArthur	Stewart
Donovan	Marchant	Stivers
Duffy	Marino	Stutzman
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy	Thornberry
Ellmers (NC)	McCaul	Tiberi
Emmer (MN)	McClintock	Tipton
Farenthold	McHenry	Trott
Fincher	McKinley	Turner
Fitzpatrick	McMorriss	Upton
Fleischmann	Rodgers	Valadao
Fleming	McSally	Wagner
Flores	Meadows	Walberg
Forbes	Meehan	Walden
Fortenberry	Messer	Walker
Fox	Mica	Walorski
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Walters, Mimi
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)	Weber (TX)
Garrett	Moolenaar	Webster (FL)
Gibbs	Mooney (WV)	Wenstrup
Gibson	Mullin	Westerman
Gohmert	Mulvaney	Westmoreland
Goodlatte	Murphy (PA)	Whitfield
Gosar	Neugebauer	Williams
Gowdy	Newhouse	Wilson (SC)

Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder

Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)

Zeldin  
Zinke

NAYS—181

Adams	Gallego	Nadler
Aguilar	Garamendi	Napolitano
Ashford	Graham	Neal
Bass	Grayson	Nolan
Beatty	Green, Al	Norcross
Becerra	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Bera	Grijalva	Pallone
Beyer	Gutiérrez	Pascrell
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Payne
Blumenauer	Hastings	Pelosi
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan	Higgins	Peters
F.	Himes	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Pingree
Brown (FL)	Honda	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Polis
Bustos	Huffman	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Israel	Quigley
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Jones	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Keating	Rush
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Cicilline	Kennedy	Sanchez, Linda
Clark (MA)	Kildee	T.
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clay	Kind	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Cohen	Kuster	Schrader
Connolly	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Costa	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lee	Sherman
Crowley	Levin	Sires
Cuellar	Lewis	Slaughter
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Loeb sack	Takai
Delaney	Lofgren	Takano
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Thompson (CA)
DeBene	Lowe	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	Lujan Grisham	Titus
Deutch	(NM)	Tonko
Luján, Ben Ray	(NM)	Torres
Doggett	Lynch	Tsongas
Doyle, Michael	Maloney,	Van Hollen
F.	Carolyn	Vargas
Duckworth	Carolyn	Veasey
Edwards	Maloney, Sean	Vela
Ellison	Matsui	Velázquez
Engel	McCollum	Visclosky
Eshoo	McDermott	Walz
Esty	McGovern	Waters, Maxine
Farr	McNerney	Watson Coleman
Fattah	Meeks	Welch
Foster	Meng	Wilson (FL)
Lance	Moore	Yarmuth
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	
Gabbard		

NOT VOTING—8

Barletta  
Capps  
Cleaver

Davis, Danny  
Ribble  
Sanchez, Loretta

Speier  
Wasserman  
Schultz

□ 1600

Mses. EDWARDS, SLAUGHTER, JACKSON LEE, Messrs. CARNEY and GARAMENDI changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**MOMENT OF SILENCE TO MOURN THE TORNADO VICTIMS OF TEXAS AND ARKANSAS**

(Mr. HENSARLING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, many of us are taught that death can

come unexpectedly, like a thief in the night. The thief came to Texas and Arkansas this past weekend in the form of deadly tornadoes and flash floods.

In the wake of their destructive path were left two dead in Nashville, Arkansas; one in Cisco, Texas; one in Corsicana, Texas; and in the Fifth District that I am proud to represent, one in Henderson County, Texas, and two next door in Van Zandt County, Van, Texas. They have left families, they have left friends, and they have left great holes in their communities that cannot be filled.

Besides the tragic loss in life, there were many who are left injured, and in the case of Van, Texas, one-third of the town is either damaged or destroyed by tornado.

Should anyone have wonder about the future of Van, Texas, as the Member of Congress, I can tell you you need not worry. The citizens of Van, I know their resilience, I know their values, I know their faith, and I know their can-do optimism. Van, Texas, will be rebuilt.

I am joined, Mr. Speaker, today by Congressman WESTERMAN of Arkansas, Congressman BARTON of Texas, Congressman BURGESS of Texas, and Congressman CONAWAY of Texas. Their districts were hit. Lives were lost in their districts as well.

Mr. Speaker, as Members, we are called upon to vote, we are called upon to speak, we are called upon to lead, and there are times we are called upon to mourn. In many of our faiths, we are taught there is a time for everything, including a time to mourn. Now is that time.

On behalf of my colleagues in the well, I would ask that all Americans remember these good citizens in their prayers and their thoughts. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the House join us in honoring those who perished by observing a moment of silence.

**PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIRE-FIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 1191) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments.