It is my hope, as I said earlier, that when the next rule in the defense bill comes to the floor that it will allow for there to be debate on a number of the important issues that Members of this House feel deserve that debate.

I have nothing but the highest regard for all those who serve on the House Armed Services Committee, but I have to say that this bill is too big. It is too big. We have not done a very good job, I don't believe, in this Congress of getting rid of the bloat, the waste, and the duplication within the Pentagon budget. For some reason, we have Members who think that the way you show you are tough in terms of the defense of our country is by supporting bills that add more and more and more money to the Pentagon's budget.

The bottom line is that strong defense doesn't mean wasteful defense. It doesn't mean weapons systems that are obsolete or that are not practical or that are not needed anymore. It doesn't mean a bloated bureaucracy.

Again, as I said earlier, this bill fails to make any of the tough choices. I want to make sure our troops get all the equipment and all the support that they need. I want to make sure that we are prepared for anything that might come at us in the future.

But wasteful defense spending doesn't help us at all. And so there are some significant problems with the underlying bill. In addition to being too big, this bill also fails to cut our nuclear arsenal. We are spending billions and billions and billions of dollars maintaining an arsenal way bigger than anybody believes that we need to, but we don't deal with that issue.

This bill continues to place restrictions on the transfer of inmates from Guantanamo, which is problematic. Again, this bill fails to face reality and make any of the tough choices in terms of overall defense spending.

Again, I will appeal to my colleagues on the Rules Committee to please make sure that we have the opportunity to debate the issue of Afghanistan on this floor. We are at war, and we very rarely discuss it in this Chamber. To those who say, well, it is up to the President to decide whether we stay or go, I will remind my colleagues that we have a role in that, too. Our indifference and our silence over the last several years means we are complicit in this war's continuing, the longest war in the history of our country.

As I said, I will offer an amendment, along with Mr. JONES of North Carolina and Mr. SMITH, the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, to make it clear that if the President wants to continue the deployment of U.S. forces beyond 2014, which was his stated policy last year, then we ought to vote on it. We ought to vote on it. And if you believe we should stay longer, you can vote ''yes.'' If you believe that enough is enough, then you can vote ''no.'' But after that time, after all this time, we have an obligation in this Congress to speak up and speak out and make sure that our constituents know what we are doing. We cannot allow this war to go on forever on autopilot. We have a responsibility here.

I have heard the arguments of my friends who want to stay. They are compelling arguments. Make them on the House floor, and have the next Congress decide whether or not we should continue the war there.

I will just close with this. When people say to me that there is no place to cut in the Pentagon's budget, I would urge them to talk to some of the men and women who serve in our Armed Forces or some of the men and women who serve in the Pentagon who, over the years, I have met with who talk freely of places where we could cut without sacrificing any of our national security, places we could cut, quite frankly, that will enhance our security, because they believe that wasteful defense spending has no place in our budget, especially during these tough fiscal times.

But I also believe when we talk about national defense it also means the quality of life in our country and whether or not people have a job, whether or not people have adequate health care, whether or not people have access to good education, and whether or not we end hunger and poverty in our country. All those things matter, as well.

So, again, I urge my colleagues to support the rule because, quite frankly, there is no reason to oppose it. And I would urge my friends on the Rules Committee to please be generous in offering and allowing Members to offer many amendments on this bill. This is an important bill not just for people on the Armed Services Committee but for all Members.

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

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

Madam Speaker, it would be easy to close debate just by reminding my colleagues that the gentleman from Massachusetts plans to support this rule. That is reason enough when we can find agreement in the Rules Committee on moving forward. But I hate to stop it there just because it is worth celebrating. It is absolutely worth celebrating.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is absolutely certain we are spending too much on the Department of Defense. I am absolutely certain we are spending too little. The gentleman from Massachusetts is absolutely certain that waste has no place in the Department of Defense. I, too, am absolutely certain that waste has no place in the Department of Defense.

Madam Speaker, just because this bill came out of the Armed Services Committee 61–0 does not mean that we do not have differences in this Chamber. We do. But this rule provides us an opportunity to debate those differences and then provides an opportunity for the Members of this body to have their will done.

Whether you are talking about the National Defense Authorization Act, or whether you are talking about the Commerce-Justice-Science appropriations bill, these bills did not come down from on high dictated by a Speaker or dictated by a minority leader. These bills were both crafted by the membership of this body, and this rule allows them to be perfected by the membership of this body should it pass this afternoon.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1445

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2014

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3530) to provide justice for the victims of trafficking, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3530

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. AVAILABILITY OF SUMS IN CRIME VICTIMS FUND.

Section 1402 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601) is amended in subsection (d) by inserting before paragraph (2) the following:

''(1) A limitation on obligations is authorized to be provided with respect to fiscal years 2016 through 2020. Except in the case where a limitation on obligations is made by a continuing resolution, if such a limitation on obligations is less than—

''(A) $805,000,000 in fiscal year 2016;

''(B) $825,000,000 in fiscal year 2017;

''(C) $845,000,000 in fiscal year 2018;

''(D) $866,000,000 in fiscal year 2019; or

''(E) $890,000,000 in fiscal year 2020;

then all sums deposited in the fund in prior fiscal years shall become available for obligation.''.