

Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard

Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)

Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Amendment No. 51 by Mr. LAMALFA of California.
Amendment No. 55 by Mr. MULVANEY of South Carolina.
Amendment No. 60 by Mr. STOCKMAN of Texas.
Amendment No. 62 by Mrs. WALORSKI of Indiana.
Amendment No. 65 by Ms. BONAMICI of Oregon.
The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for each electronic vote in this series.

Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Southernland
Speier
Stockman
Stutzman
Thompson (CA)

Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Walden
Walz
Waters
Waxman

NOES—246

Aderholt
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Clyburn
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cannonly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
DeBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte

Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
LoBiondo
Long
Lowe
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaull
McCollum
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo

Pascrell
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pittenger
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Barletta
Bustos
Campbell
Coble
Grimm

Herrera Beutler
Horsford
McCarthy (NY)
Owens
Pallone

Rokita
Simpson
Tipton

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1422

Mr. LOEBSACK changed his vote from “present” to “no.”
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.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT). Pursuant to House Resolution 312 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2397.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1425

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2397) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, July 23, 2013, amendment No. 66 printed in House Report 113-170 offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on amendments printed in House Report 113-170 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 48 by Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. JONES
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.
The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.
The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 246, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 401]
AYES—177

Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bass
Becerra
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Bralley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Camp
Capuano
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Ciilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conyers
Courtney
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DesJarlais
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garrett

Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kennedy
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lucas
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
Meadows
Meng
Messer

Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Nolan
Nugent
O'Rourke
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Perry
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Radel
Rangel
Ribble
Rohrabacher
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schradler
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Sinema

NOT VOTING—10

Barletta Grimm Pallone
Bustos Herrera Beutler Rokita
Campbell Horsford
Coble McCarthy (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1429

Mr. LAMALFA changed his vote from
“aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from California (Mr.
LAMALFA) on which further pro-
ceedings were postponed and on which
the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 235, noes 188,
not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 402]

AYES—235

Aderholt Duckworth Jones
Alexander Duffy Jordan
Amodei Duncan (SC) Joyce
Bachmann Duncan (TN) Kelly (PA)
Bachus Ellmers King (IA)
Barr Farenthold King (NY)
Barrow (GA) Fincher Kingston
Barton Fleischmann Kinzinger (IL)
Benishkek Fleming Kline
Bilirakis Flores Labrador
Bishop (UT) Forbes LaMalfa
Black Fortenberry Lamborn
Blackburn Foxx Lance
Bonner Franks (AZ) Lankford
Boustany Frelinghuysen Latham
Brady (TX) Garamendi Latta
Bridenstine Gardner LoBiondo
Brooks (AL) Garrett Long
Brooks (IN) Gerlach Lucas
Broun (GA) Gibbs Luetkemeyer
Buchanan Gibson Lummis
Bucshon Gingrey (GA) Maloney, Sean
Burgess Gohmert Marchant
Calvert Goodlatte Marino
Camp Gosar Massie
Cantor Gowdy Matheson
Capito Granger McCarthy (CA)
Carter Graves (GA) McCaul
Cassidy Graves (MO) McClintock
Chabot Griffin (AR) McHenry
Chaffetz Griffith (VA) McIntyre
Coffman Guthrie McKeon
Cole Hall McKinley
Collins (GA) Hanna McMorris
Collins (NY) Harper Rodgers
Conaway Harris Meadows
Cook Hartzler Meehan
Cotton Hastings (WA) Messer
Cramer Hensarling Mica
Crawford Holding Miller (FL)
Crenshaw Hudson Miller (MI)
Culberson Huelskamp Miller, Gary
Daines Huizenga (MI) Mullin
Davis, Danny Hultgren Mulvaney
Davis, Rodney Hunter Murphy (PA)
Denham Hurt Neugebauer
Dent Issa Noem
DeSantis Jenkins Nugent
DesJarlais Johnson (OH) Nunes
Diaz-Balart Johnson, Sam Nunnelee

Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney

Amash
Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia

NOES—188

Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Clay
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

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

NOT VOTING—10

Barletta Grimm Pallone
Bustos Herrera Beutler Rokita
Campbell Horsford
Coble McCarthy (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1433

Ms. DUCKWORTH changed her vote
from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from South Carolina (Mr.
MULVANEY) on which further pro-
ceedings were postponed and on which
the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 215, noes 206,
not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 403]

AYES—215

Amash Deutch Kaptur
Andrews Dingell Keating
Barton Doggett Kelly (IL)
Bass Doyle Kennedy
Beatty Duckworth Kildee
Becerra Duncan (SC) Kilmer
Bera (CA) Edwards Kind
Bishop (GA) Ellison Kirkpatrick
Bishop (NY) Engel Kuster
Blumenauer Enyart Labrador
Bonamici Eshoo Lance
Braley (IA) Esty Langevin
Broun (GA) Farr Larsen (WA)
Brown (FL) Foster Larson (CT)
Brownley (CA) Frankel (FL) Lee (CA)
Buchanan Fudge Levin
Butterfield Garamendi Lewis
Capps Garcia Lipinski
Capuano Garrett Loeb sack
Cárdenas Goodlatte Lofgren
Carney Gosar Lowenthal
Carson (IN) Gowdy Lowe y
Castor (FL) Grayson Lujan Grisham
Castro (TX) Green, Al (NM)
Chabot Green, Gene Lujan, Ben Ray
Chaffetz Griffith (VA) (NM)
Chu Grijalva Lummis
Cicilline Gutiérrez Lynch
Clarke Hahn Maffei
Clay Hanabusa Maloney,
Cleaver Harris Carolyn
Clyburn Hastings (FL) Massie
Coffman Heck (WA) Matheson
Cohen Higgins Matsui
Collins (GA) Himes McClintock
Connolly Hinojosa McCollum
Conyers Holt McDermott
Cooper Honda McGovern
Costa Hoyer McNerney
Courtney Huelskamp Meeks
Crowley Huffman Meng
Cuellar Huizenga (MI) Mica
Cummings Israel Michaud
Davis (CA) Issa Miller, George
Davis, Danny Jackson Lee Moore
DeFazio Jeffries Moran
DeGette Johnson (GA) Mulvaney
Delaney Johnson, E. B. Murphy (FL)
DeLauro Jones Nadler
DelBene Jordan Napolitano

Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rangel
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger

Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Southernland

NOES—206

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Benishkek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Granger

Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo

Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Takano
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Barletta
Bustos

Campbell
Coble

Gohmert
Grimm

Herrera Beutler
Horsford

McCarthy (NY)
Pallone

Rokita
Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1438

Messrs. GRAVES of Georgia and POSEY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

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

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. STOCKMAN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 137, noes 286, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 404]

AYES—137

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Barber
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Capito
Chabot
Choffman
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foster
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)

Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Harris
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huijenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Labrador
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Luetkemeyer
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCaul
McClintock
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Messer

Mica
Mullin
Neugebauer
Palazzo
Pearce
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Souterland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Wagner
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westmoreland
Williams
Wolf
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)

NOES—286

Alexander
Amash
Andrews
Bachus

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishkek

Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn

Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Forbes
Fortenberry
Sessions
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gosar
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)

Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCollum
McDermott
McKeon
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Owens
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)

Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Walt
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Grimm
Herrera Beutler
Horsford
McCarthy (NY)

Pallone
Rokita

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1443

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MRS. WALORSKI

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 185, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 405]

AYES—238

Aderholt	Ellmers	Kinzinger (IL)
Alexander	Farenthold	Kirkpatrick
Amodi	Fincher	Kline
Bachmann	Fitzpatrick	Labrador
Bachus	Fleischmann	LaMalfa
Barber	Fleming	Lamborn
Barr	Flores	Lance
Barrow (GA)	Forbes	Lankford
Barton	Fortenberry	Latham
Benishek	Fox	Latta
Bentivolio	Franks (AZ)	Lipinski
Bilirakis	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Bishop (UT)	Gardner	Long
Black	Garrett	Lucas
Blackburn	Gerlach	Luetkemeyer
Bonner	Gibbs	Lummis
Boustany	Gibson	Maloney, Sean
Brady (TX)	Gingrey (GA)	Marchant
Bridenstine	Gohmert	Marino
Brooks (AL)	Goodlatte	Matheson
Brooks (IN)	Gosar	McCarthy (CA)
Broun (GA)	Gowdy	McCaul
Buchanan	Granger	McClintock
Bucshon	Graves (GA)	McHenry
Burgess	Graves (MO)	McIntyre
Calvert	Griffin (AR)	McKeon
Camp	Griffith (VA)	McKinley
Cantor	Guthrie	McMorris
Capito	Hall	Rodgers
Carter	Hanna	Meadows
Cassidy	Harper	Meehan
Chabot	Harris	Messer
Chaffetz	Hartzler	Mica
Coffman	Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)
Cole	Hensarling	Miller (MI)
Collins (GA)	Holding	Miller, Gary
Collins (NY)	Hudson	Mullin
Conaway	Huelskamp	Mulvaney
Cook	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)
Cotton	Hultgren	Neugebauer
Cramer	Hunter	Noem
Crawford	Hurt	Nugent
Crenshaw	Issa	Nunes
Culberson	Jenkins	Nunnelee
Daines	Johnson (OH)	Olson
Davis, Rodney	Johnson, Sam	Owens
Denham	Jones	Palazzo
Dent	Jordan	Paulsen
DeSantis	Joyce	Pearce
DesJarlais	Keating	Perry
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)	Peters (MI)
Duffy	King (IA)	Peterson
Duncan (SC)	King (NY)	Petri
Duncan (TN)	Kingston	Pittenger

Pitts	Ryan (WI)
Poe (TX)	Salmon
Pompeo	Sanford
Posey	Scalise
Price (GA)	Schock
Radel	Schweikert
Reed	Scott, Austin
Reichert	Sensenbrenner
Renacci	Sessions
Ribble	Shimkus
Rice (SC)	Shuster
Rigell	Simpson
Roby	Sinema
Roe (TN)	Smith (MO)
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NE)
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NJ)
Rogers (MI)	Smith (TX)
Rohrabacher	Southerland
Rooney	Stewart
Ros-Lehtinen	Stivers
Roskam	Stockman
Ross	Stutzman
Rothfus	Takano
Royce	Terry
Ruiz	Thompson (PA)
Ryunyan	Thornberry

NOES—185

Amash	Garcia	Negrete McLeod
Andrews	Grayson	Nolan
Bass	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Beatty	Green, Gene	Pascarella
Becerra	Grijalva	Pastor (AZ)
Bera (CA)	Gutiérrez	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Pelosi
Bishop (NY)	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Peters (CA)
Bonamici	Heck (NV)	Pingree (ME)
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Pocan
Braley (IA)	Higgins	Polis
Brown (FL)	Himes	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Hinojosa	Quigley
Butterfield	Holt	Rahall
Capps	Honda	Rangel
Capuano	Hoyer	Richmond
Cárdenas	Huffman	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Israel	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Rush
Cartwright	Jeffries	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	T.
Chu	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Sarbanes
Clarke	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Clay	Kildee	Schiff
Cleaver	Kilmer	Schneider
Clyburn	Kind	Schrader
Cohen	Kuster	Schwartz
Connolly	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Costa	Lee (CA)	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Levin	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Lewis	Sherman
Cuellar	Loeb	Sires
Cummings	Loeb	Slaughter
Cummings	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Speier
Davis, Danny	Lowey	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
Delaney	Luján, Ben Ray	Tierney
DeLauro	(NM)	Titus
DelBene	Lynch	Tonko
Deutch	Maffei	Tsongas
Dingell	Maloney,	Van Hollen
Doggett	Carolyn	Vargas
Doyle	Massie	Veasey
Duckworth	Matsui	Vela
Edwards	McCollum	Velázquez
Ellison	McDermott	Visclosky
Engel	McGovern	Walz
Enyart	McNerney	Wasserman
Eshoo	Meeks	Schultz
Esty	Meng	Waters
Farr	Michaud	Watt
Fattah	Miller, George	Waxman
Foster	Moore	Welch
Frankel (FL)	Moran	Wilson (FL)
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth
Gabard	Nadler	
Gallego	Napolitano	
Garamendi	Neal	

NOT VOTING—10

Barletta	Grimm
Bustos	Herrera Beutler
Campbell	Horsford
Coble	McCarthy (NY)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1447

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Chair, on rollcall vote No. 405, I inadvertently voted “aye.” I intended to vote “no.”

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DENT was allowed to speak out of order.)

WASHINGTON KASTLES CHARITY CLASSIC

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, do you see this trophy before us? We've been on this House floor many times to celebrate baseball victories, football victories, or, I should say, baseball debacles in our case. But we celebrate a lot of things, also golf.

I want to point out that we had a wonderful experience last week, Thursday night, with the Washington Kastles, who are seated up in the Members' gallery. We had a wonderful bipartisan game of tennis between, obviously, the Members, Republican and Democrat intermixed, as well as members of the media.

I'm pleased to report to you that there were two teams, the Stars and the Stripes. My colleagues here, Mr. WATT, Ms. EDWARDS, and SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, were on the Stripes, and I'll introduce the Stars team in a moment. Mr. BISHOP will do that. We had a wonderful game.

We should also let you know, too, that members of the media played. I should let you know that part of Stripes' team included David Gregory of “Meet the Press.” He's a bigger problem on the tennis court than he is in an interview on “Meet the Press.” I also want you to know he's got a big serve. You've got to watch him. Our coach was Leander Paes, who's seated in the gallery, a professional. Our team also included former Senator John Breaux; SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, a Division I player from Duke. Did I say, “Go Lehigh”? That's basketball. Sorry. There was also Peter Cook from Bloomberg; myself; DONNA EDWARDS, who received the Good Sportsmanship Award; MEL WATT, who I must say was one of the most feisty players I've seen; Mark Ein, the owner of the Washington Kastles, who's also here; David Gregory; Jonathan Karl from ABC News; and Hans Nichols from Bloomberg—a very competitive individual, I might add. It was a great time had by all.

I know it's never appropriate to gloat when you win, but we'll do it anyway since we're Members of Congress. Here's our trophy. Stripes beat the Stars.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Thank you very much. I appreciate my friend for yielding, although I must point out I don't remember Coach DOYLE gloating like that when we won the baseball game.

We had a great night, and I was pleased to play with my fellow Members: JIM COSTA, MIKE MCINTYRE, and CHERI BUSTOS. We had two members of the press from Fox News: Ed Henry and Bret Baier. We had two people from the White House: Gene Sperling and Alan Krueger. We had Ben Olsen from D.C. United. We had Ambassador Dino Djajal, and we were joined by three members of the Kastles: Murphy Jensen, Martina Hingis, and Anastasia Rodionova.

Mr. DENT. Now I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Thank you very much.

I, too, want to thank my colleagues who participated with the Stars and Stripes. Fun was had by all. We raised a good amount of money for charity. I want to thank the Kastles for their wonderful hospitality. I got a tennis lesson from my partner, Martina Hingis.

But I do have, from a reliable source, that the Stripes, our opposition, pulled in two ringers from the Main Street media with NBC's David Gregory and Bloomberg's Hans Nichols. These two failed to disclose their professional tennis status in an amateur charitable tournament. So much for press ethics under full disclosure.

Mr. DENT. I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE).

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Chairman, when you talk about helping with education, when you talk about helping food banks, and when you talk about helping our military families, it really was worth raising a racket about. That's what happened down at the Kastle stadium. We want to thank them for their hospitality.

Tennis is a lifetime sport, but this offers a lifeline to those in need in our schools, those who are hungry, and also to our military families. We appreciate the great opportunity. It truly was a great time to have the ball in our court to do something in a positive way.

Mr. DENT. Reclaiming my time, I just wanted to say, in conclusion, it was a wonderful cause. Many charities were supported.

I should also let you know the Washington Kastles are playing tonight down at the waterfront. Get down there and watch them. It's not tennis anyone; it's tennis everyone. So get out there and do it.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair reminds Members that the rules do not allow references to occupants of the gallery.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) on which further proceedings

were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 264, noes 154, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 406]

AYES—264

Aderholt	Frankel (FL)	McGovern
Alexander	Frelinghuysen	McIntyre
Andrews	Fudge	McKinley
Bachmann	Gabbard	McMorris
Barr	Gallego	Rodgers
Barton	Garamendi	McNerney
Bass	Garcia	Meadows
Beatty	Gerlach	Messer
Becerra	Gibson	Mica
Bera (CA)	Gohmert	Michaud
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	Miller (MI)
Bishop (GA)	Gosar	Miller, Gary
Blackburn	Granger	Miller, George
Blumenauer	Graves (GA)	Mullin
Bonamici	Green, Al	Napolitano
Bonner	Griffith (VA)	Neal
Boustany	Guthrie	Negrete McLeod
Brady (PA)	Hahn	Noem
Bridenstine	Hall	Nolan
Brooks (IN)	Hanabusa	Nugent
Broun (GA)	Harper	Nunes
Brown (FL)	Harris	Nunnelee
Brownley (CA)	Hartzler	Owens
Bucshon	Hastings (FL)	Palazzo
Burgess	Hastings (WA)	Pascrell
Butterfield	Heck (WA)	Pastor (AZ)
Calvert	Hensarling	Pelosi
Camp	Higgins	Perry
Capito	Himes	Peters (CA)
Capps	Hinojosa	Peterson
Capuano	Hoyer	Petri
Cárdenas	Huelskamp	Pingree (ME)
Carney	Huffman	Pocan
Carter	Hunter	Poe (TX)
Cartwright	Israel	Posey
Cassidy	Issa	Price (GA)
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Quigley
Cicilline	Johnson (GA)	Rahall
Clarke	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Cleaver	Jones	Reichert
Clyburn	Jordan	Richmond
Cohen	Kaptur	Roe (TN)
Cole	Keating	Rogers (AL)
Cook	Kennedy	Rogers (MI)
Costa	Kildee	Rooney
Courtney	Kilmer	Ros-Lehtinen
Cramer	Kind	Ross
Crowley	Kuster	Roybal-Allard
Cuellar	Labrador	Ruiz
Daines	LaMalfa	Runyan
Davis, Danny	Lance	Ruppersberger
Davis, Rodney	Langevin	Rush
DeFazio	Lankford	Salmon
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda
Delaney	Larson (CT)	T.
DeLauro	Latham	Sánchez, Loretta
DelBene	Latta	Sanford
Denham	Lee (CA)	Sarbanes
Dent	Lewis	Scalise
DesJarlais	Lipinski	Schakowsky
Deutch	LoBiondo	Schiff
Diaz-Balart	Loebsack	Schneider
Dingell	Lofgren	Schrader
Duckworth	Lowenthal	Schwartz
Ellison	Lowey	Scott (VA)
Engel	Lucas	Scott, David
Enyart	Luetkemeyer	Sensenbrenner
Eshoo	Lynch	Serrano
Esty	Maloney, Sean	Sewell (AL)
Farenthold	Massie	Shea-Porter
Farr	Matsui	Sherman
Fattah	McCarthy (CA)	Shimkus
Fincher	McCaul	Simpson
Fitzpatrick	McCollum	Sires
Fox	McDermott	Smith (MO)

Smith (TX)	Tsongas	Waters
Southerland	Valadao	Webster (FL)
Speier	Van Hollen	Welch
Stewart	Vargas	Westmoreland
Stivers	Veasey	Whitfield
Stutzman	Vela	Williams
Swalwell (CA)	Visclosky	Wilson (FL)
Takano	Wagner	Woodall
Thompson (CA)	Walden	Yarmuth
Thompson (MS)	Walorski	Yoho
Tiberi	Walz	Young (AK)
Tierney	Wasserman	Young (FL)
Titus	Schultz	Young (IN)

NOES—154

Amash	Graves (MO)	Olson
Amodeli	Grayson	Paulsen
Bachus	Green, Gene	Payne
Barber	Griffin (AR)	Pearce
Barrow (GA)	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Benishek	Hanna	Peters (MI)
Bentivolio	Heck (NV)	Pittenger
Bishop (NY)	Holding	Pitts
Bishop (UT)	Holt	Polis
Black	Honda	Pompeo
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Radel
Bralley (IA)	Huizenga (MI)	Reed
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Renacci
Buchanan	Hurt	Ribble
Cantor	Jenkins	Rice (SC)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Rigell
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Chaffetz	Joyce	Rogers (KY)
Chu	Kelly (IL)	Rohrabacher
Clay	Kelly (PA)	Roskam
Coffman	King (IA)	Rothfus
Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Royce
Collins (NY)	Kingston	Ryan (OH)
Conaway	Kinzinger (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Schock
Conyers	Kline	Schweikert
Cooper	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Cotton	Levin	Sessions
Crawford	Long	Shuster
Crenshaw	Lujan Grisham	Sinema
Culberson	(NM)	Slaughter
Cummins	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Davis (CA)	Maffei	Smith (NJ)
DeSantis	Maloney,	Smith (WA)
Doggett	Carolyn	Stockman
Duffy	Marchant	Terry
Duncan (SC)	Marino	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (TN)	Matheson	Thornberry
Edwards	McClintock	Tipton
Ellmers	McHenry	Tonko
Fleischmann	McKeon	Turner
Fleming	Meehan	Upton
Flores	Meng	Velázquez
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Walberg
Fortenberry	Moore	Watt
Foster	Moran	Weber (TX)
Franks (AZ)	Mulvaney	Wenstrup
Gardner	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Gibbs	Nadler	Wolf
Gingrey (GA)	Neugebauer	Womack
Gowdy	O'Rourke	Yoder

NOT VOTING—15

Barletta	Grimm	Meeks
Bustos	Herrera Beutler	Pallone
Campbell	Horsford	Rokita
Coble	Luján, Ben Ray	Waxman
Doyle	(NM)	
Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1457

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

□ 1500

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER
The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 67 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. 10002. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue to a civilian employee of the Department of Defense a denial of a security clearance pursuant to Department of Defense Directive 5220.6 that lists in the notice of specific reasons of the clearance decision (as defined in section 3.2 of such Directive) financial hardships because of a "furlough caused by sequestration".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to protect the continued employment of needed and trusted Department of Defense civilian employees. DOD civilian employees who are critical to our national security mission may be in danger of losing their security clearances and their jobs if financial hardships from being furloughed result in financial delinquencies.

Right now, the DOD has issued vague guidance that they will take into account the impact that sequestration is having on servicemembers' financial situation.

While I appreciate those efforts, I believe that Congress should strengthen our commitment to our servicemembers by ensuring no funds are used to deny the renewal of security clearances to workers who are only experiencing financial hardship as a result of sequestration.

I believe this is a commonsense amendment, and it is my hope that it will receive strong support. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's intense interest in trying to protect these folks who would be affected by sequestration, but awarding or granting or giving a national security clearance is not a simple thing and it should not be taken lightly. If the Department of Defense or government agency decides that a person doesn't really qualify, they feel that they don't deserve a national security clearance, if the phrase "furlough caused by sequestration" is included in the denial, then the denial is null and void. You can't deny it if it is claimed that it's due to sequestration, and that's not fair. That's not fair to our national security. It's not fair, actually, to the Defense Department, and I just think this is not a good idea.

But I know what the gentleman wants to accomplish and would like to work with him to figure out how to do this without denying the Defense Department the right to deny a security clearance to someone that they think

is not a good risk for a security clearance.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Congressman KILMER for offering this amendment today and, frankly, for his tireless advocacy on behalf of our men and women in our civil service who support our servicemembers and veterans every day. Without this amendment, hard-working men and women who live in the district I represent and who work at Joint Base Lewis-McChord risk losing their security clearance through furloughs that are no fault of their own, thus complicating their employment situation. We should not let that happen.

The issue this amendment aims to resolve is yet another in a long series of issues that show why budgeting by sequestration is bad policy. I don't think anyone in this Chamber actually thinks civilian employees should lose their security clearance because they were furloughed, but the way sequestration was designed makes that a very real possibility.

This is a good amendment to fix a bad policy. I strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks on the specific language of the amendment, and I do hope that we will continue to work through the conference process to address any concerns about the language because we can all agree that this is a serious issue. It is extremely important that the DOD continues to grant security clearances to employees who are charged with doing critical and sensitive work.

There are many factors that DOD considers when determining if an individual can do these important jobs and to ensure that an employee is trustworthy. Sequestration-related furloughs and any financial hardships that come from sequestration are not an employee's fault. No civilian employee should be denied a security clearance because of Congress' inability to undo sequestration.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and support DOD civilians and the work they do for our country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, again I sympathize with what the gentleman is trying to do. It's just the problem in the denial, if they use the phrase "furlough caused by sequestration," they can't deny that request for a security clearance, and there may be a lot of good reasons why that person should be denied.

And so it's a question of do we protect the national security by giving the Defense Department the authority to deny regardless of what the furlough language is, or do we allow this amend-

ment, which is probably poorly written; and we would like to work with the gentleman to write it in such a way that it doesn't cause us great distress. But I just don't want to see someone who should be denied a security clearance given one because of a technicality.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 69 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the continued detention of any individual who is detained, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, by the United States at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and who has been approved for release or transfer to a foreign country.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment prohibits funds from being used to detain cleared individuals held at Guantanamo. Of the 166 people currently being held there, 86 have been cleared for release; that is, they have not been charged with any offense. They have been found guilty of nothing, and they have been judged by our military to pose no threat to the United States if released. We should release them now. Holding these 86 people who have been cleared for release is against everything we claim to stand for.

In response to this very situation, President Obama asked: Is this who we are?

I hope today we will answer: No, we are better than that.

I hope we support this amendment and move expeditiously to support the release of these detainees. It is truly astonishing that in 2013 the United States continues to hold people indefinitely who have not been charged, let alone convicted of any crime, who admittedly do not pose any threat to the United States. They should be released.

Guantanamo is an affront to America and to the founding principle of the United States that no person should be deprived of liberty without due process of law. Our continuing to hold prisoners indefinitely, without charge and without trial, is a rebuke to our professed support of liberty.

If they've been judged not to pose a threat and we hold them anyway, what kind of message are we sending? By what claim of right do we hold people in jail who have been charged with nothing, whom we're not bringing to trial, and who we have decided pose no threat to us? What are we saying about the United States and our values? We must change course and we ought to support this amendment.

Now, I know some will say these are dangerous terrorists. No, they're not. They're people who were captured in some way who have been judged by our military not to pose a threat to the United States, who have not been charged as terrorists, who have not been judged as terrorists. Some of them may be simply victims to the fact that we paid bounties to people in Afghanistan to turn in people who they said were terrorists. The Hatfields turned in the McCoys because—why not?—we were giving them a couple of thousand dollars.

So anyone who has not been charged with a crime, who has not been convicted, and who we have already decided poses no threat ought to be released. And, therefore, this amendment says no funds may be used to continue their confinement. I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the amendment would allow, and probably require, that a very large number of detainees from Guantanamo are sent back home to their home country or a country that they might have come to. They're detainees for a reason. They are detainees because they inflicted harm or danger or threats or death to our American interests, our American soldiers. They came from the battlefield.

Now, we know that two of the former detainees who have been sent back to their country established a group that's run by those two former Gitmo detainees, and so I don't think it's a good idea. I think we should keep the detainees that are dangerous. Until such time as they meet the requirements of the law, they should stay at Guantanamo. They would have to ensure that the remaining Gitmo detainees, whom most judge as the most dangerous, will not be released or otherwise brought into the homeland where U.S. citizens could be threatened.

Second, the present law ensures that, prior to releasing Guantanamo detainees to a foreign country, a careful and deliberate assessment must be made that the detainee is not likely to re-engage in terrorist activities.

What's wrong with that? There's nothing wrong with that, so why change it? Why turn these people loose to go back to the battlefield, which many of them that have been released have already done, causing additional harm to our troops. So I'm strongly opposed to this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. NADLER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I thank the gentleman from our Judiciary Committee for yielding.

And I want to say to my very good friend from Florida, the chair of the Defense Appropriations Committee, whom I greatly respect, I'm afraid there's a misunderstanding. This amendment is only about those detainees who have been cleared for release or transfer. This is not about the entire 166 people who are there.

These are the people who, after a very careful review, have been cleared for release by the intelligence community and by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. So we're holding these people without cause. We're holding them because we've let our rhetoric get ahead of ourselves.

The fact is that they would be released to their countries of origin. Their countries of origin are going to watch them. But these are people who we have found we have nothing to charge them with, and we have determined that they are not a threat to the United States or to anyone else. They shouldn't have been rounded up. They shouldn't have been detained. And they've been detained for 12 years.

46 detainees are now having to be tube-fed. They're strapped down and a tube is forced down their nose and into their stomach. They're strapped down for 2 hours so the liquid gets digested.

People that have been cleared for release, how can we justify doing this to them?

And what's the end game of our current policy?

Are we going to keep them until they die in prison? People who have been cleared for release and transfer, and we're just going to keep detaining them until they die?

Because that's the only result of the current policy.

Once they get cleaned, they should be released.

Who are we, as a Nation to detain people indefinitely, without legal cause?

It doesn't make sense. It's not American. It's a complete violation of our Constitution, of our most fundamental principle of equal justice under the law.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left? How much time does the gentleman have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, it would serve a purpose if people actually read the amendment. The amendment says none of the funds made available may be used to detain an individual who has been approved for release or transfer to a foreign country.

We hear from the gentleman from Florida, these people are there for a reason. Yes, when we arrest somebody, a murder is committed, a rape is committed, we arrest somebody. But then, the grand jury says, no, we're not going to indict this person; there's not enough evidence.

Do we hold them in jail indefinitely, forever, even though there's no charge, even though the District Attorney says we made a mistake; it's somebody else; they didn't do it? No.

Because maybe they'll commit a crime? That's antithetical to every notion of what the United States is about. These are 86 people who are not charged as terrorists, who we have no evidence are terrorists, and who have been judged by the military and the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the intelligence community to pose no threat to us.

By what claim of right do we hold them in jail? The United States, at this point, is no better than a kidnapper if it holds in jail people whom it charges with no crime and judges safe for release.

Approve the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I don't think it can be said any stronger or needed to be said any more often. These detainees are bad, bad people. They hate America. They've sworn to kill Americans, and, in fact, they have done so on the battlefield, and that's why, when they were captured, they were sent to Guantanamo. That's where they should stay unless the current law is abided by, and that is, to ensure that the remaining Gitmo detainees who are most judged as the most dangerous will not be released or brought into the homeland where U.S. citizens could be threatened.

Second, they ensure that prior to releasing Guantanamo detainees to a foreign country a careful and deliberate assessment must be made that the detainee is not likely to re-engage in terrorist activities and the foreign government can maintain control over the individual. What's wrong with that law?

It protects Americans. It protects America, and it keeps the bad guys where they need to be kept. And in this particular case, it's at Guantanamo.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 70 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to construct any new Department of Defense facility at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, or to expand any existing Department of Defense facility at such Naval Station.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit any funds in the bill from being used to construct or expand detention facilities at Guantanamo.

The bill contains \$249 million to convert temporary detention facilities into more permanent structures. But the administration wants to close Guantanamo and to release or transfer the detainees. So why waste \$429 million to construct facilities that will not be used? Because many in Congress want to keep the detainees in Guantanamo forever.

Now, we have, we know, 166 detainees in Guantanamo; 86 should be released immediately. The gentleman from Florida says that they're bad people; they are terrorists; they're there for a reason. No, they're not. They're there for different reasons. Some because they were handed over for bounties by rival militias or rival clans. Some because a mistake was made. Some because they're terrorists. But we make distinctions.

The gentleman says we shouldn't release them until a careful assessment has been made. Well, a careful assessment has been made: 86 of them, half of those in Guantanamo, have been cleared for release. That is to say, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the intelligence agencies have determined that these 86 people were not terrorists and were not likely to pose a threat to the United States if released. So they're guilty of nothing. They have been tried for nothing. We don't say that people are bad people, we ought to hold them in jail indefinitely without a trial normally, except here. So we ought to release the 86 who have been cleared for release immediately, and the others we ought to try, put on trial.

There's a separate dispute whether that should be an Article III court or a military tribunal. I prefer an Article III court, but either way, put them on trial in front of a court or in front of a military tribunal and let them be tried. Perhaps most of them will be guilty and put them in jail for long periods of time. Maybe some will be innocent. That's what the justice system is about.

Are we really going to say that Guantanamo is separate? Anyone who is unlucky enough to be sent there because at one time we thought maybe they were dangerous should stay there indefinitely until they die without a trial?

The assessment has been made for 86 of them. They have been judged not to be guilty, not to be a terrorist, and not to be a threat. That assessment has been made according to law, and these people ought to be released. The other 80 ought to be tried and, if convicted, ought to be put in prison in the United States. We have hundreds of terrorists in maximum security prisons in the United States. There's no reason a few more couldn't be put there, and we could save \$249 million.

Guantanamo was originally set up because it was thought by the Bush administration that if we held people in Guantanamo they could be tried or handled without having the constitutional rights of someone in the United States, but the Supreme Court said no. The people in Guantanamo have the same rights as if they were held in the United States. So it doesn't change what will happen to them, whether they're kept in prison in the United States or in Guantanamo.

So let's release the 86 who ought to be released because they've been adjudged that they should be released by the Joint Chiefs and by the intelligence agencies. Let's try the others, and let's keep them in jail if they're adjudged guilty. Let's proceed with American justice notions and do ourselves proud, and let's stop wasting billions of dollars on Guantanamo.

So this amendment says don't permanentize what should be and will be temporary, however temporary it is. Don't waste \$249 million on making these facilities permanent.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as I read the amendment, I'm assuming that the gentleman is trying to prevent any further construction or money of that type for the Guantanamo detainees. And I can understand that because we have just recently spent a lot of money building two brand new prisons, air-conditioned, comfortable, and we've already spent that money, so maybe we don't need to spend any money there.

But what the amendment doesn't recognize is that since 1903, we have had a

presence at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, for our own military purposes. The 4th Fleet is headquartered there and has been there for many years. Allied shipping, allied Navy facilities, allied forces move through Guantanamo Bay on a fairly regular basis. I don't know that they have any specific requests right now for any kind of construction, but I don't think we want to deny it in the event that the Defense Department finds it important to do a construction project there.

So, understand, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, has been part of the United States military facility since 1903, and so I don't think this amendment is a good amendment because it would deny our troops, our forces not even involved with Guantanamo detainees the right for military construction, or the right for whatever needs to be spent.

So, again, I just have to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1¼ minute remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, we just approved \$260 million in the defense authorization bill for Guantanamo. In addition, we approved another \$186 billion to construct a new temporary facility, almost half a billion dollars, in addition to what we're now spending. We've spent this year alone \$2,670,000 per Guantanamo detainee. Eighty-six of them have been cleared for release. We have no reason to keep them. And yet, we spend that much money on each of them.

In U.S. prisons we spend \$34,000 per year per maximum security prisoner. Imagine the discrepancy. We have now convicted 300 terrorists in U.S. prisons. They're being held at 98 Federal prisons for a fraction of the money. And we have no convictions at Guantanamo that haven't been overturned.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman just made my case. We don't really need a lot more money for construction for Guantanamo detainees. We've already spent a lot of money there.

The point is, we don't want to deny the ability of the Defense Department to provide whatever is needed for our own military forces at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, not part of the Guantanamo detainees.

I think we've talked this one to death. We're repeating ourselves now. So, in the interest of time, I'm going to yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. NADLER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the \$249 million in the budget is for expansion and making permanent detention facilities. I have

no objection to construction of other military facilities at Guantanamo Bay. I don't know whether that makes sense or not. But the \$249 million we're talking about here is for more detention facilities. That's a pure waste of money. And I'll be happy to clarify, if this amendment passes, that it should apply only to detention facilities.

So if you're opposed to wasting \$249 million more on detention facilities so we can spend hundreds of thousands of dollars a year per prisoner instead of \$34,000 per year per prisoner in the United States, if you think that's a good idea to waste all this money, then vote against this amendment. I hope rational people who don't want to waste a quarter of a billion dollars for permanent detention facilities will vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MR. PIERLUISI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 71 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce—

(1) the first sentence of section 204(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1974 (Public Law 93-166; 87 Stat. 668);

(2) the first sentence of section 9 of the quitclaim deed of December 20, 1982 (transferring property on the Northwest Peninsula of Culebra to the government of Puerto Rico), or, with respect to such sentence, section 10 of the quitclaim deed; or

(3) with respect to a response action required under section 2701(c)(1)(B) of title 10, United States Code, with respect to property transferred by the quitclaim deed described in paragraph (2)—

(A) section 2(d)(15) of the enclosure 3 accompanying Department of Defense Manual No. 4715.20, dated March 9, 2012 (relating to "DERP Eligibility—Ineligible Activities"); or

(B) section 8074 of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Chairman, this budget-neutral amendment, which I offer with Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, would

enable DOD to remove unexploded ordnance from land in Culebra, Puerto Rico, which was used as a military training range for seven decades.

In 1974, Congress enacted legislation directing the Navy to cease operations in Culebra. A provision stated that the present bombardment area shall not be utilized for any purpose that would require decontamination at the expense of the United States.

In 1982, the Federal Government conveyed land in Culebra to the Government of Puerto Rico, including a 400-acre parcel within the former bombardment area. The deed provided that, in accordance with the 1974 act, the Government of Puerto Rico would not hold the Federal Government liable for decontamination of the land.

Four years later, in 1986, Congress enacted SARA, which amended the 1980 CERCLA law. SARA states that DOD is responsible for cleaning up contamination it caused on current and former military sites and established the Defense Environmental Restoration Program for DOD to carry out these responsibilities. That program is funded by the bill under consideration today.

SARA directed DOD to clean up former defense sites conveyed to third parties prior to 1986. These sites are eligible for Federal funding, even though there were no specific authorities enabling their cleanup at the time they were decommissioned and conveyed. Nevertheless, DOD contends that the 1974 law and the 1982 deed that tracks it prohibits the use of Federal funds to decontaminate the 400-acre parcel on Culebra, and these prohibitions were not superceded by SARA. As a result of this restrictive interpretation, Culebra is the only former defense site in the Nation that DOD contends it is barred by statute from decontaminating.

This makes no sense. The 1974 act and the 1982 deed may have been consistent with Federal policy at that time since there was no legal framework in place that would have enabled the Federal Government to pay for the cleanup of the conveyed property. However, they're now squarely at odds with Federal policy that has been in place for more than 25 years under SARA. Accordingly, there's no principled basis to treat Culebra differently from thousands of other former defense sites conveyed out of Federal hands prior to 1986 which the Federal Government is obligated to decontaminate.

The status quo poses a threat to human safety since this parcel contains beaches, walkways, and campgrounds visited by over 300,000 people a year. A recent DOD report found that since 1995, there have been 70 incidents in which members of the public encountered unexploded munitions that could have caused great harm. In fact, in March of this year, a young girl visiting a Culebra beach suffered burns after she picked up an artillery shell containing white phosphorous. The FBI responded and found six other munitions which it detonated and removed.

This potentially tragic incident underscores the need for congressional action.

This amendment would ensure that the 1974 act ceases to function as an obstacle to implementation of current Federal policy, as reflected in CERCLA and SARA. The amendment simply ensures that Culebra will receive the same treatment as other former defense sites in the FUDS program. The citizens in Culebra sacrificed so our military could receive the training it needed. Congress, in turn, should take this small step to remove the barrier that is preventing DOD from addressing safety hazards that remain on the island.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Certainly I appreciate the gentleman's passion on this issue and agree that is an important issue that needs to be addressed. As he is aware, Mr. Chairman, the Department estimates it will take multiple years and a significant investment to properly address these contaminated sites in Puerto Rico.

We look forward to working with the gentleman. We understand that he may be considering withdrawing his amendment so we can continue to work with him to address this problem, which significantly has impacted the Commonwealth.

I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PIERLUISI. I look forward to working with the majority.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY).

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate my friend yielding to me.

I simply want to rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. The agreement that was reached—and I think some people used the agreement as an excuse to do nothing—is 40 years old. It was entered into in 1973. Well, they agreed to it. I graduated from law school in 1973. The world is a much different place today. People have changed. I certainly think our environmental consciousness has improved and our consciousness of our responsibility in this has improved. And I do think this is an opportunity to rectify that.

I serve on the Energy and Water Subcommittee of this great committee. The chairman chairs that Energy and Water Subcommittee. Unfortunately, in the Formerly Used Defense Sites that were cited by the gentleman, we have over 10,000 properties, which is one of the problems I think the gentleman alludes to as far as the costs we have to deal with. All the more reason, I believe, that we ought to be very assiduous and active in beginning to address these sites.

So I appreciate the gentleman raising it, and I certainly support his position.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Reclaiming my time, it was my understanding with

Mr. YOUNG that the gentleman would consider withdrawing the amendment if we gave a commitment to continue to work with him on this very important issue, which he has dedicated so much time and effort to.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PIERLUISI. That's absolutely right. So I will withdraw my amendment. But let me just say that, again, this is one property. It's only one property out of thousands of properties facing these circumstances. So I hope we can work it out. It's not going to be costly. It makes sense to clean it up.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF OFFICER JACOB J. CHESTNUT AND DETECTIVE JOHN M. GIBSON

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the Chair's announcement of earlier today, the House will now observe a moment of silence in memory of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson.

Will all present please rise for a moment of silence.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 72 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. __. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Defense—

(1) to implement or execute any agreement with the Russian Federation pertaining to missile defense other than a treaty; or

(2) to provide the Government of the Russian Federation with any information about the ballistic missile defense systems of the United States that is classified or unclassified by the Department or component thereof.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits funds to implement or execute any non-treaty executive agreement with Russia regarding missile defense or to provide Russia with information about America's ballistic missile defense systems, both classified and unclassified. The reason the amendment says classified and unclassified is to prohibit the administration from declassifying missile defense technology to skirt the law. A similar amendment was passed last year, with bipartisan support, and is included in the current continuing resolution that is funding our government during this fiscal year.

Multiple news sources over the years have reported that the Obama adminis-

tration may seek to share our missile defense secrets with the Russians. I am concerned these reports may be accurate. While the danger to national security is a serious concern, so is the loss of billions of dollars we have sunk into creating these exceptional technologies.

The Congressional Research Service estimates the United States has spent approximately \$153 billion on missile defense. Roughly 90 percent of that \$153 billion, or \$140 billion, has been spent on hit-to-kill technology.

I ask the House to support this amendment to preserve America's lead in missile defense technologies, protect America's investment of billions of dollars, and ensure the viability of current and future missile defense technologies.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I rise to claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I had my breath taken away with the assertion that the President of the United States might give away the most intimate defense secrets of this country to Russia, and that we are debating an amendment to Defense appropriations, with all of the other problems we face and all the threats we face in this country, based on the assumption that the President of the United States might give away the most intimate defense secrets of this country to Russia.

I would simply ask my colleagues to think about the underlying assumptions based in the gentleman's amendment and vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. There have been numerous occasions in which the media has reported that the administration is considering, as a part of negotiations or other things, divulgence of our sensitive hit-to-kill technology to the Russian federation.

□ 1545

I am thankful that my colleague across the aisle says that it takes away his breath, and I hope with that that he will support this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We support your amendment. As you said, it is similar to what the bill carried last year and what was a provision in the armed services bill, so we are supportive of it. We're obviously mindful and respectful of the ranking member's position, but the majority of Congress felt the way you and I do and the committee did as well.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman responds to my concern by

suggesting that he has discovered the possibility that the President of the United States is going to give away the most intimate secrets this country holds to Russia through the media. I'm wondering—and I ask this question simply rhetorically, not necessarily of my colleague—I wonder if that was FOX News. I wonder if he saw that on the Colbert Report recently. I wonder if that was on the John Stewart program.

I was watching CNN, and I didn't see any report of that yesterday; although, I saw that a baby was born in another country. Despite the world coming apart, that was the headline news. I didn't see MSNBC, and I don't know if that was it. Perhaps it was even on a BBC telecast. But I'm wondering what media outlets are providing this inside information as to the deliberations of the President of the United States to give away these cherished secrets.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would submit that the appropriate way to gather the requested information is simply for the gentleman to Google what I have just stated.

This issue arose in 2011 with numerous comments by the White House that were reported in numerous outlets. By way of background, my source is not FOX News in this particular instance, but all he has to do is Google it and he can find it.

Also, there were numerous reports in 2012 where the President indicated—in what turned out to be an open mic—that once the elections were over with, he could more freely negotiate or give away information to the Russians. Those aren't the exact words used by the President. Unfortunately, I don't have perfect recall, but it was words to that effect.

I would emphasize that this House has visited this issue previously. This has passed with bipartisan support. So I would urge this body to again, as a precautionary measure, adopt this amendment to prevent the sharing of our hit-to-kill technology with the Russian Federation to the extent that risk becomes a reality.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I reserve the balance of my time, and I understand I have the right to close.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman indicated, in query to my rhetorical question, that all I have to do is Google and I will discover the information that will lead to our knowledge that the President of the United States is considering giving away this very sensitive information.

It comes to mind, when the gentleman suggests I should Google it, how many different encounters I have had with members of the public who said, "I saw it on the Internet; it must be true." For example, Members of Congress, after serving one term, receive a full salary pension for the rest

of their lives; and Members of Congress receive free health care for the rest of their lives; and Members of Congress, for the last 4 years in a row, have received significant pay increases because they Googled it on the Internet, and so they secured very specific, accurate information. Perhaps we should go to Facebook or LinkedIn or reddit, or maybe we should tweet each other.

Again, in very serious concern, I would suggest my colleagues absolutely reject this amendment. I would ask for their vote against it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 73 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit funding the use of force pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force, or AUMF, effective on December 31, 2014, when the last American combat troops will rotate out of Afghanistan and the responsibility for security will have passed to the Afghan people after more than 13 years of war in that country.

New Year's Day 2015 should not only bring about a new relationship between the United States and Afghanistan, it should also mark the end of a conflict that was begun in our skies on that September morning and which was formalized days later when the Congress passed the AUMF.

That legislation provided the President with the authority to use "force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations, or persons."

The 2001 AUMF was never intended to authorize a war without end, and it now poorly defines those who pose a threat to our country. That authority and the funding that goes along with it

should expire concurrent with the end of our combat role in Afghanistan.

In addition to this amendment, I have introduced bipartisan legislation, H.R. 2324, which sunsets the AUMF effective the same date, December 31, 2014, and calls on the administration to work with Congress together to determine what new authority, if any, is necessary to protect the country after that time.

The Constitution vests the Congress with the power to declare war and the responsibility of appropriating funds to pay for it. It is our most awesome responsibility and central to our military efforts overseas. We owe it to the men and women we send into combat to properly define and authorize their mission, and my amendment will effectively give Congress the next 16 months to do so.

In his recent speech at National Defense University, President Obama specifically called on Congress to work with him:

I look forward to engaging Congress and the American people in efforts to refine, and ultimately repeal, the AUMF's mandate, and I will not sign any laws designed to expand this mandate further. Our systematic effort to dismantle terrorist organizations must continue, but this war, like all wars, must end.

This amendment is a prudent first step towards meeting the President's challenge, a call that we must embrace, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Members of Congress sworn to defend the Constitution.

I urge a "yes" vote and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, in some ways I'm somewhat sympathetic to the hopes that underlie this amendment. I hope that terrorism has gone away by December 31, 2014. I hope that Zawahiri and the others responsible for 9/11 and those who authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attack or harbored them are all brought to justice in the next 14 months. I hope that our country and other countries around the world no longer have to worry about terrorists hiding bombs inside their clothing or inside their bodies, trying to kill as many innocent people as possible. And I hope that military and civilians who serve our Nation all around the world, and others in the private sector, are no longer the target for suicide bombings and assassinations and the other sorts of things that we've seen since 9/11.

But, Mr. Chairman, what if my hopes don't come to pass? What if the world has something else in store? What if terrorism still exists by December 31, 2014? Well, then it seems to me that this amendment doesn't make a lot of sense. Because this amendment says no matter what—not just in Afghanistan, but anywhere around the world—we're

not going to fund anything through the Department of Defense pursuant to that AUMF.

Now, I've got to say, I have been and continue to be for updating that AUMF to better reflect the way that al Qaeda has evolved over the last decade or so. Unfortunately, that has been resisted by the administration, as the gentleman just pointed out.

Of course we all want this war against terrorists and other wars to end, but, unfortunately, the enemy gets a vote. So for us to unilaterally say, because of the calendar, we're done, and, oh, maybe we'll pass some new authority—but maybe not—in order to protect this country, I think, is dangerous. It's shortsighted. It is putting hopes above reality.

So I hope my colleagues reject this. We can do better in fighting terrorists in a variety of ways. But to bury our head in the sand and say it's all going to be over on a certain date is not the way to protect this country, and I believe it forfeits our most essential responsibilities under the Constitution.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. I want to yield to my colleague from Indiana. Before I do, two quick points.

No one is suggesting, of course, that terrorism is going to go away in 16 months or all of our problems will be over. But what we are saying with this amendment is that the authorization we passed that authorizes force against those who planned, authorized, and committed the 9/11 attacks shouldn't be used to go after groups like al Shabaab, which may not even have been in existence at the time of 9/11.

This AUMF is now outdated; and unless we have a sunset date, we're going to continue to rely on an AUMF that no longer describes the nature of the conflict we're in.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY).

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding and rise in strong support of his amendment.

The gentleman who is in opposition mentions that the administration mentions the United States Constitution. The fact is we have a constitutional responsibility. With the passage of more than a decade and a changing world—and I would agree with the gentleman, something else may be in store—we ought to revisit that issue. We ought to exercise our constitutional, congressional prerogative and have a full debate.

Again, the gentleman is providing over 1½ years. In such a serious issue, I think even this Congress could come to grips with that type of fundamental issue and resolve the future.

So I strongly support what the gentleman is doing and appreciate his amendment.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I just point out to my colleagues, this

House has voted 2 years in a row to update the AUMF so it does better reflect the way that al Qaeda has changed. We have included the exact language used by the Obama administration and the Bush administration in court proceedings and just adopted that. The House has passed that. I don't remember how the particular gentleman voted on that, but the House has passed it. The Senate has not gone along. But there has been an effort to update the language to better reflect the way that the threat has changed, but that's a far different thing from saying, okay, we're just going to make this go away and hope that in the meantime we can do something better. I think that is terribly risky.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. I would only say to my colleague, through the Chair, that this institution has proved that unless we have a deadline, we simply refuse to act.

What the President has said in terms of any new authorization for use of force—and it's something I agree wholeheartedly with the White House—is that he won't support a new authorization that is broader than the one that we seek to sunset. That, I think, is a problem with some of the drafts which the majority has proposed.

We don't want an expanded war. We do want an authorization that reflects the precise nature of the threat, and that threat has changed since 9/11. It no longer comes as much from the core of al Qaeda, which has been decimated; rather, it comes now from a group of franchises, loosely affiliated organizations that sometimes, as a product of convenience, will associate with al Qaeda for financing or legitimacy. But it is now a far-flung terrorist challenge, and any authorization ought to reflect the changing nature of threat.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is you have to read the amendment and the words that are in it. The amendment says we can spend no money for any part of the Department of Defense pursuant to the AUMF after December 31, 2014.

□ 1600

Now, we can have a very interesting discussion about how the AUMF should be updated, about different authority that could take its place, but none of that is before us. What is before us is that it basically says, no funding shall be used. It essentially repeals the AUMF.

Now, I realize the gentleman is trying to precipitate further debate, but the fact is terrorism is not going away. This prohibits any U.S. military action, not only in Afghanistan, but anywhere in the world that al Qaeda or its

affiliates may have traveled. This stops all of that.

My point is that there is too dangerous a risk in a world where there are too many people still trying to find new, innovative ways to attack us and kill as many Americans as possible. We can't take that risk.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, and yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 74 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 74 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$65,000,000) (increased by \$65,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, my amendment addresses a current issue that is undermining an already weakened system of justice in our military.

Any JAG will tell you that it is impossible to effectively prosecute a case if the investigation was improperly handled. That is why the DOD Inspector General report released last week was so troubling.

It uncovered that of the 501 investigations of sexual assault offenses they audited, all but 83 had some sort of deficiency. That means that less than 20 percent were completed without error. Fifty-six cases, 11 percent of the cases, had serious deficiencies. And 399 of these cases had interview and post-interview deficiencies. They also found weaknesses in collecting evidence, not developing leads, and photographing the scene. This in large part is a result of inadequate training in how to properly investigate these complex cases.

A February IG report found that criminal investigators want and need more training on conducting sexual assault investigations. For example, criminal investigators for the Air Force told the IG they wanted more training on the psychology of interviewing victims and evidence collec-

tion. One investigator said he would be "in trouble" if he only relied on the training he received.

That is why I'm offering this amendment that will provide an additional \$10 million in funds to train investigators on how to properly investigate sexual assault-related offenses.

My amendment realigns funds from the Operations and Maintenance Defense-wide account and shifts \$5 million to Army Operations and Maintenance, \$2.5 million to Air Force Operations and Maintenance, and \$2.5 million to Navy Operations and Maintenance, which are accounts that pay for training investigators.

Ensuring that assaults are investigated properly is the first step for holding perpetrators accountable.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I claim the time.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, this is an issue that we can't sweep under the rug any longer. We have got to face it square on. The gentlelady's amendment helps do that.

The subcommittee when preparing this legislation was extremely concerned about the issue, and we have included considerable amounts of money to deal with sexual predators and sexual assaults in the military, especially demanding that the military do a better job at enforcing the rules, the laws, to protect the rights of those who are sexually abused.

I thank the gentlelady for offering this amendment, and we do support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Chair, I've got goose bumps that I actually have an amendment that my colleagues on the other side support.

I would like to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY).

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the gentlewoman for yielding and the chairman's support.

Madam Chair, the amendment does seek to target an important part of the process when prosecuting a sexual assault—the investigation of the incident.

As the Congresswoman pointed out, the Inspector General found this particular part of the process lacking in terms of interviewing victims, investigating crime scenes, and notifying the sexual assault response coordinator. The funding proposed would provide the means to include special training for tactics and techniques when investigating crimes of these natures. I would join the chairman of the committee in thanking her for raising the issue and strongly support it.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, let me just say in closing, we all now recognize 26,000 cases a year of sexual assault and rape. This is not sexual harassment, I might point out; this is unwanted sexual contact. Of those cases, only 3,000 are actually reported. The fear of reporting, the fear of reprisal is so great, that very few of them, less than 20 percent, actually report them.

Then when you report these cases, to have them improperly or inadequately investigated, that then results in a handful of actual courts-martial, and then even smaller, some 250 convictions out of some 3,000 that are reported suggests that we have a lot of work to do.

I thank my colleagues for the support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Chair, I would like to thank my colleague, Ms. SPEIER for offering this amendment. Frequently, sexual-assault victims in the military are referred to Uniformed mental-health experts. From there, they are all too often subsequently diagnosed with "personality disorders" and separated from the military. While the military is making some positive steps to correct the improper processes surrounding sexual assault cases, it is impossible to know how many veterans of the military have disputed their personality disorder discharges and it is even more difficult to know how many victims of sexual assault did not come forward in fear of being labeled or scapegoated. Instead of sweeping these crimes under the rug, this amendment will review these cases and identify individuals that were improperly separated from the military subsequent to reporting a sexual assault and correct their record. I urge support for this important way forward in addressing sexual crimes.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 75 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 8, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,500,000)".

Page 8, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,500,000)".

Page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Chair, since I began working on this issue of military sexual assault 3 years ago, I've had the opportunity to speak to over 100 courageous survivors of rape.

With each of their experiences, there is a unique nature to them. But many of these survivors that decided to report these crimes have had a very similar experience after they reported: they were retaliated against, ostracized, and involuntarily separated from the military on the grounds of a personality or adjustment disorder.

Mental health diagnoses are grossly misused to administratively discharge or retaliate against survivors of sexual assault and other servicemembers. Since 2001, the military has discharged more than 31,000 servicemembers on the grounds that they were subject to a personality disorder.

A GAO investigation found that 22 to 60 percent of the time personality disorders were either not diagnosed by a trained psychiatrist or psychologist, or there was undue command influence.

This pattern has become a potent lesson to servicemembers that are assaulted: report and get kicked out of the military with a personality disorder diagnosis. This designation amounts to a scarlet letter, pinned where their medals should be, and follows them for the rest of their lives. These servicemembers are re-victimized every time they apply for a job and submit their DD214s. It also makes it virtually impossible to retain a security clearance.

My amendment aims to address this clear pattern of retaliation against victims who report a crime of rape or sexual assault. The amendment provides funds to correct their service record and provide them with the benefits they have earned. My amendment realigns \$65 million within the Operations and Maintenance Defense-wide account to dedicate these funds to identifying and correct the service record of servicemembers who were summarily discharged from the military following reports of a sexual assault. This amendment requires the Department of Defense to review all separations of individuals that made an unrestricted report of sexual assault and determine if they were discharged, and on what grounds—including personality and adjustment disorders. My amendment will also direct the Secretary of Defense to correct their records of service—to right this wrong—and provide them with any compensation and services they weren't able to receive as a consequence of this error.

This is the very least we can do for these brave survivors. It is the first step in addressing the systemic re-victimization of courageous men and women who were brave enough to come forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I claim the time.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Again, Madam Chairman, this is a good amendment. Those who are subject to sexual assaults, sexual attacks, and

who have been separated from the military on grounds of a disorder need to have their records corrected if information indicates that that should be done.

Sexual assault victims have already suffered a great deal. They deserve to have their military records accurately reflect their military service. Those victims who were improperly discharged on the grounds of a personality disorder deserve to have those records corrected.

We do support the amendment. This bill already provides substantial funding to provide these services.

I notice a very distinguished gentleman rising who would like me to yield, and I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding and would like to associate myself with his kind remarks, and appreciate the gentlewoman for offering the amendment and would like to indicate my support for the amendment as well.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, needless to say, we support this amendment. We have already robustly financed sexual assault programs. We fully fund the President's request for sexual assault prevention and response programs at the service level and at the Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program office.

I would like to emphasize "prevention." If we can prevent these sexual assaults, then the other problems go away. So it is important that we do pay attention to prevention.

In addition, our bill provides \$25 million to the Department and the services, including the Guard and Reserve, to implement a Sexual Assault Special Victims program, such as the Air Force Special Victims Counsel program, to provide all victims with specially trained legal assistance throughout the investigation and prosecution process—fair play. That's important.

We also support a number of policy changes that were including the FY 2014 National Defense Authorization Act. I think our bill goes a long way on this issue, and this amendment goes even further, so we enthusiastically support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1615

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their unanimous support of this effort and of this particular amendment.

Madam Chair, let me just close by saying that the GAO says 20 to 60 percent of these personality disorder designations are either done improperly or are done with undue influence. Certainly, those who have been victimized deserve to be able to have that designation erased from their DD-214 forms so that they are not in a position of having to then in the civilian world explain why they have this designation on their discharge papers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Chair, I would like to thank my colleague, Ms. SPEIER for offering this amendment. While many protections for victims of sexual violence have recently been put in place across our Armed Forces, a review by the IG of military sexual assault cases revealed that over three-quarters (83%) of the 501 investigations conducted, were not properly investigated, and had significant deficiencies, such as a failure to collect key evidence; incomplete interviews; and only partial crime scene investigations. As a former District Attorney, I was stunned by these findings. I have worked to protect victims of abuse and violence throughout my career and know that such sloppy investigative work will only cause further injury to victims and their families. To add insult to injury, these victims are the very men and women who have devoted their lives to the lives of others. With this amendment, we will be returning the favor of their commitment to our country's security and ensure additional funding and training to close the harmful loops that exist in the military's investigative processes related to sexual assaults. This amendment is a vital step towards ensuring an environment where there is justice for all victims. I urge support of our amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 84 printed in House Report 113-170.

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. RADEL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 97 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RADEL) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. RADEL. Madam Chair, this amendment should serve as a reminder to the President that he does not have the authority to unilaterally send our children to war. In fact, it was Senator Obama who in 2007 said:

History has shown us time and again, however, that military action is most successful when it is authorized and supported by the legislative branch.

Here we are, again, seeing that Senator Obama and President Obama are

two very different people; and with the rhetoric heating up on Syria in particular and with word that we will now arm rebel factions, we must make a statement today. What we are saying is: Mr. President, if you want to go to war, you go through us.

Don't get me wrong. My heart goes out to the innocent families who have been victimized and caught up in this fierce civil war in Syria, but that's exactly what it is—a civil war—and we cannot be the police of the world. If you thought that the situations in Iraq and Afghanistan were complicated, the situation in Syria has history going back 1,000 years with deep and profound complexities. We cannot just go into Syria and pick and choose who to arm. Too many times we have seen those we arm often turn their own weapons against us, weapons that we have provided. We do not have to use military force around the world to be a leader for democracy.

This amendment is about Congress doing its job instead of following the President's cloudy, unclear foreign policy. This is about the House of the people making decisions for the people—for our young men and women in the military who are serving our country today.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I rise to claim the additional 10 minutes on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman for offering the amendment.

Madam Chair, I would point out in my opening remarks that I think the fundamental responsibility of this body is to be engaged in these types of situations and to make determinations relative to our constitutional responsibility, particularly in dangerous situations when it involves military action. Syria, for example, is reported to have the fourth most sophisticated, integrated air defense of any nation on the planet Earth. Reports in the media indicate that Russia has kept these systems resupplied and up to date technologically.

It is but one of many things that we have to consider as far as the safety and well-being of those who are in our military forces, as well as, ultimately, what our national interests are.

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

Mr. RADEL. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, first of all, I want to congratulate our colleague from Florida for having a very successful first few months in the Congress. He has done a really good job.

I am happy to rise in support of this amendment. It is a responsible approach to a critical national security issue. We appreciate the gentleman

working closely with the committee to address this issue in a responsible manner that protects our national interests.

So I say, again, thank you for the initiative that you have offered here today.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I would make an additional observation on the gentleman's amendment.

There are political and diplomatic issues of Russia's relationship with the Assad regime. Altering this relationship over the long run may become an objective of U.S. foreign policy. Maybe. Maybe not. However, entering into an armed conflict with this relationship in mind is a dangerous step, among many other dangerous steps, and it renews the prospect of a more openly hostile relationship with a country that otherwise had ended the Cold War. So it's certainly an additional reason as to my appreciation for the gentleman offering the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RADEL. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Chair, I now yield 2 minutes to my neighbor up north, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY).

Mr. ROONEY. I want to thank my friend from Florida (Mr. RADEL) for bringing this amendment to the floor today.

Madam Chair, I would have liked to have seen something that went specifically to not arming the so-called "rebels" in Syria, but I think it's important that we also address this issue of the President of the United States and what his obligations are to this Congress and to the American people under the War Powers Act.

The Founding Fathers didn't want one person to be able to take us to these wars in foreign lands. They wanted there to be debate, deliberation, and for the President to have to come and make the argument to the American people through their representation as to why something is such an important part of our national interests that he would send our men and women into harm's way to potentially die for us in that land.

In this case, we have Assad, who is a dangerous dictator in the Middle East. On the other hand, we have the rebels, who are infiltrated by al Qaeda and other bad actors—the same people we've been fighting, by the way, over the last 10 years.

So whose side are we on—Sunni? Shia? It's a civil war in the Middle East. What is our national interest?

Ladies and gentlemen, if you can't answer that question, if you're not absolutely sure—as the President needs to make us sure through the War Powers Act and through authorization, which this amendment requires—then you cannot support sending our men and women or getting involved in Syria or even sending weapons to the so-called "rebels" over there.

Support the Radel amendment. Make the President make the case for Syria. Come to Congress, and let the people decide.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield such time as he may consume to my good friend from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

I thank my colleague for this extremely important amendment.

Madam Chair, we have a dire situation in Syria, and everyone's heart breaks for the suffering of the Syrian people. Over 100,000 people are getting slaughtered by the leader of their own government. It's absolutely unconscionable. So the questions for us are: What can we practically do? Whatever it is that we do do, does Congress have a say in the "yes" or "no" of military action?

I thank the gentleman for this amendment because there are two questions here.

One is as to the policy itself, the use of military force, arming the rebels. Is that a wise policy? Will it make things better or will it make things worse?

The second question is: Whatever the policy is, is it the responsibility of those of us who have been elected to represent Americans as Members of Congress—and we all do—to be accountable in making that enormously important and consequential decision that has the potential to send our troops into combat?

Let me talk briefly about the policy.

The military situation there is chaotic. The rebels are united loosely in an effort to bring down Assad, but distinguishing between the "good rebels" and the "bad rebels" is impossible. In fact, we are reading reports right now of how rebels who are having disputes with fellow rebels are settling them by beheading them. That's literally what's happening. So the notion that we can have a micromanaged approach and pick the good guys and arm them and not have any reasonable and, actually, inevitable expectation that the arms will get into bad hands, I think, is naive.

Also, General Dempsey, who is a hard-headed thinker about military matters, testified and laid out very clearly, if we just want to arm the rebels, that it's going to be like \$500 million, or it could be into the billions. If we want to do standoff attacks, which supposedly will be surgical, that could be in the \$1 billion-a-month range. If we want to actually have a no-fly zone, it will take hundreds of ships and aircraft in order to implement that—over \$1 billion a month. That's a consequential decision that we can't stumble into.

Then the second question, Madam Chair, is the congressional responsibility to act. One of the frustrations that, I think, Americans have with all of us is the sense that we are not accountable. Do you know what? If we allow an action to be taken that has the potential to send troops into combat and if we haven't actually stood up and voted "yes" or "no," then they are right. We have a job to do under the Constitution. This amendment is really saying to all of us here in Congress on

both sides of the aisle that, if the moment comes when that decision is going to be made by the President, he has to return to us for approval, and we have to stand and make our decision.

So with regard to that constitutional responsibility, what is more important?

We all talk about how much we admire the troops for their willingness to sacrifice—and all of us do—but do you know what? All Americans admire the troops, but 435 Americans in this Chamber have the responsibility to make certain that, when we take advantage of the willingness of these young men and women to serve and to sacrifice, including to give up their lives, we are the ones who must make the decision about the policy. Our responsibility—all of ours—is to make certain that whatever policy it is we are asking them to pursue be worthy of their willingness to sacrifice. That has to be done at the beginning.

Once our troops are in the field, yes, we have to support them. Then, once they're in the field, we find ourselves conflicted about having a discussion about how it is they got there. Do you know what? They got there because we sent them there. Sometimes we do it consciously. Sometimes we stumble into it. That's not right. There are 435 of us in this House who are united by a common responsibility to the soldiers and sailors who serve and to the citizens whom we represent.

So I thank the gentleman as I see this as an opportunity for Members of this House on both sides of the aisle, who share a common admiration for the people who serve in the military and who share a common sense of duty to the people we represent, to be accountable for any policy that has the potential to send our soldiers into combat.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RADEL. I would like to thank the gentleman from Vermont as well.

Madam Chair, it is times like these as we debate this that we realize the heavy weight we carry on our shoulders. We are talking about people's lives as we approach this. Once again, this re-asserts the fact that this is the people's House and that we want to have a say in our foreign policy.

At this point, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

□ 1630

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding and for this important amendment. Madam Chair, not only should there be no American troops sent to Syria, there should be no American weapons sent to Syria.

Several weeks ago, a Catholic priest named Father Francois Murad was murdered in northern Syria. Who

killed him? The very people that we're considering arming. What was he guilty of? Serving the poor. We have no business shipping weapons to those who would raid convents and kill innocent civilians.

Madam Chair, there are now 100,000 people dead from this conflict. What began as a hopeful exercise of civic engagement by the Syrian people against the brutal Assad regime has now become a wanton slaughter. We don't know who is who among this Syrian rebel movement. No one there is safe, and no happy projections of democratic ideals will make this better. We do not have control over the Syrian battle space. Americans must not be complicit in this killing field.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, from my perspective, I would also make it clear that what we're talking about at this point is the use of military force. There is no question that there is a significant and tragic humanitarian crisis taking place.

It is estimated that about 6.8 million people are in need of various types of humanitarian assistance in Syria itself. There are about 4.25 million people displaced within that country. We have 1.78 million Syrians displaced to neighboring countries. There were 486,972, as of the latest count, that are refugees in Jordan; 607,908 are refugees in Lebanon; 412,789 are refugees in Turkey; 161,014 are refugees in Iraq, and 92,367 in Egypt. It's one reason why today it's estimated that about \$814 million of U.S. humanitarian aid has been expended for good purposes. That's certainly not what we're talking about here today, and I certainly would want to make our colleagues understand that as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RADEL. Madam Chair, this is excellent bipartisan discussion; whereas, this country tends to be a little war weary these days, but we see where the United States can have a role, most especially when it comes to humanitarian aid, with our allies in the region and how exactly we can help.

Once again, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have highlighted just how deeply profound these complexities are in Syria. We're not only confused when it comes to who the rebels are—I don't even know if they're good or bad anymore. We simply don't know what rebel factions are playing a part in this. You've got Hezbollah, you've got al Qaeda, and then you have the state players in this; and we know that we have sensitive relationships with Russia, with China, who also potentially, at least diplomatically, are involved in this.

Again, I just want to commend our colleagues here. This is excellent discussion.

At this point, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I feel very strongly about this issue, Madam Chair. I believe without a shadow of a doubt this is one of the most insane policies that borders on madness. For the United States to give funding, training, and arms most likely to al Qaeda in Syria doesn't make any sense.

Can we realize what it is we're talking about right now? This is Islamic jihad, which has declared war on the United States and declared war on our ally Israel. And we're now in a position when we're authorizing arming, training, and funding for allies of al Qaeda, and al Qaeda themselves, in Syria? This is absolute madness.

You see, Madam Chair, the decision to arm the Syrian rebels by the Obama administration just this week will likely have catastrophic consequences for our United States national security and the national security of our ally Israel. The Syrian rebels that the President wants to arm consist mostly of al Qaeda members that we've spent the last decade fighting a war against. Have we forgotten the thousands of Americans that were killed on September 11 in the horrific Twin Towers attack and here in this city at the Pentagon? We lost over 3,000 Americans that day. Are we forgetting who we fought in Iraq and in Afghanistan? It's my opinion, Madam Chair, that this is insanity to aid those who've taken the lives of Americans with impunity and continue to do so.

Just take note that the leader of al Qaeda is an individual named Zawahiri. Zawahiri called on Muslims from around the world to make their way to Syria and support the rebels and, in fact, become the rebels who are seeking to overthrow Assad.

We don't have a great track record, Madam Chair, of putting arms into the hands of terrorists. Take a look at the Fast and Furious program in Mexico and the terrorists who received arms from the United States. Take a look at Benghazi and the tens of thousands of weapons, MANPADS, that went into the hands of al Qaeda after Benghazi. And now we're intentionally going to make a decision to send money, training, and arms to al Qaeda?

How about a referendum with the American people? I think this would be more than a 90 percent issue. Don't do it. That's why we're standing here today. Don't do it.

The top spiritual leader of the Muslim Brotherhood is a man named Qaradawi. He has been outlawed from the United States because he's a terrorist. Also, he was outlawed from Egypt because he's a terrorist. He has called for jihad in Syria, and he has said:

Every Muslim trained to fight and capable of doing that must make himself available.

So you have the head of al Qaeda and the head of the terrorist organization the Muslim Brotherhood both calling on Islamic jihadists to go to Syria to fight and be the rebels. And we're going to arm them, and we're going to train

them, and we're going to provide material support to them? Not my vote.

Madam Chair, former President Morsi, who was formerly the head of the Muslim Brotherhood, which was outlawed under Mubarak in Egypt, he supported the call from hardline Egyptian clerics who called for Egyptians to go fight jihad in Syria. So you see, there's a common thread here. All the wrong guys on the wrong team are all calling for jihadists to go to Syria and fight. It was reported that over 2,500 Egyptians have already gone to Syria to fight jihad.

Pakistan Taliban fighters have left Pakistan to join the fight in Syria, and they're working with al Qaeda-affiliated groups in Syria.

On Monday, al Qaeda's Iraq-affiliated attack on the Abu Ghraib prison helped 500 inmates escape, most of whom were part of senior positions in al Qaeda. These prisoners included trained fighters and ideological extremists who are expected to travel to Syria to join the fight with the rebels.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield the gentlewoman as much time as she may consume.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman on the other side of the aisle, my friend.

These prisoners included trained fighters and ideological extremists who are expected to travel to Syria to join the fight with the rebels.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the top military officer in the United States, Martin Dempsey, has warned us that intervening in Syria could assist Islamist extremists, helping them gain access to chemical weapons and biological weapons and further erode United States military readiness already suffering from sharp defense budget cuts. He has said that using force is "no less than an act of war," and stated that some of the military options for Syria may not be feasible without compromising U.S. security elsewhere.

He made reference to the chaos in Iraq after the fall of Saddam Hussein and Libya after Qadhafi. He warned of the unintended consequences if Assad fell without having a viable opposition. He said "we could inadvertently empower extremists or unleash the very chemical weapons we seek to control."

This is a hub for jihadist activity. The American taxpayer has no obligation. In fact, I say this body must protect the American taxpayer from being involved in arming al Qaeda in Syria. We must defeat this effort, and that's why I'm in support of this today.

Again, we have the major general from the Israeli military intelligence, and he said that right before our eyes the center of global jihad is developing; let's not do it. I agree with him.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 98 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. __. No funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense to fund military operations in Egypt, nor may funds made available by this Act be used by the Department of Defense to fund individuals, groups, or organizations engaged in paramilitary activity (as that term is used in section 401 of title 10, United States Code) in Egypt.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

There's been some misunderstanding about what my amendment does. I welcome the opportunity to clarify the intention of the amendment.

I realize that Members of the House have different views about the current U.S. relationship with the Egyptian Government and the Egyptian military. This amendment is not designed to affect the current military-to-military relationship with Egypt. It is not intended to prevent U.S. participation in the Multinational Forward Observer mission in the Sinai, in other words, the peacekeeping mission. It is not intended to curtail the activities of the Office of Military Cooperation. It is not intended to prevent U.S. military exercises with the Egyptian military. And it is certainly not intended to prevent U.S. marines from providing security at our diplomatic facilities in Egypt.

My amendment is quite simple. It's intended to prevent the U.S. military from engaging in offensive operations in Egypt and to prevent the Defense Department from providing assistance to Egyptian paramilitary or terrorist groups.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOMACK. I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Chair, I'm so pleased to hear my friend from Kentucky further discuss the true intent of what his amendment does; and respectfully, I recognize that, in order for the amendment to be made in order, it has to be written broadly. And because it was written broadly, there were concerns expressed by a number of people on both sides of the aisle about what an amendment written this way might do that would negatively affect a lot of

the things that we presently do and have been doing for a long time in Egypt.

I can speak personally to it because it was right after 9/11, while commanding an infantry battalion in Arkansas with the Arkansas National Guard, that I was called to duty to lead a task force of infantry soldiers and other personnel of over 500 men and women to the Sinai in Egypt to become the U.S. battalion so that other forces of the 18th Airborne Corps could go prosecute missions elsewhere in support of the war on terror.

The gunslingers of Arkansas distinguished themselves by going to the Sinai in Egypt on very short notice and executed that mission, the U.S. battalion in the South Sinai Peninsula that does the observe-and-report mission, consistent with all of the protocols that were established with the Treaty of Peace in 1979. In fact, our unit was there during the 20th anniversary of the MFO. Since that time, other State National Guard units have followed this mission and have been doing it consistently—Oregon, Oklahoma, and others—until, because of sequestration, the active component has accepted responsibility for that mission once again. So we've had a lot of our men and women across the country into the Sinai to do the mission of the MFO.

On top of that, our country has had a number of exercises called Bright Star, which is, if not the largest, one of the largest military training exercises that takes place on a biennial basis.

□ 1645

Now it didn't happen in 2011 because of unrest in Egypt, but my understanding is that Bright Star is certainly going to occur again.

So it is our hope, and as I said, I'm glad that my friend from Kentucky has further clarified the intent of his amendment, that it is not designed to affect the Multinational Forward Observer, nor is it designed to affect the training exercises that would happen with a Bright Star operation, nor does it affect what goes on with the Office of Military Cooperation or the Defense Attache program or, as he has indicated, our marine security to outposts in that region.

So again, I am very, very pleased, and we can breathe a bit of a sigh of relief that there is no intent in here at all to abandon, Madam Chair, the Treaty of Peace that was famously signed in 1979, and everybody has the vivid reminder of that picture with Jimmy Carter in the middle and Anwar Sadat and Menachem Begin signing over that peace treaty.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, I appreciate the words from my good colleague from Arkansas, and I certainly appreciate the service that he's provided to our country and the service that others have provided there in the mission of keeping the peace.

If we count the two chairmen of the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces, Egypt has been led by five different men in the past 2½ years. So five of them in 2½ years, only one of them democratically elected. I would say this is not a stable environment, and so my constituents have concerns that we don't escalate military activity in the region.

My good friend is correct about the intention of the amendment that I have offered. My amendment, again, is intended to prevent the U.S. military from engaging in offensive operations in Egypt and to prevent the Defense Department from providing assistance to the Egyptian paramilitary or terrorist groups. It's certainly not intended to prevent the peacekeeping missions or the current military missions there or, most of all, protecting our embassies. We want to make sure that we allow the service of our good marines over there in Egypt.

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

Mr. WOMACK. I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), the distinguished chair of the Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Chair, situations in Egypt have been problematic, and we're all dealing with that and trying to come to terms. But I want to remind Members that one reason we have a relationship with Egypt is the Israel-Egypt Peace Treaty. We helped forge peace between Egypt and Israel, a peace that has held for over 30 years.

Our military-to-military relationship has been a key component to keeping that peace. Since the signing of the treaty, the Egyptian military has been a reliable partner and ally. Throughout all the changes and turmoil, the Egyptian military has upheld our security arrangements, including the peace treaty. They've also maintained priority access for U.S. ships through the Suez Canal and allowed U.S. military planes to use their airspace. We cannot underestimate the importance of this.

Furthermore, since July 3, the Egyptian military has successfully closed nearly 80 percent of the tunnels used to smuggle goods and arms into the Gaza Strip. This is an important part of our partnership and how we've worked together. The relationship between the United States and Egypt has never been more critical than it is now. This amendment could jeopardize our ability to help Egypt and Israel secure the Sinai if the intent were other than it has been explained just a few minutes ago. It could harm our efforts to secure the Libyan border with Egypt, which is used to smuggle weapons to be used against Israel.

It's vital to the United States national security that we maintain our long-standing relationship with the Egyptian military. I'm not going to oppose this amendment as long as the intent is not to interfere with this 30-

year partnership and relationship. U.S. and Israeli security are simply too important to put at risk.

I appreciate the time and the effort.

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Either to yourself or possibly for the author of the amendment, the question I have, because there has been a lot of talk, it is "not the intent of the amendment" to interfere with any intercooperation we have today with the Egyptians. It is not our intent not to be involved in the Sinai, but the amendment reads no funds, and then goes on to fund military operations in Egypt.

If I am an adviser, if I am a member of the uniformed services, how is the intent met under the particular restrictions of the amendment? That would be my question.

Mr. WOMACK. Reclaiming my time, I don't want to put words in the mouth of the author of the amendment, but I would yield to the gentleman from Kentucky to further clarify, as I understand it, his willingness to make sure that we make the appropriate adjustments to this amendment in a conference.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

To allay your concerns and the concerns of the gentlelady who spoke, the intentions are the intentions that have been mentioned here, and the verbiage that was allowed in the amendment process was very difficult to convey the intention. It would be our intention to work through the process going forward in conference or otherwise to ameliorate the language and to ameliorate your concerns.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. If the gentleman will yield, as a Member of the House and the committee, I would want to participate in that to ensure we do not disrupt the very positive interchange that is taking place.

Mr. WOMACK. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his further clarification of the intent going forward beyond this.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

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

Mr. WOMACK. I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Chair, it is in our interest that we have a strong, stable, moderate, and truly democratic Egypt. It's in the best interests of both our countries. We've had a 30-year relationship, and those interests would be damaged if we decide to in any way disengage from Egypt and its people in their quest for a true democracy or reduce current levels of support for the Egyptian military. This is a country of 80 million

people, a cornerstone of peace in the Middle East, despite its recent troubles, and we need to make sure that we keep the Egyptians close to us as a strong ally and work with their military operations.

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Chair, let me just say in conclusion, I do appreciate my friend from Kentucky for further clarifying this intent of his amendment. It is something that I believe we can work with so long as we can make the proper adjustments once we get to conference.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113-170 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 67 by Mr. KILMER of Washington.

Amendment No. 69 by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 70 by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 73 by Mr. SCHIFF of California.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 277, noes 142, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 407]

AYES—277

Andrews	Brooks (IN)	Cohen
Bachus	Broun (GA)	Cole
Barber	Brown (FL)	Connolly
Barr	Brownley (CA)	Conyers
Barrow (GA)	Butterfield	Cooper
Bass	Camp	Costa
Beatty	Capito	Courtney
Becerra	Capps	Cramer
Benishek	Capuano	Crowley
Bera (CA)	Cárdenas	Cuellar
Bilirakis	Carney	Cummings
Bishop (GA)	Carson (IN)	Davis (CA)
Bishop (NY)	Cartwright	Davis, Danny
Bishop (UT)	Castor (FL)	Davis, Rodney
Black	Castro (TX)	DeFazio
Blackburn	Chu	DeGette
Blumenauer	Cielline	Delaney
Bonamici	Clarke	DeLauro
Brady (PA)	Clay	DelBene
Braley (IA)	Cleaver	Dent
Bridenstine	Clyburn	Deutch
Brooks (AL)	Coffman	Dingell

Doggett	Kuster
Doyle	Lamborn
Duckworth	Langevin
Duncan (SC)	Lankford
Duncan (TN)	Larsen (WA)
Edwards	Larson (CT)
Ellison	Latham
Engel	Lee (CA)
Enyart	Levin
Eshoo	Lewis
Esty	Lipinski
Farenthold	Loeb
Farr	Lofgren
Fattah	Long
Fitzpatrick	Lowenthal
Fleming	Lowey
Flores	Lujan Grisham (NM)
Forbes	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Fortenberry	Lynch
Foster	Maffei
Fox	Maloney
Frankel (FL)	Gabbard
Fudge	Gallego
Gabbard	Garamendi
Gallego	Garcia
Garamendi	Gibbs
Garcia	Gibson
Matheson	Gohmert
Matsui	Goodlatte
McCollum	McDermott
McDermott	McGovern
McGovern	McIntyre
McIntyre	McKeon
McKeon	McKinley
McKinley	McMorris
McMorris	Rodgers
Rodgers	Sires
Sires	McNerney
McNerney	Meadows
Meadows	Smith (NJ)
Smith (NJ)	Smith (WA)
Smith (WA)	Speier
Speier	Stivers
Stivers	Swalwell (CA)
Swalwell (CA)	Takano
Takano	Thompson (CA)
Thompson (CA)	Thompson (MS)
Thompson (MS)	Tierney
Tierney	Titus
Titus	Tonko
Tonko	Tsongas
Tsongas	Turner
Turner	Upton
Upton	Noem
Noem	Van Hollen
Van Hollen	Vargas
Vargas	Veasey
Veasey	Velázquez
Velázquez	Visclosky
Visclosky	Walz
Walz	Wasserman
Wasserman	Schultz
Schultz	Waters
Waters	Watt
Watt	Pelosi
Pelosi	Perlmutter
Perlmutter	Peters (CA)
Peters (CA)	Peters (MI)
Peters (MI)	Peterson
Peterson	Pingree (ME)
Pingree (ME)	Pocan
Pocan	Poe (TX)
Poe (TX)	Polis
Polis	Price (NC)
Price (NC)	Quigley

NOES—142

Aderholt	Crenshaw
Alexander	Culberson
Amash	Daines
Amodei	Denham
Bachmann	DeSantis
Barton	DesJarlais
Bentivolio	Diaz-Balart
Boustany	Duffy
Brady (TX)	Ellmers
Buchanan	Fincher
Bucshon	Fleischmann
Burgess	Franks (AZ)
Calvert	Frelinghuysen
Cantor	Gardner
Cartwright	Garrett
Cassidy	Gerlach
Chabot	Gingrey (GA)
Chaffetz	Gosar
Collins (GA)	Gowdy
Collins (NY)	Granger
Conaway	Graves (GA)
Cook	Graves (MO)
Cotton	Harper
Crawford	Harris

Rahall	Marchant
Rangel	McCarthy (CA)
Renacci	McCaul
Rice (SC)	McClintock
Richmond	McHenry
Rigell	Mica
Roe (TN)	Miller (FL)
Rogers (AL)	Miller (MI)
Rogers (MI)	Miller, Gary
Rothfus	Mullin
Roybal-Allard	Mulvaney
Ruiz	Murphy (PA)
Runyan	Neugebauer
Ruppersberger	Nunes
Rush	Nunnelee
Ryan (OH)	Paulsen
Sanchez, Linda	Perry
T. Sanchez, Loretta	Petri
Sanford	Pittenger
Sarbanes	Pitts
Schakowsky	Pompeo
Schiff	Posey
Schneider	Price (GA)
Schrader	Radel
Schwartz	Barletta
Scott (VA)	Bonner
Scott, Austin	Bustos
Scott, David	Campbell
Serrano	Coble
Sewell (AL)	Herrera Beutler
Shea-Porter	Horsford
Sherman	Joyce
Shuster	McCarthy (NY)
Sinema	Olson
Sires	Pallone
Slaughter	Reed
Smith (NJ)	Rokita
Smith (WA)	Vela
Speier	
Stivers	
Swalwell (CA)	
Takano	
Thompson (CA)	
Thompson (MS)	
Tierney	
Titus	
Tonko	
Tsongas	
Turner	
Upton	
Noem	
Van Hollen	
Vargas	
Veasey	
Velázquez	
Visclosky	
Walz	
Wasserman	
Schultz	
Waters	
Watt	
Pelosi	
Perlmutter	
Peters (CA)	
Peters (MI)	
Peterson	
Pingree (ME)	
Pocan	
Poe (TX)	
Polis	
Price (NC)	
Quigley	

Reichert	Stockman
Ribble	Stutzman
Roby	Terry
Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)
Rohrabacher	Thornberry
Rooney	Tiberi
Ros-Lehtinen	Tipton
Roskam	Valadao
Ross	Wagner
Royce	Walberg
Ryan (WI)	Walden
Salmon	Walorski
Scalise	Weber (TX)
Schock	Webster (FL)
Schweikert	Wenstrup
Sensenbrenner	Whitfield
Sessions	Womack
Shimkus	Yoder
Simpson	Yoho
Smith (MO)	Young (AK)
Smith (NE)	Young (FL)
Smith (TX)	Young (IN)
Southerland	
Stewart	

NOT VOTING—14

Herrera Beutler	Pallone
Horsford	Reed
Joyce	Rokita
McCarthy (NY)	Vela
Olson	

□ 1722

Messrs. PERRY and YOHO changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. ELLISON and STIVERS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Messrs. UPTON, PEARCE, GRIFFIN of Arkansas, MESSER, LEWIS, THOMPSON of Mississippi, BROOKS of Alabama, GIBBS, DENT, GUTHRIE, BISHOP of Utah, and RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 242, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 408]

AYES—176

Amash	Cárdenas	Crowley
Andrews	Carney	Cummings
Bass	Cartwright	Davis (CA)
Beatty	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny
Becerra	Castro (TX)	DeFazio
Bishop (GA)	Chu	DeGette
Bishop (NY)	Cielline	Delaney
Blumenauer	Clarke	DeLauro
Bonamici	Clay	DelBene
Brady (PA)	Cleaver	Deutch
Braley (IA)	Clyburn	Dingell
Brown (FL)	Latta	Doggett
Brownley (CA)	Connelly	Doyle
Butterfield	Conyers	Duckworth
Capps	Cooper	Duncan (TN)
Capuano	Costa	Edwards

Ellison	Larson (CT)	Quigley	Paulsen	Rothfus	Stutzman	Garamendi	Luján, Ben Ray	Ryan (OH)
Engel	Lee (CA)	Rangel	Pearce	Royce	Terry	Garcia	(NM)	Sánchez, Linda
Enyart	Levin	Richmond	Perry	Ryunan	Thompson (PA)	Grayson	Lynch	T.
Eshoo	Lewis	Roybal-Allard	Petri	Ruppersberger	Thornberry	Green, Al	Maffei	Sanford
Esty	Loeb sack	Ruiz	Pittenger	Ruiz (OH)	Tiberi	Grijalva	Maloney,	Sarbanes
Farr	Lofgren	Rush	Pitts	Ryan (WI)	Tipton	Gutiérrez	Carolyn	Schakowsky
Fattah	Lowenthal	Sánchez, Linda	Poe (TX)	Salmon	Turner	Hahn	Hahn	Massie
Frankel (FL)	Lowe y	T.	Pompeo	Scalise	Upton	Hanabusa	Matsui	Schiff
Fudge	Luján, Ben Ray	Sanchez, Loretta	Posey	Schneider	Valadao	Hastings (FL)	McCollum	Schneider
Gabbard	(NM)	Sanford	Price (GA)	Schock	Wagner	Heck (NV)	McDermott	Schwartz
Garamendi	Lynch	Sarbanes	Radel	Schwartz	Walberg	Heck (WA)	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Garcia	Maffei	Schakowsky	Rahall	Schweikert	Walden	Higgins	McNerney	Sensenbrenner
Grayson	Maloney,	Schiff	Reed	Scott, Austin	Walorski	Himes	Meeks	Serrano
Green, Al	Carolyn	Schrader	Reichert	Sensenbrenner	Weber (TX)	Hinojosa	Meng	Sewell (AL)
Green, Gene	Massie	Scott (VA)	Renacci	Sessions	Webster (FL)	Holt	Michaud	Shea-Porter
Grijalva	Matsui	Scott, David	Ribble	Sherman	Wenstrup	Honda	Miller, George	Sherman
Gutiérrez	McCollum	Serrano	Rice (SC)	Shimkus	Westmoreland	Hoyer	Moore	Sires
Hahn	McDermott	Sewell (AL)	Rigell	Shuster	Whitfield	Huffman	Moran	Slaughter
Hanabusa	McGovern	Shea-Porter	Roby	Simpson	Williams	Israel	Murphy (FL)	Smith (WA)
Hanna	McNerney	Sires	Roe (TN)	Sinema	Wilson (SC)	Jackson Lee	Nadler	Speier
Hastings (FL)	Meeks	Slaughter	Rogers (AL)	Smith (MO)	Wolf	Jeffries	Napolitano	Swalwell (CA)
Heck (WA)	Meng	Smith (WA)	Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Womack	Johnson (GA)	Neal	Takano
Higgins	Michaud	Swalwell (CA)	Rogers (MI)	Smith (NJ)	Woodall	Johnson, E. B.	Negrete McLeod	Thompson (CA)
Himes	Miller, George	Takano	Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)	Yoder	Jones	Nolan	Thompson (MS)
Hinojosa	Moore	Thompson (CA)	Rooney	Southerland	Yoho	Kaptur	O'Rourke	Tierney
Holt	Moran	Thompson (MS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Stewart	Young (AK)	Keating	Pascrell	Titus
Honda	Nadler	Tierney	Roskam	Stivers	Young (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Pastor (AZ)	Tonko
Hoyer	Napolitano	Titus	Ross	Stockman	Young (IN)	Kennedy	Payne	Tsongas
Huffman	Neal	Tonko				Kildee	Pelosi	Van Hollen
Israel	Negrete McLeod	Tsongas		NOT VOTING—15		Kilmer	Perlmutter	Vargas
Jackson Lee	Nolan	Van Hollen	Barletta	Johnson (GA)	Rokita	Kuster	Peters (CA)	Veasey
Jeffries	O'Rourke	Vargas	Bustos	Lujan Grisham	Speier	Langevin	Peters (MI)	Vela
Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell	Veasey	Campbell	(NM)	Waters	Larsen (WA)	Peterson	Velázquez
Jones	Pastor (AZ)	Vela	Coble	McCarthy (NY)	Wittman	Larson (CT)	Petri	Visclosky
Kaptur	Payne	Velázquez	Herrera Beutler	Olson		Lee (CA)	Pingree (ME)	Walz
Keating	Pelosi	Visclosky	Horsford	Pallone		Levin	Pocan	Walz
Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter	Walz				Lewis	Polis	Wasserman
Kennedy	Peters (CA)	Wasserman				Lipinski	Price (NC)	Schultz
Kildee	Peters (MI)	Schultz				Lipinski	Quigley	Waters
Kilmer	Peterson	Watt				Loeb sack	Rangel	Watt
Kind	Pingree (ME)	Waxman				Richmond	Lofgren	Waxman
Kuster	Pocan	Welch				Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard	Welch
Langevin	Polis	Wilson (FL)				Lowe y	Ruiz	Wilson (FL)
Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)	Yarmuth				Lujan Grisham	Ruppersberger	Yarmuth
						(NM)	Rush	

NOES—242

Aderholt	DesJarlais	Jordan
Alexander	Diaz-Balart	Joyce
Amodei	Duffy	Kelly (PA)
Bachmann	Duncan (SC)	King (IA)
Bachus	Ellmers	King (NY)
Barber	Farenthold	Kingston
Barr	Fincher	Kinzing er (IL)
Barrow (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Kirkpatrick
Barton	Fleischmann	Kline
Benishek	Fleming	Labrador
Bentivolio	Flores	LaMalfa
Bera (CA)	Forbes	Lamborn
Bilirakis	Fortenberry	Lance
Bishop (UT)	Foster	Lankford
Black	Fox x	Latham
Blackburn	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Bonner	Frelinghuysen	Lipinski
Boustany	Gallego	LoBiondo
Brady (TX)	Gardner	Long
Bridenstine	Garrett	Lucas
Brooks (AL)	Gerlach	Luetkemeyer
Brooks (IN)	Gibbs	Lummis
Broun (GA)	Gibson	Maloney, Sean
Buchanan	Gingrey (GA)	Marchant
Bucshon	Gohmert	Marino
Burgess	Goodlatte	Matheson
Calvert	Gosar	McCarthy (CA)
Camp	Gowdy	McCaul
Cantor	Granger	McClintock
Capito	Graves (GA)	McHenry
Carson (IN)	Graves (MO)	McIntyre
Carter	Griffin (AR)	McKeon
Cassidy	Griffith (VA)	McKinley
Chabot	Grimm	McMorris
Chaffetz	Guthrie	Rodgers
Coffman	Hall	Meadows
Cole	Harper	Meehan
Collins (GA)	Harris	Messer
Collins (NY)	Hartzler	Mica
Conaway	Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)
Cook	Heck (NV)	Miller (MI)
Cotton	Hensarling	Miller, Gary
Courtney	Holding	Mullin
Cramer	Hudson	Mulvaney
Crawford	Huelskamp	Murphy (FL)
Crenshaw	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)
Cuellar	Hultgren	Neugebauer
Culberson	Hunter	Noem
Daines	Hurt	Nugent
Davis, Rodney	Issa	Nunes
Denham	Jenkins	Nunnelee
Dent	Johnson (OH)	Owens
DeSantis	Johnson, Sam	Palazzo

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 408, Nadler (NY) amendment No. 69, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 237, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 409]

AYES—187

Amash	Carson (IN)	DeGette
Andrews	Cartwright	DeLauro
Bass	Castor (FL)	DelBene
Beatty	Castro (TX)	Deutch
Becerra	Chu	Dingell
Bera (CA)	Cioccilline	Doggett
Bishop (GA)	Clarke	Doyle
Bishop (NY)	Clay	Duckworth
Blumenauer	Cleaver	Duncan (TN)
Bonamici	Clyburn	Edwards
Brady (PA)	Ellison	Ellison
Braley (IA)	Connolly	Engel
Broun (GA)	Conyers	Enyart
Brown (FL)	Cooper	Eshoo
Brownfield (CA)	Courtney	Esty
Butterfield	Crowley	Farr
Capps	Cummings	Fattah
Capuano	Davis (CA)	Frankel (FL)
Cárdenas	Davis, Danny	Fudge
Carney	DeFazio	Gabbard

NOES—237

Aderholt	Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam
Alexander	Duffy	Jordan
Amodei	Duncan (SC)	Joyce
Bachmann	Ellmers	Kelly (PA)
Bachus	Farenthold	King (IA)
Barber	Fincher	King (NY)
Barr	Fitzpatrick	Kingston
Barrow (GA)	Fleischmann	Kinzing er (IL)
Barton	Fleming	Kirkpatrick
Benishek	Flores	Kline
Bentivolio	Forbes	Labrador
Bilirakis	Fortenberry	LaMalfa
Bishop (UT)	Foster	Lamborn
Black	Fox x	Lance
Blackburn	Franks (AZ)	Lankford
Bonner	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Boustany	Gallego	Latta
Brady (TX)	Gardner	LoBiondo
Bridenstine	Garrett	Long
Brooks (AL)	Gerlach	Lucas
Brooks (IN)	Gibbs	Luetkemeyer
Buchanan	Gibson	Lummis
Bucshon	Gingrey (GA)	Maloney, Sean
Burgess	Gohmert	Marchant
Calvert	Goodlatte	Marino
Camp	Gosar	Matheson
Cantor	Gowdy	McCarthy (CA)
Capito	Granger	McCaul
Carter	Graves (GA)	McClintock
Cassidy	Graves (MO)	McHenry
Chabot	Green, Gene	McIntyre
Chaffetz	Griffin (AR)	McKeon
Coffman	Griffith (VA)	McKinley
Cole	Grimm	McMorris
Collins (GA)	Guthrie	Rodgers
Collins (NY)	Hall	Meadows
Conaway	Hanna	Meehan
Cook	Harper	Messer
Costa	Harris	Mica
Cotton	Hartzler	Miller (FL)
Cramer	Hastings (WA)	Miller (MI)
Crawford	Hensarling	Miller, Gary
Crenshaw	Holding	Mullin
Cuellar	Hudson	Mulvaney
Culberson	Huelskamp	Murphy (PA)
Daines	Huizenga (MI)	Neugebauer
Davis, Rodney	Hultgren	Noem
Delaney	Hunter	Nugent
Denham	Hurt	Nunes
Dent	Issa	Nunnelee
DeSantis	Jenkins	Olson
DesJarlais	Johnson (OH)	Owens

Palazzo Rothfus Thornberry
 Paulsen Royce Tiberi
 Pearce Runyan Tipton
 Perry Ryan (WI) Turner
 Pittenger Salmon Upton
 Pitts Sanchez, Loretta Valadao
 Poe (TX) Scalise Wagner
 Pompeo Schock Walberg
 Posey Schrader Walden
 Price (GA) Schweikert Walorski
 Radel Scott, Austin Weber (TX)
 Rahall Scott, David Weber (TX)
 Reed Sessions Webster (FL)
 Reichert Shimkus Wenstrup
 Renacci Shuster Westmoreland
 Ribble Simpson Whitfield
 Rice (SC) Sinema Williams
 Rigell Smith (MO) Wilson (SC)
 Roby Smith (NE) Wittman
 Roe (TN) Smith (NJ) Wolf
 Rogers (AL) Smith (TX) Womack
 Rogers (KY) Southerland Woodall
 Rogers (MI) Stewart Yoder
 Rohrabacher Stivers Yoho
 Rooney Stockman Young (AK)
 Ros-Lehtinen Stutzman Young (FL)
 Roskam Terry Young (IN)
 Ross Thompson (PA)

Kind Murphy (FL) Sarbanes
 Kuster Nadler Schakowsky
 Labrador Napolitano Schiff
 Larsen (WA) Negrete McLeod Schrader
 Larson (CT) Nolan Schweikert
 Lee (CA) Nugent Scott (VA)
 Levin O'Rourke Sensenbrenner
 Lewis Pascrell Serrano
 Loeb sack Pastor (AZ)
 Lofgren Payne
 Lowenthal Pelosi
 Lowey Perlmutter
 Lujan Grisham Peters (MI)
 (NM) Peterson
 Luján, Ben Ray Petri
 (NM) Pingree (ME)
 Lynch Pocan
 Maffei Poe (TX)
 Maloney, Carolyn Polis
 Maloney, Sean Posey
 Massie Price (GA)
 Matsui Price (NC)
 McClintock Quigley
 McCollum Rangel
 McDermott Rohrabacher
 McGovern Rooney
 McIntyre Roybal-Allard
 McNeerney Ruiz
 Meeks Rush
 Michaud Ryan (OH)
 Miller, George Sanchez, Linda
 Moore T.
 Moran Sanchez, Loretta
 Mulvaney Sanford

Schneider Smith (WA) Walden
 Schock Southerland Walorski
 Schwartz Stewart Walz
 Scott, Austin Stivers Weber (TX)
 Scott, David Stutzman Webster (FL)
 Sessions Terry Wenstrup
 Sewell (AL) Thompson (PA) Westmoreland
 Shea-Porter Thornberry Whitfield
 Sherman Tiberi Williams
 Shimkus Tipton Wilson (SC)
 Shuster Turner Wittman
 Simpson Upton Wolf
 Sinema Valadao Womack
 Smith (MO) Vargas Yoder
 Smith (NE) Vela Yoho
 Smith (NJ) Wagner Young (FL)
 Smith (TX) Walberg Young (IN)

Barletta
 Bustos
 Campbell
 Coble

Herrera Beutler
 Horsford
 McCarthy (NY)
 Meng

Neal
 Pallone
 Rokita
 Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—9

Coble
 Herrera Beutler
 Horsford
 McCarthy (NY)
 Pallone
 Rokita

□ 1732

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 236, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 410]

AYES—185

Amash Cohen Grayson
 Bachmann Connolly Green, Al
 Bass Conyers Green, Gene
 Beatty Cooper Griffith (VA)
 Becerra Courtney Grijalva
 Benishek Crowley Gutiérrez
 Bishop (NY) Cummings Hahn
 Blumener Davis, Danny Hanabusa
 Bonamici DeFazio Hastings (FL)
 Brady (PA) Heck (WA)
 Braley (IA) DeLauro Higgins
 Broun (GA) DelBene Himes
 Brown (FL) Deutch Hinojosa
 Buchanan Doggett Holt
 Burgess Doyle Honda
 Capps Duncan (TN) Huelskamp
 Capuano Edwards Huffman
 Cárdenas Ellison Israel
 Carney Enyart Jackson Lee
 Carson (IN) Eshoo Jeffries
 Castor (FL) Esty Johnson (GA)
 Castro (TX) Farr Johnson, E. B.
 Chu Fattah Jones
 Cicilline Frankel (FL) Kaptur
 Clarke Gabbard Keating
 Clay Garamendi Kelly (IL)
 Cleaver Gibson Kennedy
 Clyburn Gohmert Kildee
 Coffman Graves (GA) Kilmer

NOES—236

Aderholt Fincher Lipinski
 Alexander Fitzpatrick LoBiondo
 Amodei Fleischmann Long
 Andrews Fleming Lucas
 Bachus Flores Luetkemeyer
 Barber Forbes Lummis
 Barr Fortenberry Marchant
 Barrow (GA) Foster Marino
 Barton Foxx Matheson
 Bentivolio Franks (AZ) McCarthy (CA)
 Bera (CA) Frelinghuysen McCaul
 Bilirakis Fudge McHenry
 Bishop (GA) Gallego McKee
 Bishop (UT) Garcia McKinley
 Black Gardner McMorris
 Blackburn Garrett Rodgers
 Bonner Gerlach Meadows
 Boustany Gibbs Meehan
 Brady (TX) Gingrey (GA) Messer
 Bridenstine Goodlatte Mica
 Brooks (AL) Gosar Miller (FL)
 Brooks (IN) Gowdy Miller (MI)
 Brownley (CA) Granger Miller, Gary
 Bucshon Graves (MO) Mullin
 Butterfield Griffin (AR) Murphy (PA)
 Calvert Grimm Neugebauer
 Camp Guthrie Noem
 Cantor Hall Nunes
 Capito Hanna Nunnelee
 Carter Harper Olson
 Cartwright Harris Owens
 Cassidy Hartzler Palazzo
 Chabot Hastings (WA) Paulsen
 Chaffetz Heck (NV) Pearce
 Cole Hensarling Perry
 Collins (GA) Holding Peters (CA)
 Collins (NY) Hoyer Pittenger
 Conway Hudson Pitts
 Cook Huizenga (MI) Pompeo
 Costa Hultgren Radel
 Cotton Hunter Reed
 Cramer Hurt Reichert
 Crawford Issa Renacci
 Crenshaw Jenkins Ribble
 Cuellar Johnson (OH) Rice (SC)
 Culberson Johnson, Sam Richmond
 Daines Jordan Rigell
 Davis (CA) Joyce Roby
 Davis, Rodney Kelly (PA) Roe (TN)
 Delaney King (IA) Rogers (AL)
 Denham King (NY) Rogers (KY)
 Dent Kingston Rogers (MI)
 DeSantis Kinzinger (IL) Ros-Lehtinen
 DesJarlais Kirkpatrick Roskam
 Diaz-Balart Kline Ross
 Dingell LaMalfa Rothfus
 Duckworth Lamborn Royce
 Duffy Lance Runyan
 Duncan (SC) Langan Ruppersberger
 Eilmers Lankford Ryan (WI)
 Engel Latham Salmon
 Farenthold Latta Scalise

NOT VOTING—12

Barletta
 Bustos
 Campbell
 Coble

Herrera Beutler
 Horsford
 McCarthy (NY)
 Meng

Neal
 Pallone
 Rokita
 Young (AK)

□ 1737

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

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 99 printed in House Report 113-170.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of Mr. NUGENT to offer the Nugent amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, is it in order for a designee to offer an amendment on behalf of its sponsor on this bill?

The Acting CHAIR. Would the gentleman please restate the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, is it in order for a designee to offer an amendment on behalf of its sponsor on this rule?

The Acting CHAIR. Under the terms of House Report 113-170, the named sponsor of an amendment may name a designee.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, point of further parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Does the gentleman from Kansas have a formal designation of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT)?

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair has been made aware that the gentleman from Kansas is the designee of the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the Chair. The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Security Agency to—

(1) conduct an acquisition pursuant to section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 for the purpose of targeting a United States person; or

(2) acquire, monitor, or store the contents (as such term is defined in section 2510(8) of title 18, United States Code) of any electronic communication of a United States

person from a provider of electronic communication services to the public pursuant to section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) and a Member opposed each will control 7½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer this evening clarifies and confirms the scope of two programs that Mr. Snowden illegally exposed while sitting in a hotel room in Communist China.

First, the amendment clarifies that under section 702 no U.S. citizen or person in the U.S. can be targeted, period. I say again, no U.S. person under section 702 may be targeted in any way by the United States Government. While there are other specific authorities the U.S. person may be subject to an investigation, the U.S. Government may not do so under section 702. That's what this amendment intends to clarify.

The second part of the amendment clarifies section 215, also known as section 501 of FISA. The amendment clarifies that no content of communications can be stored or collected by the National Security Agency—that's no emails, no video clips, no Skype. No record of the actual conversation or the contents thereof may be recorded or collected by the National Security Agency. I can't repeat that enough. That's the intent of this amendment.

I want to make clear to everyone that, contrary to the suggestions of some, the NSA has not been acting outside of the scope of its authorities. The Meta-Data program is carefully designed with program layers of oversight by all three branches of government. This is precisely the way our government ought to operate, with input from Article I and Article II and Article III of the United States Constitution.

It is, of course, our duty to ensure that the NSA stays within these legal bounds here in Congress, and this amendment makes those boundaries perfectly clear for everyone to know and understand.

And we shouldn't mislead the American people into thinking that the NSA has been acting illegally. There is perhaps no program in the United States Government that is as carefully monitored and overseen as the programs this amendment attempts to clarify.

To the extent that some in this Chamber wish to review or provide more protections and controls for these programs, we should proceed through a carefully considered and debated legislative process so that the full implications for our security are clearly understood.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 7½ minutes.

□ 1745

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been described and offered as an alternative to the Amash-Conyers amendment that we will consider next. It is not.

This amendment restates the existing ban on the intentional targeting of United States persons under section 702. It also places into law for the next fiscal year the Obama administration's current ban on collecting the contents of the communications of U.S. persons under section 215. I agree with these prohibitions. But they have nothing to do with the current misuse of section 215 to engage in the suspicionless, bulk collection of Americans' telephone records.

The dragnet collection under section 215 telephone metadata program reveals call information—including all numbers dialed, all incoming phone numbers and call duration—but not the content of communications. Therefore, this amendment would have no impact whatsoever on this misuse of section 215. Metadata reveals highly personal and sensitive information, including, for example, when and how often one calls the doctor, a journalist, or the local Tea Party or ACLU affiliate. By tracing the pattern of calls, the government can paint a detailed picture of anyone's personal, professional, and political associations and activities.

Congress never authorized this type of unchecked, sweeping surveillance of our citizens. It is this problem—the indiscriminate, bulk collection of metadata under section 215—that we need to fix right now.

The Amash-Conyers amendment does so by restoring the required reasonable relationship between the collection of records and specific persons being investigated under section 215. The Amash-Conyers amendment ensures that this standard is not ignored by the administration or by the FISA Court, as is happening now.

This amendment does not fix the problem with 215. The Amash-Conyers amendment does. However you vote on this amendment, and I intend to vote in favor of it, it is imperative that we also vote in favor of the Amash-Conyers amendment because this amendment, although doing no harm, does not solve the problems that Congress and Mr. SENSENBRENNER and many others have articulated with respect to the misuse of section 215 of the PATRIOT Act.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding, and I thank the gentleman from Kansas for offering this amendment, because it helps focus on what concerns most Americans and it clarifies what really is and is not happening.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes it is a challenge for those of us on the Intelligence Committee to talk openly about this—even the safeguards—in some of these programs. But this amendment helps make it clear and reassures Americans about some of the things they may have read or heard that is occurring with NSA. But at the same time, this amendment is not an overreaction that actually increases the danger that Americans face from terrorism around the world.

This amendment says clearly that NSA cannot acquire information for the purpose of targeting Americans, and it says clearly that NSA may not acquire, monitor, or store the content of the communication of any Americans.

I think the key point that Members need to know is there are multiple layers of safeguards to make sure that these programs operate exactly in the way that the FISA Court has laid them out to operate.

The Intelligence Committees of both the House and Senate do a considerable amount of oversight, get regular reports. Even if somebody accidentally punches a "2" versus a "3" on their keyboard, we get a report about that. And it even goes so far as members of the Intelligence Committee can go sit next to the analysts and watch what they are doing.

But it is not just the Intelligence Committees. The FISA Court has oversight of the same sorts of reports. They can change the guidelines that it operates under. But in addition to that, there are internal inspector general monitoring of these. So you get every branch of government involved in making sure that the safeguards are in place and those same safeguards will be in place to make sure that the provisions of the gentleman's amendment are followed as well.

Some, however, Mr. Chairman, would do away with these programs. No amount of safeguards are good for them. But they never say what would replace them, they never say what would fill the gap in meeting our responsibilities to defend Americans. They would just have them go away, and I guess assume that somehow or other that Americans could be made safe.

The truth is, we had been incredibly successful and somewhat lucky since 9/11 as far as preventing further terrorist attacks on our homeland. That is because of the work of the military, intelligence professionals, law enforcement and, as I say, a fair amount of luck.

But these programs at NSA have made a crucial contribution to that success over the last decade. It seems to me it would be foolhardy to toss them away, as some would want to do.

I think this amendment strikes the right approach. I also believe, Mr. Chairman, The Wall Street Journal makes a good point in today's editorial when it says:

The last thing Congress should do is kill a program in a rush to honor the reckless claims of Mr. Snowden and his apologists.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the House Intelligence Committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Thank you, Mr. POMPEO.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Pompeo amendment.

This amendment strongly reaffirms that in America, privacy and security must coexist together. This amendment states in no uncertain terms that the government cannot use section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, FISA, to intentionally target an American for surveillance.

This important amendment also reaffirms that phone conversations cannot be collected through section 215 of the PATRIOT Act. It makes the intentions of Congress very clear.

I believe the Pompeo amendment makes a powerful statement that NSA cannot target Americans for the collection or listen to their phone calls. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes." However, I do understand the concerns of the American people and of Congress when it comes to these programs.

On the House Intelligence Committee, we are reviewing and evaluating potential ways to change the FISA Act that will provide the intelligence community with the tools it needs to keep our country safe while also protecting privacy and civil liberties. We are committed to having this important discussion. However, I do have concerns about the amendment we will debate next.

The Amash amendment is an on/off switch for section 215 of the PATRIOT Act. It will have an immediate operational impact and our country will be more vulnerable to terrorist attacks. This authority has helped prevent terrorist attacks on U.S. soil. A planned attack on the New York City subway system was stopped because of section 215.

But the Amash amendment passes this authority and it will end it. This amendment goes too far, too fast, on the wrong legislative vehicle. We need to debate the scope of this program, and we are, but this is an extreme knee-jerk reaction to the situation.

This program has been authorized and reauthorized by Congress. It receives extensive oversight by the Intelligence Committee and is a vital tool for our intelligence community to protect our Nation. Remember, 9/11 happened in part because we failed to connect the dots. One of the critical tools we now have and use to connect those dots is section 215 of the PATRIOT Act. Remember, this is just phone records—just phone numbers—no conversations.

I respectfully urge a "no" vote on the Amash amendment and a "yes" vote on the Pompeo amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman

from the State of California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Thank you, Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on the amendment. Why? Because it restates current law, and current law has been interpreted by the administration in a way that is, frankly, contrary to the intent of the crafters of the PATRIOT Act.

Section 215 of the PATRIOT Act says that you can obtain information that is relevant to a national security investigation.

Now, what has happened since Congress enacted that provision? It is a low bar, but under the NSA's interpretation, it is no bar at all. Because, as has been widely reported, they are collecting the information about every phone call made by every American. Clearly, that is not relevant to a terrorist investigation.

I think it is important to note that business records that are the subject of 215 include a lot of sensitive information. What are business records? phone records? Internet records? credit card records? medical records? Are these things that we would voluntarily give up to the government? No. They are incredibly sensitive, and that's why they are being sought.

I do think it is important to note that the amendment that will follow after this one doesn't end the ability of the government to pursue terrorism. We are all for that. It merely requires that the government adhere to the law, which requires that there be relevance to a terrorist investigation.

I certainly do not challenge the motivation of the gentleman who has offered this amendment, but I do think if you think that this provides a remedy, then you are wrong. This provides a fig leaf.

We should vote against it, and I hope that we will move on to the Amash amendment and solve the problem today.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to correct a couple of things.

This legislation is not a fig leaf. It is intended to clarify some things that have been said, some beliefs that people hold, about what section 215 authorizes and what section 702 authorizes.

It is intended to make crystal clear to everyone here, as well as to the American public, the boundaries of these two important national security programs. These laws have been in place and interpreted by multiple administrations in the same way. There was no change in this law when this President came into office, and we should continue to support these programs regardless of who is the Commander in Chief for the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment,

and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 100 printed in House Report 113-170.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to execute a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court order pursuant to section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861) that does not include the following sentence: "This Order limits the collection of any tangible things (including telephone numbers dialed, telephone numbers of incoming calls, and the duration of calls) that may be authorized to be collected pursuant to this Order to those tangible things that pertain to a person who is the subject of an investigation described in section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861)."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 312, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH) and a Member opposed each will control 7½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

We are here today for a very simple reason: to defend the Fourth Amendment, to defend the privacy of each and every American.

As the Director of National Intelligence has made clear, the government collects the phone records without suspicion of every single American in the United States.

My amendment makes a simple, but important change. It limits the government's collection of the records to those records that pertain to a person who is the subject of an investigation pursuant to section 215.

□ 1800

Opponents of this amendment will use the same tactic that every government throughout history has used to justify its violation of rights—fear. They will tell you that the government must violate the rights of the American people to protect us against those who hate our freedoms. They will tell you there is no expectation of privacy in documents that are stored with a third party. Tell that to the American

people. Tell that to our constituents back home.

We are here to answer one question for the people we represent: Do we oppose the suspicionless collection of every American's phone records?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 7½ minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I am very happy to yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I think the American people and, certainly, some well-intentioned Members in this Chamber have legitimate concerns. They should be addressed. We should have time and education on what actually happens in the particular program of which we speak.

I will pledge to each one of you today and give you my word that this fall, when we do the Intel authorization bill, that we will work to find additional privacy protections with this program which have no email, no phone calls, no names, and no addresses.

Fourteen Federal judges have said, yes, this comports with the Constitution; 800 cases around the 1979 case have affirmed the underpinnings of the legality of this case—800. So 14 judges are wrong, and 800 different cases are wrong. The legislators on both Intelligence committees—Republicans and Democrats—are all wrong.

Why is it that people of both parties came together and looked at this program at a time when our Nation was under siege by those individuals who wanted to bring violence to the shores of the United States?

It is that those who know it best support the program because we spend as much time on this to get it right, to make sure the oversight is right. No other program has the legislative branch, the judicial branch, and the executive branch doing the oversight of a program like this. If we had this in the other agencies, we would not have problems.

Think about who we are in this body. Have 12 years gone by and our memories faded so badly that we've forgotten what happened on September 11?

This bill turns off a very specific program. It doesn't stop so-called "spying" and other things that this has been alleged to do. That's not what's happening. It's not a surveillance bill. It's not monitoring. It doesn't do any of those things.

What happened after September 11 that we didn't know on September 10—again, passing this amendment takes us back to September 10, and afterwards we said, wow, there is a seam, a gap—was somebody leading up to the

September 11 attacks who was a terrorist overseas, called a "terrorist," living amongst us in the United States, and we missed it because we didn't have this capability.

What if we'd have caught it?

The good news is we don't have to what-if. It's not theoretical. Fifty-four times this and the other program stopped and thwarted terrorist attacks both here and in Europe—saving real lives. This isn't a game. This is real. It will have a real consequence. This is hard.

Think about the people who came here before us in this great body—Madison, Lincoln, Kennedy served here—and about the issues they dealt with and about the politics of "big" and of moving America forward while upholding the article I mandate to this House in that we must provide for the general defense of the United States. Think of those challenges. Think of those challenges that they met.

Are we so small that we can only look at our Facebook "likes" today in this Chamber, or are we going to stand up and find out how many lives we can save?

Let us get back to the big politics of protecting America and of moving America forward. Soundly reject this amendment. Let's do this right in the Intel authorization bill.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, this amendment will not stop the proper use of the PATRIOT Act or stop the FISA authorities from conducting terrorism and intelligence investigations. I'd never block that.

All this amendment is intending to do is to curtail the ongoing dragnet collection and storage of the personal records of innocent Americans. It does not defund the NSA, and it will continue to allow them to conduct full-fledged surveillance as long as it relates to an actual investigation.

Our joining together on this bipartisan amendment demonstrates our joint commitment to ensure that our fight against terrorism and espionage follows the rule of law and the clear intent of the statutes passed by this Congress. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this amendment.

I rise in support of this amendment, which I am cosponsoring with my colleague from Michigan, Representative JUSTIN AMASH.

This amendment will prevent mass collection of personal records, such as phone calling information, under Section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act. When Congress passed and later revised this provision, we did not intend for it to authorize the bulk, indiscriminate collection of personal information of individuals not under investigation.

However, we have learned that this law has been misused to allow the collection of call detail information on every phone call made in the United States under a bizarre interpreta-

tion of the statute's authorization to collect "relevant" information. As my colleague and author of the statute, Representative JIM SENBRENNER, has stated, "This expansive characterization of relevance makes a mockery of the legal standard."

This amendment will not stop the proper use of PATRIOT Act and FISA authorities to conduct terrorism and intelligence investigations. All this amendment is intended to do is curtail the ongoing dragnet collection and storage of the personal records of innocent Americans. It does not defund the NSA, and it would continue to allow them to conduct full fledged surveillance as long as it relates to an actual investigation.

Our joining together on this bipartisan amendment demonstrates our joint commitment to ensuring that our fight against terrorism and espionage follows the rule of law and the clear intent of the statutes passed by Congress. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this amendment to demonstrate our bipartisan commitment to protecting individual liberty.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I am very happy to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlelady from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Madam Chair, this is a very important issue that we are taking up today because the number one duty of the Federal Government is the safety of the American people—of our constituents and of our own skins, the skins of each one of us in this Chamber today. As we know all too well, national security is a real and present danger, and it is something that we have to take quite seriously. We can't deal in false narratives.

A false narrative has emerged that the Federal Government is taking in the content of Americans' phone calls. It's not true. It's not happening.

A false narrative has emerged that the Federal Government is taking in the content of the American people's emails. It's not true. It's not happening.

We need to deal in facts. The facts are real, and the facts are these:

The only people who have benefited from the revelation of classified information by someone who worked for this government—who intentionally and without authorization declassified some of the most sensitive national security information that we have—are those who are engaged in Islamic jihad. They will have been benefited, and those whom we seek to protect will have not.

Consider this:

There is more information about each one of us contained in the phone book that sits at home on your kitchen counter than information that is in the National Security Database that we're talking about today. Your name, your address are in the phone book. Your name, your address are not in this National Security Database.

No other nation in the world has the advantage that the United States of America has on national security—no

other nation—and we by this amendment today would agree to handcuff ourselves and our allies by restricting ourselves? Let it not be. Let us not deal in false narratives. Let us deal in facts that will keep the American people safe.

When you look at an envelope, when a letter is put in the mail, is there a privacy right as to what has been written on that envelope? No, there isn't. There is a privacy right as to what is contained inside that envelope. That's a Fourth Amendment right.

Is there a Fourth Amendment right to the record that you called someone on a certain day? No, there isn't—that's a record—but there is a Fourth Amendment right to what's in that phone call. Let's deal in reality, not in false narratives.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SEN-SENRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of the Amash amendment. I do so as the person who was the principal author of the PATRIOT Act in 2001, who got that law through quickly after 9/11 and who supported and managed its 2006 reauthorization.

Let me make this perfectly clear that unlike what we have heard from speakers on the other side of this issue, this amendment does not stop the collection of data under section 215—the people who are subject to an investigation of an authorized terrorist plot. What it does do is to prevent the collection of data of people who are not subject to an investigation.

Now, relevance is required in any type of a grand jury subpoena or in a criminal collection of data for a criminal trial. This goes far beyond what the NSA is doing. The time has come to stop it, and the way we stop it is to approve this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his leadership on this important issue.

Madam Chair, reports of the NSA surveillance program have broad and far-reaching consequences.

Many Americans feel that our fundamental liberties as a country and our constitutional rights are threatened. In addition, it has ruined and hurt our reputation abroad—threatening our trade relationships with allies, threatening American jobs as a result, and putting in danger our cooperative security relationships that we need to fight the war on terror.

The responsible thing to do is to show some contrition. Let's pass this amendment. Let's make sure that we can have a practical approach that shows that protecting our liberties and securities are consistent and critical for the United States of America. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. Madam Chair, here is the question:

It's a question of balancing privacy versus security. It's a question beyond that. It's a question of who will do the balancing.

Right now, the balancing is being done by people we do not know, by people we do not elect and, in large part right now, by somebody who has admitted lying to this body at a hearing. That's wrong.

We should be doing the balancing. We were elected to do that. We need to pass this amendment so that we can do the balancing, not the folks who are not elected and whom we do not know.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AMASH. May I inquire of the Chair how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN). The gentleman from Michigan has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. I want to talk about the much ballyhooed oversight.

Every year, there is a report to the Judiciary Committee, an annual report, on section 215. This year, the report was eight sentences—less than a full page. To think that the Congress has substantial oversight of this program is simply incorrect. I cannot match Mr. SENSENBRENNER's brilliant remarks; but I do agree that when we wrote the PATRIOT Act relevance had a meaning.

Madam Chair, I submit for the RECORD a letter to Mr. SENSENBRENNER from the Department of Justice, which basically says, because 300 inquiries were made, the records of every single American became relevant. That's a joke.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2013.

Hon. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SENSENBRENNER: This responds to your letter to the Attorney General dated June 6, 2013, regarding the "business records" provision of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA), 50 U.S.C. §1861, enacted as section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act.

As you know, on June 5, 2013, the media reported the unauthorized disclosure of a classified judicial order issued under this provision that has been used to support a sensitive intelligence collection program. Under this program, which has been briefed to Congress and repeatedly authorized by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC), the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) obtains authorization to collect telephony metadata, including the telephone numbers dialed and the date, time and duration of calls, from certain telecommunications service providers. The National Security Agency (NSA), in turn, archives and analyzes this information under carefully controlled circumstances and provides leads to the FBI or others in the Intelligence Community for

counterterrorism purposes. Aspects of this program remain classified, and there are limits to what can be said about it in an unclassified letter. Department of Justice and Intelligence Community staff are available to provide you a briefing on the program at your request.

In your letter, you asked whether this intelligence collection program is consistent with the requirements of section 215 and the limits of that authority. Under section 215, the Director of the FBI may apply to the FISC for an order directing the production of any tangible things, including business records, for investigations to protect against international terrorism. To issue such an order, the FISC must determine that (1) there are reasonable grounds to believe that the things sought are relevant to an authorized investigation, other than a threat assessment; (2) the investigation is being conducted under guidelines approved by the Attorney General under Executive Order 12333; and (3) if a U.S. person is the subject of the investigation, the investigation is not being conducted solely upon the basis of First Amendment protected activities. In addition, the FISC may only require the production of items that can be obtained with a grand jury subpoena or any other court order directing the production of records or tangible things. Finally, the program must, of course, comport with the Constitution.

The telephony metadata program satisfies each of these requirements. The lawfulness of the telephony metadata collection program has repeatedly been affirmed by the FISC. In the years since its inception, multiple FISC judges have granted 90-day extensions of the program after concluding that it meets all applicable legal requirements.

Of particular significance to your question is the relevance to an authorized international terrorism investigation of the telephony metadata collected through this program. First, it is critical to understand the program in the context of the restrictions imposed by the court. Those restrictions strictly limit the extent to which the data is reviewed by the government. In particular, the FISC allows the data to be queried for intelligence purposes only when there is reasonable suspicion, based on specific facts, that a particular query term, such as a telephone number, is associated with a specific foreign terrorist organization that was previously identified to and approved by the court. NSA has reported that in 2012, fewer than 300 unique identifiers were used to query the data after meeting this standard. This means that only a very small fraction of the records is ever reviewed by any person, and only specially cleared counterterrorism personnel specifically trained in the court-approved procedures can access the records to conduct queries. The information generated in response to these limited queries is not only relevant to authorized investigations of international terrorism, but may be especially significant in helping the government identify and disrupt terrorist plots.

The large volume of telephony metadata is relevant to FBI investigations into specific foreign terrorist organizations because the intelligence tools that NSA uses to identify the existence of potential terrorist communications within the data require collecting and storing large volumes of the metadata to enable later analysis. If not collected and held by NSA, the metadata may not continue to be available for the period that NSA has deemed necessary for national security purposes because it need not be retained by telecommunications service providers. Moreover, unless the data is aggregated by NSA, it may not be possible to identify telephony

metadata records that cross different telecommunications networks. The bulk collection of telephony metadata—i.e. the collection of a large volume and high percentage of information about unrelated communications—is therefore necessary to identify the much smaller subset of terrorist-related telephony metadata records contained within the data. It also allows NSA to make connections related to terrorist activities over time and can assist counterterrorism personnel to discover whether known or suspected terrorists have been in contact with other persons who may be engaged in terrorist activities, including persons and activities inside the United States. Because the telephony metadata must be available in bulk to allow NSA to identify the records of terrorist communications, there are “reasonable grounds to believe” that the data is relevant to an authorized investigation to protect against international terrorism, as section 215 requires, even though most of the records in the dataset are not associated with terrorist activity.

The program is consistent with the Constitution as well as with the statute. As noted above, the only type of information acquired under the program is telephony metadata, not the content of any communications, not the identity, address or financial information of any party to the communication, and not geolocation information. Under longstanding Supreme Court precedent, there is no reasonable expectation of privacy with respect to this kind of information that individuals have already provided to third-party businesses, and such information therefore is not protected by the Fourth Amendment. See *Smith v. Maryland*, 442 U.S. 735, 739–42 (1979).

Moreover, it is important to bear in mind that activities carried out pursuant to FISA, including those conducted under this program, are subject to stringent limitations and robust oversight by all three branches of government. As noted above, by order of the FISC, the Government is prohibited from indiscriminately sifting through the telephony metadata it acquires. Instead, all information that is acquired is subject to strict, court-imposed restrictions on review and handling that provide significant and reasonable safeguards for U.S. persons. The basis for a query must be documented in writing in advance and must be approved by one of a limited number of highly trained analysts. The FISC reviews the program approximately every 90 days.

The Department of Justice conducts rigorous oversight to ensure the telephony metadata is being handled in strict compliance with the FISC’s orders, and the Department of Justice and The Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) conduct thorough and regular reviews to ensure the program is implemented in compliance with the law.

The program is also subject to extensive congressional oversight. The classified details of the program have been briefed to the Judiciary and Intelligence Committees on many occasions. In addition, in December 2009, the Department of Justice worked with the Intelligence Community to provide a classified briefing paper to the House and Senate Intelligence Committees to be made available to all Members of Congress regarding the telephony metadata collection program. It is our understanding that both Intelligence Committees made this document available to all Members prior to the February 2010 reauthorization of section 215. That briefing paper clearly explained that the government and the FISC had interpreted Section 215 to authorize the collection of telephony metadata in bulk. An updated version of the briefing paper was provided to

the Senate and House Intelligence Committees again in February 2011 in connection with the reauthorization that occurred later that year.

Finally, we do not agree with the suggestion in your letter that the Department’s March 9, 2011 public testimony on section 215 conveyed a misleading impression as to how this authority is used. Quoting a portion of that testimony, your letter states that it “left the committee with the impression that the Administration was using the business records provision sparingly and for specific materials. The recently released FISA order, however, could not have been drafted more broadly.” In fact, key language in the testimony in question noted that orders issued pursuant to section 215 “have also been used to support important and highly sensitive intelligence collection operations, on which this committee and others have been separately briefed.” We hope that the explanation above regarding the use of this authority to identify specific terrorism-related telephony metadata records helps to clarify the point.

The recent unauthorized disclosure of this and other classified intelligence activities has caused serious harm to our national security. Since the disclosure of the telephony metadata collection program, the Department of Justice and the Intelligence Community have worked to ensure that Congress and the American people understand how the program operates, its importance to our security, and the rigorous oversight that is applied. As part of this effort, senior officials from ODNI, NSA, DOJ and FBI provided a classified briefing for all House Members on June 11, 2013 and separate classified briefings to the House Democratic Caucus and the House Republican Conference on June 26, 2013.

The Department of Justice is committed to ensuring that our efforts to protect national security are conducted lawfully and respect the privacy and civil liberties of all Americans. We look forward to continuing to work with you and others in the Congress to ensure that we meet this objective.

We hope this information is helpful. Please do not hesitate to contact this office if we may provide additional assistance with this or any other matter.

Sincerely,

PETER J. KADZIK,

Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

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

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Chair, this is not about how sincere the NSA people are in implementing this technique. It is not about how careful they are. It is whether they have the right to collect the data in the first place on every phone call on every American every day.

The PATRIOT Act did not specifically authorize it. Section 215 talks about tangible things that are relevant to an authorized security investigation. In the NSA’s interpretation of that, “relevant” is all data all the time. That is simply wrong. We should support the Amash amendment and vote for it.

□ 1815

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Madam Chair, amendment IV:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, house, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Those who choose to trade liberty for security will find they have neither.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Warrants need to be particular and specific about the place to be searched and the items to be seized.

No judge would ever sign a general search warrant like the British did, allowing the police to search every house on the block, much less seize everybody’s phone records, but this is what has happened under section 215 under the government.

The government has gone too far in the name of security and the Fourth Amendment has been bruised.

Rein in government invasion. No more dragnet operations. Get a specific warrant based on probable cause, or stay out of our lives.

And that’s just the way it is.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chairperson, this amendment stops the government from misusing section 215, to engage in the dragnet collection of all of our personal telephone records. Congress did not grant the executive the authority to collect everything it wants so long as it limits any subsequent search of that data.

This amendment restores the requirement that records sought are relevant to an authorized foreign intelligence or terrorist investigation. It restores the minimal relevant standard required by Congress but ignored by successive administrations.

No administration should be permitted to operate above or beyond the law as they have done in this respect. I therefore urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of the Amash-Conyers amendment.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. General warrants, writs of assistance, that’s what we’re looking at, and the Founding Fathers found that to be anathema. What they’re doing does violate the Fourth Amendment. We took an oath to uphold the Constitution, and we’re supposed to rely on a secret agency that deals with a secret court that deals with a selective secrecy committee; and Members of Congress are limited to their access to the actions of that committee, but we’re supposed to trust them.

Folks, we’ve got a job to do. Vote “yes.”

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 45 seconds remaining, and the gentleman from Florida has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. AMASH. I yield 30 seconds to the gentlelady from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Chairwoman, countless men and women from my State of Hawaii and all across the country have worn the uniform and put their lives on the line to protect our freedoms and our liberties. I cannot in good conscience vote to take a single dollar from the pockets of hardworking taxpayers from across the country to pay for programs which infringe on the very liberties and freedoms our troops have fought and died for.

Ben Franklin said:

They who give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We're here to answer one question for the people we represent: Do we oppose the suspicion list collection of every American's phone records?

When you had the chance to stand up for Americans' privacy, did you?

Please support the Amash amendment and oppose the NSA's blanket surveillance of our constituents.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 2 minutes for the closing argument to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. COTTON. Madam Chairwoman, I rise to strongly urge opposition to the Amash amendment.

This program has stopped dozens of terrorist attacks. That means it's saved untold American lives.

This amendment is not simple. It does not limit the program. It does not modify it. It does not constrain the program. It ends the program. It blows it up. Some of you've heard the analogy that if you want to search for a needle in a haystack, you have to have the haystack. This takes a leaf blower and blows away the entire haystack. You will not have this program if this amendment passes. And it does so, despite all of the safeguards you have already heard.

This program is constitutional under Supreme Court precedent—not recent precedent. Precedent goes back to 1979, just 2 years after I was born, the year that one of the young sponsors of this amendment was born. This program is approved by large bipartisan majorities of this body on the statute—text that they approved, not their secret intents or wishes.

It is overseen by article III judges who have been confirmed by the Senate and are independent of the executive branch. It is reviewed by the Intelligence Committees, and it is executed primarily by military officers, not generals, but the majors and the colonels who have been fighting and bleeding for this country for 12 years.

What is it, metadata? It sounds kind of scary. It's nothing more than an Excel spreadsheet with five columns: called to, called from, date, time, and the duration. Five columns, billions of rows. It's in a lockbox. It can't be searched unless you have specific suspicion of a number being used by a terrorist. Only then do they go into that database and do they run a search for what that number has been calling.

Why do you need it? Verizon, AT&T, other companies will not keep this data for the years necessary. Secondly, you need it quickly. When I was in Iraq as a platoon leader with the 101st Airborne, if we rolled up a bad guy and we found a cell phone or we found a thumb drive, we would immediately upload that data so intelligence professionals could search it so they could go roll up another bad guy, because you only have a few hours to stop a terrorist once you catch another terrorist.

Folks, we are at war. You may not like that truth. I wish it weren't the truth. But it is the truth. We're at war. Do not take this tool away from our warriors on the frontline.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113-170 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 24 by Mr. TERRY of Nebraska.

Amendment No. 99 by Mr. POMPEO of Kansas.

Amendment No. 100 by Mr. AMASH of Michigan.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. TERRY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

Mr. TERRY. Madam Chair, I withdraw my request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 24.

The Acting CHAIR. The request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 24 is withdrawn, and the amendment stands

adopted in accordance with the previous voice vote thereon.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 409, noes 12, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 411]

AYES—409

Aderholt	Cotton	Graves (MO)
Alexander	Courtney	Grayson
Amash	Cramer	Green, Al
Amodei	Crawford	Green, Gene
Andrews	Crenshaw	Griffin (AR)
Bachmann	Crowley	Griffith (VA)
Bachus	Cuellar	Grimm
Barber	Culberson	Guthrie
Barr	Cummings	Gutiérrez
Barrow (GA)	Daines	Hahn
Barton	Davis (CA)	Hall
Bass	Davis, Danny	Hanabusa
Benishek	Davis, Rodney	Hanna
Bentivolio	DeFazio	Harper
Bera (CA)	DeGette	Harris
Bilirakis	Delaney	Hartzler
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Hastings (FL)
Bishop (NY)	DelBene	Hastings (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Denham	Heck (NV)
Black	Dent	Heck (WA)
Blackburn	DeSantis	Hensarling
Blumenauer	DesJarlais	Higgins
Bonamici	Deutch	Himes
Bonner	Diaz-Balart	Hinojosa
Boustany	Dingell	Holding
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Hoyer
Brady (TX)	Doyle	Hudson
Braley (IA)	Duckworth	Huelskamp
Bridenstine	Duffy	Huffman
Brooks (AL)	Duncan (SC)	Huizenga (MI)
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (TN)	Hultgren
Broun (GA)	Ellison	Hunter
Brown (FL)	Ellmers	Hurt
Brownley (CA)	Engel	Israel
Buchanan	Enyart	Issa
Bucshon	Eshoo	Jackson Lee
Burgess	Esty	Jeffries
Butterfield	Farenthold	Jenkins
Calvert	Farr	Johnson (GA)
Camp	Fattah	Johnson (OH)
Cantor	Fincher	Johnson, E. B.
Capito	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, Sam
Capps	Fleischmann	Jones
Cárdenas	Fleming	Jordan
Carney	Flores	Joyce
Carson (IN)	Forbes	Kaptur
Carter	Fortenberry	Keating
Cartwright	Foster	Kelly (IL)
Cassidy	Foxo	Kelly (PA)
Castor (FL)	Frankel (FL)	Kennedy
Castro (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Kildee
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Kilmer
Chaffetz	Gabbard	Kind
Chu	Gallego	King (IA)
Ciilline	Garamendi	King (NY)
Clarke	Garcia	Kingston
Clay	Gardner	Kinzinger (IL)
Cleaver	Garrett	Kirkpatrick
Clyburn	Gerlach	Kline
Coffman	Gibbs	Kuster
Cole	Gibson	Labrador
Collins (GA)	Gingrey (GA)	LaMalfa
Collins (NY)	Gohmert	Lamborn
Conaway	Goodlatte	Lance
Connolly	Gosar	Langevin
Cook	Gowdy	Lankford
Cooper	Granger	Larsen (WA)
Costa	Graves (GA)	Larson (CT)

Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo

NOES—12

Becerra
Capuano
Cohen
Conyers

NOT VOTING—12

Barletta
Beatty
Bustos
Campbell

□ 1847

Messrs. COLLINS of New York, GALLEGRO, HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. BACHMANN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Messrs. MCGOVERN, McDERMOTT, GRIMM, LEWIS, PEARCE, PAYNE, ANDREWS, and CARSON of Indiana changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”
So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 205, noes 217, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 412]

AYES—205

Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Cappan
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kildee
Kingston
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Crowley
Cummings
Daines
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming

Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman

Weber (TX)
Welch
Williams
Wilson (SC)

NOES—217

Aderholt
Alexander
Andrews
Bachmann
Barber
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Boehner
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Delaney
Denham
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa

Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (PA)
Miller (TX)
Mills
Mintz
Moffet
Mullins
Munoz
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Murphy (TX)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo

NOT VOTING—12

Barletta
Beatty
Bustos
Campbell

□ 1851

Mr. CIBILLINE changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall Nos. 411—Pompeo amendment #99, “yes” and 412—Amash amendment #100, “No.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD. Mr. Chair, on rollcall Nos. 411, "yes" and 412, "yes."

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider a final period of general debate.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I would rise to enter into a colloquy with my colleague from Washington (Mr. HECK) and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HECK of Washington. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Madam Chair, every summer, Joint Base Lewis-McChord in Washington's 10th Congressional District hosts nearly 6,000 ROTC cadets from all across the Nation. These cadets conduct an assessment exercise we call Warrior Forge. The exercise is an invaluable tool in shaping our next generation of Army officers.

For 40 years, this course has honed the skills, provided the cohesion, and fostered the knowledge necessary to create the Army's next leaders. I have visited this program, and you need not have a single doubt about the quality of the next generation of military leaders in our Nation.

Yet, Madam Chair, an effort is afloat to radically change this proven system, without the knowledge or input from this Congress. Members of this body, including myself, the ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee, and the former ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee have been requesting from the Army a simple brief and cost-benefit analysis of this proposed radical transformation. And for over 2 years, those requests have repeatedly been delayed and dismissed and denied.

Now, while my preference would have been to offer a limiting amendment to this legislation, I asked the ranking member and the chair if, in this instance, we could work together to seek from the Army a timely report so that Congress and the relevant committees can do our job, which is to ensure proper oversight.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman raising the issue. I am aware of it, and would gladly work with him to get the answers on this proposal.

Mr. HECK of Washington. I thank the ranking member very much.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I simply want to take this time to thank someone I have a profound respect for, as we all do, my chairman, our chairman, BILL YOUNG from Florida, for the masterful job he has done leading us to this point. And I would ask that he be given a round of applause.

I want to thank the members of the subcommittee and the staff. And I would also want to thank four young people who've worked in our offices

this summer for all of their efforts on our behalf: Craig, Morgan, Deepa, and Matt.

Finally, I want to thank all of my colleagues. We did work our way through 100 amendments. From my perspective, this is exactly how this institution should work, to have issues and disagreement, to have discussions, to have votes, and to have a conclusion to the process, and to report a bill.

So, again, I thank my colleagues, and I thank the chair and the colleagues I work with every day on the Defense Subcommittee.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chair, I'd like to use my time to say thank you to the House and all of the Members who participated in some vigorous debate, for having conducted the affairs of the House in a most professional way, proving to our constituents that we can work things out, that we can work together.

□ 1900

I just want to say thank you to Mr. VISCLOSKY, who is handling the minority leadership on this bill for the first time. I think he deserves a lot of credit and a lot of applause for the good job that he did in keeping this schedule on track.

PETER, thank you very much.

While it seems a long time ago, it was only Monday night that we finally received the 100 amendments that would be filed and considered during the debate. We had to analyze those amendments by Tuesday—yesterday—so that we could begin the debate on this bill. Our staff did an outstanding job in working late into the night Monday night analyzing these amendments so that we could consider where we would be on those amendments.

I would like to read the names of the members of our staff, headed by Tom McLemore as staff director and Paul Juola in a similar position for Mr. VISCLOSKY. Also, Becky Leggierrri, Brook Boyer, Ann Reese, Megan Rosenbush, Tim Prince, Walter Hearne, B.G. Wright, Paul Terry, Maureen Holohan, Jennifer Miller, Adrienne Ramsay, and Sherry Young. They are a professional staff. It's hard to find any more of a professional staff than those that I just mentioned.

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

The Acting CHAIR. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014".

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE

of Texas) having assumed the chair, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2397) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, directed her to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under House Resolution 312, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2397 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 86, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$25,000,000)".

Page 86, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$20,000,000)".

Page 87, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will re-appropriate resources in areas critical to our national security and to defend Israel, our most important ally in the Middle East.

The motion to recommit adds \$20 million in funding for Israel's Iron Dome defense program and \$5 million for the Arrow defense program in order to bolster protection against short- and long-range missile attacks.

Now here's something on which we can all agree. Defending Israel is in the interest of our national security. The bond between the United States and Israel is rooted in our shared national interest and our common values of democracy, rule of law, and basic human rights. Israel's security is our security. The same forces threatening Israel jeopardize the United States. And this is not a partisan issue.

All of us who have been to Israel are struck by how close Israelis live to neighbors who want to destroy them. As a former mayor of a city, I ran a city where we had real problems like gangs and crimes; but never did I have to worry about the towns next door shooting rockets at my residents. I can't imagine what it would be like to be the mayor of Sderot.

In 2008, before we had Iron Dome, a surge in Hamas rocket attacks forced Israel to launch a ground operation that, tragically, claimed over a thousand Israeli and Palestinian lives.

Fast forward to last November. In just 1 week, over 1,500 rockets were fired at Israel again by terrorist groups in Gaza. Thankfully, this time, Iron Dome intercepted over 80 percent of the deadly attacks, preventing war and saving lives.

I know that we can all agree that support for Israel's missile defense program is not merely a favor we do for Israel. Our political and military leaders have long praised the strategic significance of Israel's powerful military advancing our interests in the region, saving our Nation billions of dollars on military personnel and equipment that we might otherwise be forced to deploy.

Looking at Israel's neighborhood, never has this situation been so urgent for both our countries, with increased threats from Iran, Hamas, Hezbollah, and al Qaeda, and instability in Syria, Egypt, and Jordan. We must do all we can to strengthen Israel's defenses, and that is why this amendment to increase funding for these defense systems is so timely and so necessary.

Support for Israel has always enjoyed overwhelming bipartisan support. So I urge my Democratic and Republican colleagues to come together on this important amendment to support Israel and promote stability in the Middle East.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. There's no doubt that Iron Dome is an extremely effective missile defense system. And because of that, the committee fully funded this bill at \$220 million for Iron Dome, which is fully in line with the President's request and the recently passed defense authorization bill.

Additionally, this is the third year of consecutive funding for a 4-year commitment. The truth of the matter is they really can't spend it any faster or any more effectively. So as is so often the case, this motion is purely a political statement, and I urge its rejection.

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill; and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 231, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 413]

AYES—192

Andrews	Green, Al	Owens
Barber	Green, Gene	Pascrell
Barrow (GA)	Grijalva	Pastor (AZ)
Bass	Hahn	Payne
Beatty	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter
Bera (CA)	Heck (WA)	Peters (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Peters (MI)
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Peterson
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Pingree (ME)
Bonamici	Holt	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Honda	Polis
Braley (IA)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Huffman	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Israel	Rahall
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Capps	Jeffries	Richmond
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Carney	Jones	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Rush
Cartwright	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	T.
Chu	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Ciilline	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clarke	Kind	Schakowsky
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Cleaver	Kuster	Schneider
Clyburn	Langevin	Schrader
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz
Connelly	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Scott, David
Cooper	Levin	Serrano
Costa	Lewis	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lipinski	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Loebsack	Sherman
Cuellar	Lofgren	Sinema
Cummings	Lowenthal	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lowe	Slaughter
Davis, Danny	Lujan Grisham	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	(NM)	Speier
DeGette	Lujan, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
Delaney	(NM)	Takano
DeLauro	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	Maffei	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Maloney,	Tierney
Dingell	Carolyn	Titus
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Tonko
Doyle	Matheson	Tsongas
Duckworth	Matsui	Van Hollen
Edwards	McCollum	Vargas
Ellison	McDermott	Veasey
Engel	McGovern	Vela
Enyart	McIntyre	Velázquez
Eshoo	McNerney	Visclosky
Esty	Meeks	Walz
Farr	Meng	Wasserman
Fattah	Michaud	Schultz
Foster	Miller, George	Waters
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Watt
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Waxman
Gallego	Nadler	Welch
Garamendi	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Garcia	Negrete McLeod	Yarmuth
Grayson	Nolan	

NOES—231

Aderholt	Bachmann	Benishek
Alexander	Bachus	Bentivolio
Amash	Barr	Bilirakis
Amodei	Barton	Bishop (UT)

Black	Harper	Pompeo
Blackburn	Harris	Posey
Bonner	Hartzler	Price (GA)
Boustany	Hastings (WA)	Radel
Brady (TX)	Heck (NV)	Reed
Bridenstine	Hensarling	Reichert
Brooks (AL)	Holding	Renacci
Brooks (IN)	Hudson	Ribble
Broun (GA)	Huelskamp	Rice (SC)
Buchanan	Huizenga (MI)	Rigell
Bucshon	Hultgren	Roby
Burgess	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Calvert	Hurt	Rogers (AL)
Camp	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Cantor	Jenkins	Rogers (MI)
Capito	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Carter	Johnson, Sam	Rooney
Cassidy	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen
Chabot	Joyce	Roskam
Chaffetz	Kelly (PA)	Ross
Coffman	King (IA)	Rothenfus
Cole	King (NY)	Royce
Collins (GA)	Kingston	Runyan
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	Kline	Salmon
Cook	Labrador	Sanford
Cotton	LaMalfa	Scalise
Cramer	Lamborn	Schock
Crawford	Lance	Schweikert
Crenshaw	Lankford	Scott, Austin
Culberson	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Daines	Latta	Sessions
Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Denham	Long	Shuster
Dent	Lucas	Simon
DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
DesJarlais	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Smith (NJ)
Duffy	Marino	Smith (TX)
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Southerland
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Stewart
Ellmers	McCaul	Stivers
Farenthold	McClintock	Stockman
Fincher	McHenry	Stutzman
Fitzpatrick	McKeon	Terry
Fleischmann	McKinley	Thompson (PA)
Fleming	McMorris	Thornberry
Flores	Rodgers	Tiberi
Forbes	Meadows	Tipton
Fortenberry	Meehan	Turner
Fox	Messer	Upton
Franks (AZ)	Mica	Valadao
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	Wagner
Gabbard	Miller (MI)	Walberg
Gardner	Miller, Gary	Walden
Garrett	Moran	Walorski
Gerlach	Mullin	Weber (TX)
Gibbs	Mulvaney	Webster (FL)
Gibson	Murphy (PA)	Weststrum
Gingrey (GA)	Neugebauer	Westmoreland
Gohmert	Noem	Whitfield
Goodlatte	Nugent	Williams
Gosar	Nunes	Wilson (SC)
Gowdy	Nunnelee	Wittman
Granger	O'Rourke	Wolf
Graves (GA)	Olson	Womack
Graves (MO)	Palazzo	Woodall
Griffin (AR)	Paulsen	Yoder
Griffith (VA)	Pearce	Yoho
Grimm	Perry	Young (AK)
Guthrie	Petri	Young (FL)
Gutiérrez	Pittenger	Young (IN)
Hall	Pitts	
Hanna	Poe (TX)	

NOT VOTING—10

Barletta	Herrera Beutler	Pallone
Bustos	Horsford	Rokita
Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	
Coble	Neal	

□ 1915

Messrs. STEWART and RICE of South Carolina changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

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 bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 315, nays 109, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 414]

YEAS—315

Aderholt	Freilinghuysen	McKeon
Alexander	Gabbard	McKinley
Amodi	Gallego	McMorris
Andrews	Garamendi	Rodgers
Bachmann	Garcia	McNerney
Bachus	Gardner	Meadows
Barber	Garrett	Meehan
Barr	Gerlach	Messer
Barrow (GA)	Gibbs	Mica
Barton	Gingrey (GA)	Miller (FL)
Beatty	Gohmert	Miller (MI)
Benishek	Goodlatte	Miller, Gary
Bentivolio	Gosar	Moran
Bera (CA)	Gowdy	Mullin
Billirakis	Granger	Mulvaney
Bishop (GA)	Graves (GA)	Murphy (FL)
Bishop (NY)	Graves (MO)	Murphy (PA)
Bishop (UT)	Green, Al	Negrete McLeod
Black	Green, Gene	Neugebauer
Blackburn	Griffin (AR)	Noem
Bonner	Griffith (VA)	Nugent
Boustany	Grimm	Nunes
Brady (PA)	Guthrie	Nunnelee
Brady (TX)	Hall	O'Rourke
Braley (IA)	Hanabusa	Olson
Bridenstine	Hanna	Owens
Brooks (AL)	Harper	Palazzo
Brooks (IN)	Harris	Pascrell
Broun (GA)	Hartzler	Pastor (AZ)
Brown (FL)	Hastings (WA)	Paulsen
Brownley (CA)	Heck (NV)	Pearce
Buchanan	Heck (WA)	Perry
Buchson	Hensarling	Peters (CA)
Burgess	Higgins	Peters (MI)
Butterfield	Holding	Peterson
Calvert	Hoyer	Petri
Camp	Hudson	Pittenger
Cantor	Huizenga (MI)	Pitts
Capito	Hultgren	Poe (TX)
Cárdenas	Hunter	Pompeo
Carter	Hurt	Posey
Cassidy	Israel	Price (GA)
Castro (TX)	Issa	Price (NC)
Chabot	Jackson Lee	Radel
Chaffetz	Jenkins	Rahall
Clyburn	Johnson (OH)	Reed
Coffman	Johnson, E. B.	Reichert
Cole	Johnson, Sam	Renacci
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Ribble
Collins (NY)	Joyce	Rice (SC)
Conaway	Kaptur	Rigell
Connolly	Kelly (PA)	Roby
Cook	Kilmer	Roe (TN)
Costa	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)
Cotton	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Courtney	Kingston	Rogers (MI)
Cramer	Kinzinger (IL)	Rooney
Crawford	Kirkpatrick	Ros-Lehtinen
Crenshaw	Kline	Roskam
Cuellar	Kuster	Ross
Culberson	Labrador	Rothfus
Daines	LaMalfa	Royce
Davis (CA)	Lamborn	Ruiz
Davis, Rodney	Lance	Runyan
Delaney	Langevin	Ruppersberger
DelBene	Lankford	Ryan (OH)
Denham	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (WI)
Dent	Larson (CT)	Salmon
DeSantis	Latham	Sanchez, Loretta
DesJarlais	Latta	Sanford
Diaz-Balart	Lipinski	Scalise
Dingell	LoBiondo	Schneider
Doggett	Loeb sack	Schock
Duckworth	Long	Schwartz
Duffy	Lowey	Schweikert
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Scott (VA)
Ellmers	Luetkemeyer	Scott, Austin
Engel	Lujan Grisham	Scott, David
Enyart	(NM)	Sensenbrenner
Esty	Luján, Ben Ray	Sessions
Farenthold	(NM)	Sewell (AL)
Fattah	Lummis	Shea-Porter
Fincher	Maffei	Sherman
Fitzpatrick	Maloney, Sean	Shimkus
Fleischmann	Marchant	Shuster
Fleming	Marino	Simpson
Flores	Matheson	Sinema
Forbes	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (MO)
Fortenberry	McCaull	Smith (NE)
Foster	McCollum	Smith (NJ)
Foxx	McHenry	Smith (TX)
Franks (AZ)	McIntyre	Smith (WA)

Southerland	Van Hollen
Stewart	Vargas
Stivers	Veasey
Stockman	Vela
Stutzman	Visclosky
Terry	Wagner
Thompson (PA)	Walberg
Thornberry	Walden
Tiberi	Walorski
Tipton	Walz
Titus	Wasserman
Tsongas	Schultz
Turner	Weber (TX)
Meadows	Webster (FL)
Upton	Wenstrup
Valadao	

NAYS—109

Amash	Gutiérrez
Bass	Hahn
Becerra	Hastings (FL)
Blumenauer	Himes
Bonamici	Hinojosa
Capps	Holt
Capuano	Honda
Carney	Huelskamp
Carson (IN)	Huffman
Cartwright	Jeffries
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)
Chu	Jones
Cicilline	Keating
Clarke	Kelly (IL)
Clay	Kennedy
Cleaver	Kildee
Cohen	Kind
Conyers	Lee (CA)
Cooper	Levin
Crowley	Lewis
Cummings	Lofgren
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal
DeFazio	Lynch
DeGette	Maloney,
DeLauro	Carolyn
Deutch	Massie
Doyle	Matsui
Duncan (TN)	McClintock
Edwards	McDermott
Ellison	McGovern
Eshoo	Meeks
Farr	Meng
Frankel (FL)	Michaud
Fudge	Miller, George
Gibson	Moore
Grayson	Nadler
Grijalva	Napolitano

NOT VOTING—9

Barletta	Coble	McCarthy (NY)
Bustos	Herrera Beutler	Pallone
Campbell	Horsford	Rokita

□ 1930

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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 SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1911. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving

Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 2397, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 2397, including corrections in spelling, punctuation, section and title numbering, cross-referencing, conforming amendments to short titles, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 2397.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, during the final vote series last night, I inadvertently voted "no" on the DeLauro amendment No. 44 that would prohibit the use of funds to train the Afghan Special Mission Wing. I would say for the record that I support the amendment offered by Ms. DELAURO, and had I voted correctly, I would have voted for the amendment.

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 2641

Mr. MARINO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove as cosponsors Congressman CAPUANO and Congressman PALLONE from my bill, H.R. 2641, the Responsibly and Professionally Invigorating Development (RAPID) Act of 2013.

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

There was no objection.