Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—4

Amash
Broun (GA)
Duncan (SC)
Massie

NOT VOTING—17

Bachmann
Barton
Bridenstine
Capito
Castor (FL)
Crowley
DeFazio
DesJarlais
Edwards
Harris
Holt
Kinzinger (IL)
Maloney, Carolyn
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Pelosi
Rush

□ 1419

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, during roll-call votes 497, 498, 499, and 500, I was away from the House floor and would have voted "aye" on all four measures.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2015

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 722, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 124) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Pursuant to House Resolution 722, the amendment printed in part A of House Report 113–600 is adopted, and the joint resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution, as amended, is as follows:

H.J. RES. 124

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the applicable appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2014 and under the authority and conditions provided in such Acts, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2014, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available in the following appropriations Acts:

(1) The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014 (division A of Public Law 113–76).

(2) The Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–76).

(3) The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014 (division C of Public Law 113–76).

(4) The Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014 (division D of Public Law 113–76).

(5) The Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2014 (division E of Public Law 113–76).

(6) The Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2014 (division F of Public Law 113–76).

(7) The Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014 (division G of Public Law 113–76).

(8) The Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014 (division H of Public Law 113–76).

(9) The Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2014 (division I of Public Law 113–76).

(10) The Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014 (division J of Public Law 113–76).

(11) The Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2014 (division K of Public Law 113–76).

(12) The Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014 (division L of Public Law 113–76).

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) is hereby reduced by 0.0554 percent.

SEC. 102. (a) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for: (1) the new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 2014 or prior years; (2) the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 2014 funds; or (3) the initiation, resumption, or continuation of any project, activity, operation, or organization (defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element, and for any investment items defined as a P–1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R–1 line item that includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account) for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2014.

(b) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 104. Except as otherwise provided in section 102, no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2014.

SEC. 105. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2015, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2015 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 11, 2014.

SEC. 107. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 108. Appropriations made and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, for those programs that would otherwise have high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of appropriations at the beginning of fiscal year 2015 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, such high initial rates of operation or complete distribution shall not be made, and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this joint resolution that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 110. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 111. (a) For entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2014, and for activities under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, activities shall be continued at the rate to maintain program levels under current law, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, to be continued through the date specified in section 106(3).

(b) Notwithstanding section 106, obligations for mandatory payments due on or about the first day of any month that begins after October 2014 but not later than 30 days after the date specified in section 106(3) may continue to be made, and funds shall be available for such payments.

SEC. 112. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 113. Funds appropriated by this joint resolution may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672 (22 U.S.C. 2412), section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2680), section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 6212), and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094(a)(1)).

SEC. 114. (a) Each amount incorporated by reference in this joint resolution that was previously designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act, respectively.

(b) The reduction in section 101(b) of this joint resolution shall not apply to—

(1) amounts designated under subsection (a) of this section; or

(2) amounts made available by section 101(a) by reference to the second paragraph under the heading ''Social Security Administration—Limitation on Administrative Expenses'' in division H of Public Law 113–76.

(c) Section 6 of Public Law 113–76 shall apply to amounts designated in subsection (a) for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.

SEC. 115. During the period covered by this joint resolution, discretionary amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2015 that were provided in advance by appropriations Acts shall be available in the amounts provided in such Acts, reduced by the percentage in section 101(b).

SEC. 116. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ''Department of Agriculture—Domestic Food Programs—Food and Nutrition Service—Commodity Assistance Program'' at a rate for operations of $275,701,000, of which $208,682,000 shall be for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program.

SEC. 117. For ''Department of Health and Human Services—Food and Drug Administration—Salaries and Expenses'', amounts shall be made available by this joint resolution as if ''outsourcing facility fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379j–62,'' were included after ''21 U.S.C. 381,'' in the second paragraph under such heading in division A of Public Law 113–76.

SEC. 118. Amounts made available by section 101 for ''Department of Commerce—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—Procurement, Acquisition and Construction'' may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to maintain the planned launch schedules for the Joint Polar Satellite System and the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite system.

SEC. 119. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except sections 106 and 107 of this joint resolution, for ''Department of Defense—Overseas Contingency Operations—Operation and Maintenance—Operation and Maintenance, Army'', up to $50,000,000, to be derived by reducing the amount otherwise made available by section 101 for such account, may be used to conduct surface and subsurface clearance of unexploded ordnance at closed training ranges used by the Armed Forces of the United States in Afghanistan: *Provided*, That such funds may only be used if the training ranges are not transferred to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for use by its armed forces: *Provided further*, That the authority provided by this section shall continue in effect through the earlier of the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated as provided under section 114 for such account.

SEC. 120. The following authorities shall continue in effect through the earlier of the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense:

(1) Section 1004 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 374 note).

(2) Section 1215 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 10 U.S.C. 113 note).

(3) Section 127b of title 10, United States Code, notwithstanding subsection (c)(3)(C) of such section.

(4) Subsection (b) of section 572 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (20 U.S.C. 7703b(b)), notwithstanding paragraph (4) of such subsection.

SEC. 121. (a) Funds made available by section 101 for ''Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund'' may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid disruption of continuing projects or activities funded in this appropriation.

(b) The Secretary of Energy shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 3 days after each use of the authority provided in subsection (a).

SEC. 122. (a) Funds made available by section 101 for ''Department of Energy—Environmental and Other Defense Activities—Defense Environmental Cleanup'' for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant may be obligated at a rate for operations necessary to assure timely execution of activities necessary to restore and upgrade the repository.

(b) The Secretary of Energy shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on each use of the spending rate authority provided in this section that exceeds customary apportionment allocations.

SEC. 123. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the District of Columbia may expend local funds under the heading ''District of Columbia Funds'' for such programs and activities under title IV of H.R. 5016 (113th Congress), as passed by the House of Representatives on July 16, 2014, at the rate set forth under ''District of Columbia Funds—Summary of Expenses'' as included in the Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Request Act of 2014 (D.C. Act 20–370), as modified as of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

SEC. 124. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ''Office of Special Counsel—Salaries and Expenses'' at a rate for operations of $22,939,000.

SEC. 125. The third proviso under the heading ''Small Business Administration—Business Loans Program Account'' in division E of Public Law 113–76 is amended by striking ''$17,500,000,000'' and inserting ''$18,500,000,000'': *Provided*, That amounts made available by section 101 for such proviso under such heading may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to accommodate increased demand for commitments to general business loans under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act: *Provided further*, That this section shall become effective upon enactment of this joint resolution.

SEC. 126. Sections 1101(a) and 1104(a)(2)(A) of the Internet Tax Freedom Act (title XI of division C of Public Law 105–277; 47 U.S.C. 151 note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for ''November 1, 2014''.

SEC. 127. Section 550(b) of Public Law 109–295 (6 U.S.C. 121 note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for ''October 4, 2014''.

SEC. 128. The authority provided by section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 129. (a) Amounts made available by section 101 for the Department of Homeland Security for ''U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses'', ''U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology'', ''U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Air and Marine Operations'', ''U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Construction and Facilities Management'', and ''U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses'' shall be obligated at a rate for operations as necessary to respectively—

(1) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers and Border Patrol agents in accordance with the provisos under the heading ''U.S. Customs and Border Protection—Salaries and Expenses'' in division F of Public Law 113–76;

(2) sustain border security and immigration enforcement operations;

(3) sustain necessary Air and Marine operations; and

(4) sustain the staffing levels of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents, equivalent to the staffing levels achieved on September 30, 2014, and comply with the fifth

proviso under the heading ''U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—Salaries and Expenses'' in division F of Public Law 113–76.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on each use of the authority provided in this section.

SEC. 130. Section 810 of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6809) shall be applied by substituting ''on the date that is 1 year after the date specified in section 106(3) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015'' for ''10 years after the date of the enactment of this Act''.

SEC. 131. (a) The authority provided by subsection (m)(3) of section 8162 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note; Public Law 106–79) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution.

(b) For the period covered by this joint resolution, the authority provided by the provisos under the heading ''Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission—Capital Construction'' in division E of Public Law 112–74 shall not be in effect.

SEC. 132. Activities authorized under part A of title IV and section 1108(b) of the Social Security Act (other than under section 413(h) of such Act) shall continue through the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution, in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2014 (except that the amount appropriated for section 403(b) of such Act shall be $598,000,000, and the requirement to reserve funds provided for in section 403(b)(2) of such Act shall not apply with respect to this section), and out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for such purpose. Grants and payments may be made pursuant to this authority through the applicable portion of the first quarter of fiscal year 2015 at the pro rata portion of the level provided for such activities through the first quarter of fiscal year 2014.

SEC. 133. Amounts allocated to Head Start grantees from amounts identified in the seventh proviso under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Children and Families Services Programs'' in Public Law 113–76 shall not be included in the calculation of the ''base grant'' in fiscal year 2015, as such term is used in section 640(a)(7)(A) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9835(a)(7)(A)).

SEC. 134. The first proviso under the heading ''Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Low Income Home Energy Assistance'' in division H of Public Law 113–76 shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting ''2015'' for ''2014''.

SEC. 135. Amounts provided by this joint resolution for ''Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Children and Families—Refugee and Entrant Assistance'' may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to maintain program operations at the level provided in fiscal year 2014.

SEC. 136. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by this joint resolution for ''Department of Health and Human Services—Office of the Secretary—Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund'', there is appropriated $58,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2015, to remain available until September 30, 2015, for expenses necessary to support acceleration of countermeasure and product advanced research and development pursuant to section 319L of the Public Health Service Act for addressing Ebola.

SEC. 137. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by this joint resolution for ''Department of Health and Human Services—Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—Global Health'', there is appropriated $30,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2015, to remain available until September 30, 2015, for expenses necessary to support the responses of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (referred to in this section as the ''CDC'') to the outbreak of Ebola virus in Africa: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available for transfer by the Director of the CDC to other accounts of the CDC for such support: *Provided further*, That the Director of the CDC shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 30 days after the date of any transfer under the preceding proviso.

SEC. 138. Amounts made available by this joint resolution for ''Department of Education—Rehabilitation Services and Disability Research'', ''Department of Education—Departmental Management—Program Administration'', and ''Department of Health and Human Services—Administration for Community Living—Aging and Disability Services Programs'' may be obligated in the account and budget structure set forth in section 491 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 3515e).

SEC. 139. Of the unobligated balance of amounts provided by section 108 of Public Law 111–3, $4,549,000,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 140. Section 113 of division H of Public Law 113–76 shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) for ''September 30, 2014''.

SEC. 141. (a) Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are made available for accounts in title I of division J of Public Law 113–76 at an aggregate rate for operations of $6,558,223,500.

(b) Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report delineating the allocation of budget authority in subsection (a) by account and project.

SEC. 142. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ''Department of Veterans Affairs—Departmental Administration—General Operating Expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration'' at a rate for operations of $2,524,254,000.

SEC. 143. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for ''Department of Veterans Affairs—Departmental Administration—Office of Inspector General'' at a rate for operations of $126,411,000.

SEC. 144. Section 209 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6436) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for ''September 30, 2014''.

SEC. 145. Amounts made available by section 101 for ''Broadcasting Board of Governors—International Broadcasting Operations'', ''Bilateral Economic Assistance—Funds Appropriated to the President—Economic Support Fund'', ''International Security Assistance—Department of State—International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement'', ''International Security Assistance—Department of State—Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs'', and ''International Security Assistance—Funds Appropriated to the President—Foreign Military Financing Program'' shall be obligated at a rate for operations as necessary to sustain assistance for Ukraine and independent states of the Former Soviet Union and Central and Eastern Europe to counter external, regional aggression and influence.

SEC. 146. Section 7081(4) of division K of Public Law 113–76 shall be applied to amounts made available by this joint resolution by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution for ''September 30, 2014''.

SEC. 147. The Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635 et seq.) shall be applied through June 30, 2015, by substituting such date for ''September 30, 2014'' in section 7 of such Act.

SEC. 148. (a) Section 44302(f) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''September 30, 2014'' and inserting ''the date specified in section 106(3) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015''.

(b) Section 44303(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''September 30, 2014'' and inserting ''the date specified in section 106(3) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015''.

(c) Section 44310(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''September 30, 2014'' and inserting ''the date specified in section 106(3) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015''.

This joint resolution may be cited as the ''Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After 1 hour of debate on the joint resolution, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in part B of House Report 113–600, if offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) or his designee, shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for 6 hours equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. 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 H.J. Res. 124.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present H.J. Res. 124, a short-term continuing resolution to keep the doors of the Federal Government open after the end of the fiscal year on September 30.

H.J. Res. 124 is a critical measure that ensures that hardworking Americans continue to have access to the government programs and the services they rely on and helps avoid the unnecessary uncertainty and economic harm caused by the threat of a government shutdown.

The bill continues government operations at the current rate of $1.012 trillion into the next fiscal year and lasts

until December 11, 2014. That level is in line with the Ryan-Murray budget agreement that this House approved last year.

My committee sought to draft a responsible, restrained bill that does not include controversial riders and does not seek to change existing Federal policies; however, it does make several very limited adjustments to prevent catastrophic or irreversible damage to critical government programs to address pressing global crises that have surfaced in recent months or to ensure good government.

These are changes I believe all of my colleagues can and should support. These include provisions, Mr. Speaker, that, one, increase funding at the Department of Veterans Affairs to help deal with the disability claims backlog and further investigations into waitlist allegations; two, to boost funding for Ebola research and response; three, to provide some funding flexibility within CBP and ICE to meet border security needs; and, four, to continue a surge in funding for State Department programs that help counter regional aggression against Ukraine and other former Soviet states. Each of these provisions is funded within the total discretionary funding level of $1.012 trillion.

The CR will also extend authority for certain laws currently in place such as the Internet Tax Freedom Act for the duration of the CR and the Export-Import Bank through June 30 of next year.

Later, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee will offer an amendment to this bill to address the President's request for the authority to train and equip Syrian rebels to fight ISIL. This critical amendment will address an issue of great importance to our national security, and attaching it to this continuing resolution will allow its enactment within a swift timeframe.

It does not involve any new or additional funding for these activities. I hope that my colleagues in the House will support the adoption of that amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, but we cannot address each and every aspect of Federal agency budgets within the scope of a continuing resolution like this one. These line-by-line budget decisions must be made in full-year regular appropriations legislation.

I am very proud, Mr. Speaker, that the House made great strides toward completing this vital work, which is our constitutional duty, by approving 11 out of 12 appropriations bills in committee and seven of them on the floor of the House, all before the August recess, dealing with some 400 amendments to those seven bills on the House floor.

The House made a good faith effort to complete all of these bills, but, unfortunately, the Senate has failed to approve a single appropriations bill which is why we are at this point today in trying to pass a continuing resolution.

It is high time that the Senate leadership allows us to complete critical legislation to fund the entire Federal Government in an up-to-date, line-by-line way in regular order.

This continuing resolution will allow us the time, hopefully, to do just that; however, as we move forward, we cannot and should not continue to fall back on stopgap funding bills like this one.

These lurching short-term bills only postpone the tough budget decisions, heighten our Nation's mistrust of Congress, and cause uncertainty within our Federal agencies and the economy.

At this point, though, the best way to avoid causing serious damage to the country is to pass this continuing resolution. It is our most clear path forward. It allows us the time we need to draft bicameral pieces of legislation that reflect our real and urgent budgetary requirements and utilize our Nation's taxpayer dollars in the most responsible, representative way.

□ 1430

Before I close these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge the service and hard work of the staff of the committee on both sides of the aisle, but I especially want to acknowledge the service and hard work of the clerk of the Defense Subcommittee, Tom McLemore.

Over his years on this committee he has been an integral member of the staff, no more so than his time as Defense clerk. Sadly, this will be his last bill before he moves on to greener pastures, and we will miss him a great deal. So I want to thank Tom for his service to this committee and to the Nation.

With that said, Mr. Speaker, we have just under 2 weeks left until the end of the fiscal year on September 30, so I ask that the House pass H.J. Res. 124 today without delay. I also urge the Senate to pass this bill and submit it to the President for his signature as soon as possible.

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

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

While it was my sincere hope that we could have completed action on all 12 appropriation bills before the end of the fiscal year, I understand Chairman ROGERS' desire to quickly pass the CR and prevent another disastrous government shutdown.

This continuing resolution gives the House and Senate Appropriations Committees roughly 3 months to reach agreement on each of the discretionary bills and the important programs they fund. Of great importance in these negotiations will be the funding levels in the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education bill. Unfortunately, it has the dubious distinction of being the only one not even brought to the full committee for markup, denying Members on both sides of the aisle the opportunity to offer amendments and have a full, open debate about these critical programs.

Yesterday, Ranking Member DELAURO and all the Democratic members of that subcommittee introduced our version of the bill that we hope will help clarify our priorities for the process in the coming months.

The CR portion of this legislative package contains much-needed funding to address urgent crises, including the spread of Ebola, ensuring critical work continues to develop and manufacture treatment therapies, as well as work on a vaccine.

However, I do regret that the majority's proposed CR resorts to one of the worst legislative mechanisms to reduce scoring, an across-the-board cut. This type of provision shirks one of the most fundamental responsibilities of this committee, making difficult decisions about program levels. Worse still, it is misleading to the public and creates an illusion that program levels remain at last year's level, when they are, in fact, lower.

I also have concerns with the length of the extension of the Export-Import Bank.

The President spoke forcefully about the threat of ISIL last week. There is a clear need for an international coalition to execute an aggressive, targeted strategy aimed at degrading ISIL, and later this afternoon, the House will begin debate on the administration's request for narrow title 10 authority.

Lastly, the rules of this CR added three technical changes to the underlying text that were needed and which I support. Additional language was needed on the Ebola funding, on the LIHEAP money, and on recreation fees.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, no appropriator ever wants a CR, but none of us want to repeat last year's shutdown. It is my sincere hope that if this CR is enacted we can use the coming months wisely to craft agreement on all 12 bills by December 11. There is absolutely no reason to punt our responsibilities into the new year and the new Congress.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chair of the full committee for yielding, and I rise in support of the continuing resolution.

We must pass this continuing resolution to keep the Federal Government open and operating for taxpayers. Mr. Speaker, as you know, this legislation continues funding to pay our troops, for the Department of Defense operations, and for defense and maintenance, research and development, and procurement at fiscal year 2014 levels.

But a word of caution to my colleague. We have had a great deal of talk lately from some quarters about

eventually extending this continuing resolution to September of next year, 2015. That would be a very bad idea for the Department of Defense and many other important agencies and programs. While this approach might hold the line on spending in other agencies and programs, a yearlong continuing resolution has proven to be terribly costly for the Department of Defense.

Funding under a CR promotes budget uncertainty that makes defense planning and managing programs nearly impossible. It is damaging to our men and women in uniform, our military readiness, our defense industrial base, and our defense posture as we face challenges around the world, in the Middle East, the Pacific, Africa, Europe, and considered additional actions in Iraq and also Syria.

Three months ago, our full committee and our Defense Subcommittee produced a strong, bipartisan fiscal year 2015 Defense Appropriations bill. We hope the Senate will now join us to complete the process, allowing us to fulfill our responsibilities under the Constitution for a strong national defense.

Mr. Chairman, I commend your strong efforts and that of the staff and urge support of the resolution.

But before I conclude, may I also join with Chairman ROGERS in saluting Tom McLemore, the clerk to the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations, for his years of hard work on behalf of all Members, Republicans and Democrats, his strong work on behalf of a strong national defense, for his work with me in my brief tenure as chairman, but for the many years of loyal support he gave to our late chairman, Congressman Bill Young of Florida.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a member of the Labor, HHS, and Foreign Operations Subcommittees of Appropriations.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me thank our ranking member for her unwavering leadership on our committee on so many issues.

Thank you, Congresswoman LOWEY.

Let me thank also our chairman for continuing to try to help us work in a bipartisan way to bring a real Labor, HHS bill to the floor.

This continuing resolution contains, yes, critical and much-needed funding to address the Ebola crisis in Africa. It also, though, includes across-the-board cuts which will negatively impact my congressional district, all of our congressional districts, and countless households across America.

For example, this CR includes two different cuts to the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program. It includes a $14 million reduction in the TANF contingency fund and a $15 million reduction that will eliminate TANF research funds, funds that are used, mind you, by the Department of Health and Human Services to evaluate the effectiveness of TANF programs and to develop approaches for improving employment outcomes among TANF recipients.

These cuts are unnecessary and come at a time when people are literally living on the edge. It is unacceptable that at a time when we are passing short-term funding bills that underfund public health and workforce training programs we are now providing over $80 billion in war funding. The American people expect Congress to create jobs, to strengthen our economy, and to ensure that our security funds are wisely spent. With sequester cuts looming, it is time that we focus our spending here at home.

Finally, let me just address the upcoming debate and vote on funding to arm and train Syrian rebels. This should not be an amendment to the continuing resolution. National security issues should not be an afterthought to funding the government.

Now, not a single person in this body thinks that the United States should stand idle while ISIS wreaks havoc in the Middle East, but this is a sectarian civil war where the use of force and arming and training rebels will place us in the middle of a war where most recognize there is no military solution. So, before we expand the airstrikes in Iraq and vote to provide weapons and training to rebels in Syria, Congress must have a thorough and robust debate on the long-term implications of taking such actions.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. I have grave concerns about the specific proposal to arm and train the Free Syrian Army, which will be voted on tomorrow by this House, and I intend to address this further during the debate on the McKeon amendment.

How can we ensure that U.S. weapons and training don't end up in the wrong hands?

How in the world will we know when our objectives have been met and when ISIS has been contained or eliminated?

How will we avoid getting embroiled in the civil war?

Congress must weigh all of the options before us, not just the military ones, before we make any decision on committing the U.S. to yet another long-term war. This is the type of debate that we failed to have in the wake of 9/11 and which resulted in the passage of an overly broad authorization that continues to be used today.

So we must ask the hard questions, not only about the current proposal to arm and train Syrian rebels, but about the entire strategy.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 10 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Finally, let me just say, we cannot become embroiled in another war. The cost and the consequences to our national security, to our brave men and women in uniform, and to our ability to continue to nation-build here at home must be laid out to the public. That is our constitutional duty and responsibility. Unfortunately, we get a pass with this continuing resolution.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), ranking member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and also want to add my voice to those who are complimenting Mr. McLemore on his dedication to public service and his retirement as clerk of the Defense Subcommittee.

I would tell my colleagues that, despite the strong leadership and very best efforts of Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY, I am abjectly disappointed that we again find ourselves in the position of considering another continuing resolution. Continuing resolutions are no way to run a nation. We cannot expect good government if we are incapable of providing appropriations in a timely and predictable manner.

As importantly, I am greatly concerned about providing another authority for conducting military operations in the Middle East.

In letters to Congress, the President has cited the powers granted to him in Article II of the United States Constitution as the legal basis for some of the actions already taken. In recent briefings and public statements, the administration also indicates that the authorized use of military force resolutions passed in 2001 and 2002 remain the legal foundation for current operations. However, these authorities were approved by the Congress in a different time and for different conflicts and with a very different membership.

The time has come to rationalize the authorities with the needs of the current conflict and for the current legislative body to weigh in on this matter of war and peace rather than to rely on authorities intended for Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden.

I appreciate the President's honesty in pointing out that the efforts to combat ISIL will extend into the next administration. So why, after 3 years of civil war in Syria, are we including this authority in a continuing resolution that will be in effect for less than 3 months, providing a fleeting authority for what we all anticipate will be a protracted effort? Further, this approach fails to take into consideration the long-term financial costs of conducting this mission, which has been estimated to cost up to $500 million a year.

I also believe that there is an inherent flaw in this strategy, training and

equipping nonstate actors as the main effort in combating a threat to the region and our national security.

□ 1445

The United States invested lives and innumerable injuries, as well as a great deal of national treasure, to train and equip the Iraqi Army, only to see the result of that professional force collapse in the midst of serious conflict. Why then do we expect the next force we train to behave differently? We must also ask ourselves if we can truly vet these rebel groups beyond their known affiliations and ensure that we are not arming the next extremist threat to the region.

I would note that, recently, some of our allies and partners in the region have made commitments of equipment, training areas, and financial resources. I believe far more will ultimately be required of them, including leadership and troops of their own, to truly degrade and defeat ISIL.

The task of fighting ISIL is complicated. I am gravely concerned with the complexities we face while ensuring the safety of our forces. It is for these reasons that I am opposed to the amendment that will be offered by Chairman MCKEON.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations, a very hardworking member.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this short-term continuing resolution.

This CR simply keeps the government funded at the current fiscal year rate, which is, by the way, in line with the Ryan-Murray budget agreement that was passed by Congress last year under the steadfast leadership of Chairman ROGERS, of our subcommittee chairmen and chairwomen, and of the ranking members.

The House is doing its work. The House has done its work. We have passed 11 of the 12 bills out of the full committee, and seven of those appropriations bills, under regular order and through immense debate, have actually passed the floor of the House. Yet the Senate has passed how many appropriations bills? Mr. Speaker, not even one. That is why we are here, once again, with this continuing resolution. Our record very clearly shows that, unlike the Senate, the House is committed to actually doing the hard work—to going line by line to fund the vital programs and looking at opportunities to eliminate waste and to reduce spending.

Again, we have done our work. Now we need a willing partner, Mr. Speaker, on the other side, in the Senate, to do their part so then we can go to conference and negotiate the differences, but that is not in our hands. That is in the hands of the American people.

We are now at the end of this fiscal year, as the chairman said—just a couple of weeks away. The key is to pass this continuing resolution to keep the government running. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the weeks ahead and continuing to go line by line, agency by agency, looking for waste, making sure that we are doing what has to be done. I also know that the House will do its job.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman and the members of the Appropriations Committee. Let's get this done.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the ranking minority member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee and a senior member of the Defense Subcommittee.

Mr. MORAN. I thank my very good friend, the ranking member of our committee.

I want to join with Chairman ROGERS and Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN in the shout-out to Tom McLemore. I trust, as Chairman ROGERS said, that he is going on to greener pastures. He deserves to.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress is an imperfect body. Our constituents remind us of that on an almost daily basis. We certainly know that this is an imperfect process within which we have to operate, and the bill before us is an imperfect bill from our perspective and, I suspect, from the majority's perspective, but that is the world we live in. We have to choose the best option oftentimes among a host of difficult options, so this is the best option—to vote ''yes'' on this continuing resolution. It is the most responsible thing to do. To vote ''no'' would say that we are willing to let the government be shut down, unfunded. So we don't have a responsible option but to vote ''yes'' on this continuing resolution.

I appreciate the work that Chairman ROGERS, Ranking Member LOWEY, and the chairs of the committees and of the subcommittees have put in to making it as good as we could under the circumstances.

We also have an imperfect option with regard to the Ex-Im Bank. It ought to be extended for an additional 5 more years. It generates a lot of money for the United States, and we offer fewer subsidies than our allies do to multinational corporations, but to not extend it at least until June 30 is irresponsible. Again, it is the best option we have before us.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the McKeon amendment, which would provide $500 million to train and equip Syrian soldiers to fight ISIS, I don't think we have a better option. I find it difficult to disagree with my colleagues, particularly with colleagues who I am so fond of, such as the gentleman from Indiana, but if we are going to vote ''no,'' we ought to have an alternative.

What would we do under the circumstances? I don't know what better alternative there is.

Are we going to ignore what ISIS is doing in Iraq? Are we going to ignore the fact that the death toll over the last year has been almost 10,000 people—9,826—excluding deaths from the Syrian civil war? 17,000 have been executed in Tikrit, and 650 were executed in Mosul just because they were non-Arabs or non-Sunni Muslims. It was ethnic cleansing on an historic scale. Now 20 journalists are missing in Syria. Many of them are held by the Islamic State. The U.N. estimates that more than a million people have been displaced by violence in Iraq in this year alone.

It is serious given what they have done and particularly given the fact that ISIS is growing exponentially. I remember we got a figure of about 12,000, and then, last week, it was about 20,000. This week, it is estimated that there are over 30,000. They are recruited from all over the world—15,000 foreign fighters, 2,000 of whom are westerners who hold passports where there is a visa waiver and they might be able to get into the United States. Some of them are Americans. They are making millions of dollars a day in revenue from oil and kidnapping and so on. Their assets are estimated at about $2 billion. This is the wealthiest, most lethal, extremist terrorist group that has yet to present itself on the planet.

Can we turn around and do nothing?

The reality is, since the United States has the largest, most capable military—larger and more capable than all of the other militaries in the world combined—the responsibility falls on our shoulders to lead. What we are doing is leading by training, by seeing to it that, while there will be boots on the ground, there won't be primarily Americans in those boots. It will be people who know the territory, who know the language, who know the culture, and who have been vetted. We will provide intelligence and air support. This is the best of a long list of bad options.

Mr. Speaker, I think we need to vote ''aye'' and allow the President to proceed on this policy.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia, who made an excellent presentation.

May I inquire of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 18½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 15¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR), a member of the Homeland Security and Foreign Operations Subcommittees.

Mr. CUELLAR. I thank Ranking Member LOWEY for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of passing this legislation before us.

First, I want to thank Chairman ROGERS, and I certainly want to thank

the ranking member, Mrs. LOWEY, for working together to produce this continuing resolution. This continuing resolution will maintain vital funding for the Federal agencies that provide services to taxpayers.

Congress has two major responsibilities, which are to pass a budget and to pay our bills on time. This bill would ensure that, while the House and the Senate will pass these appropriations bills probably in the form of an omnibus bill at the end of the year, we need to pass this CR. Additionally, this CR will contain much-needed funds to respond to the Ebola outbreak, to the reauthorization authority for the Export-Import Bank, and to provide the administration funding flexibility to deal with unaccompanied minors at the border.

Tomorrow, we will also have an amendment to help fight the ISIS threat, and we must stand together with our President to fight that threat. I know it is a complicated situation, but doing nothing is certainly not an option. Last year, our failure to uphold the basic responsibilities of Congress resulted in a government shutdown, and we must not let that happen again. We do need the CR, but we must get back to regular order—pass full appropriations bills, go to conference, and get our job done. I think, if we are able to do that, we will be able to make sure that we do the hard job that we were sent up here to do. We were not sent up here to make the easy decisions. These are difficult decisions, but this is the responsibility of Congress.

Again, I do want to thank the chairman, and I do want to thank the ranking member. I stand in support of the CR and of the amendment that will be coming in tomorrow to fight the threat that we see with ISIS.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), ranking member of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank our very capable ranking member, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I echo the disappointment already expressed that, once again, the end of the fiscal year has come, and rather than this House completing its work on the 12 appropriations bills, we are scrambling to pass now another continuing resolution.

This is a classic definition of ''dysfunction''—kicking the can down the road, shirking our responsibility to address the priorities of our Nation through precise 2015 departmental funding levels and with decisiveness. We get the reverse of that—uncertainty, a 3 month kick the can. It hurts job growth. It hurts economic recovery. We must reverse this regression and inertia. Congress must make the difficult choices that allow our Republic to function with certainty and dispatch again.

On the Energy and Water Subcommittee, we took great strides to set such a path forward. While I did not agree with some parts of the bill, our subcommittee did its job to fund critical job creation in water resource projects, to support science activities necessary for American competitiveness and economic growth, to fund work on critical national defense priorities, nuclear nonproliferation, and our cleanup efforts. Unfortunately, this continuing resolution stalls that work. Contracts cannot be let, and it keeps us mired in the past.

While our bill addresses a limited number of immediate needs, including flexibility for the Department of Energy to continue ongoing cleanup at the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant, America surely needs a firmer path forward, and I plead with the leadership of this institution to do that. It is my sincere hope that this short-term continuing resolution provides the necessary time to pass full-year appropriations so that Congress measures up to what the American people expect of us, and that is to do our job. 2015 funding levels should match the requirements of reality, not political stunts 6 weeks before an election.

□ 1500

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my colleague if she has further requests for time?

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I think, as has been said here numerous times by people on both sides of the aisle, we regret that we are having to bring a continuing resolution to the floor to continue the government over the end of the fiscal year. But that is because we attempted on the House side, on both sides of the aisle, to pass all 12 of these individual appropriations bills. And we were on our way to passing all of them until the Senate decided they weren't going to take any of them up, and they haven't. So it left us no choice but to ask for a continuing resolution to keep the government's lights on until December 11, by which time, hopefully, we will be able to cobble together an omnibus appropriations bill for all of the government for all of next year.

So that is where we are. We really have no choice. I don't think either side wants to shut down the government. Certainly on this side, we do not. So the necessity is that we pass this bill.

Now, the amendment coming up, on giving the President the authority to establish training bases and equip fighters in Syria, is all important, an amendment that I certainly support and welcome into the appropriations bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) for her hard work on these bills all year long, and all of the staff and all of the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle. We are a committee that abhors continuing resolutions, yet we are faced with no choice but to try to pass one.

So I urge my colleagues to support the continuing resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS). All time for debate on the joint resolution has expired.

AMENDMENT PRINTED IN PART B OF HOUSE REPORT 113–600 OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. __. (a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide assistance, including training, equipment, supplies, and sustainment, to appropriately vetted elements of the Syrian opposition and other appropriately vetted Syrian groups and individuals for the following purposes:

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

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

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

(b) Not later than 15 days prior to providing assistance authorized under subsection (a) to vetted recipients for the first time—

(1) the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership of the House of Representatives and Senate a report, in unclassified form with a classified annex as appropriate, that contains a description of—

(A) the plan for providing such assistance;

(B) the requirements and process used to determine appropriately vetted recipients; and

(C) the mechanisms and procedures that will be used to monitor and report to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership of the House of Representatives and Senate on unauthorized end-use of provided training and equipment and other violations of relevant law by recipients; and

(2) the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership of the House of Representatives and Senate a report, in unclassified form with a classified annex as appropriate, that contains a description of how such assistance fits within a larger regional strategy.

(c) The plan required in subsection (b)(1) shall include a description of—

(1) the goals and objectives of assistance authorized under subsection (a);

(2) the concept of operations, timelines, and types of training, equipment, and supplies to be provided;

(3) the roles and contributions of partner nations;

(4) the number of United States Armed Forces personnel involved;

(5) any additional military support and sustainment activities; and

(6) any other relevant details.

(d) Not later than 90 days after the Secretary of Defense submits the report required in subsection (b)(1), and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall provide the appropriate congressional committees and leadership of the House of Representatives and the Senate with a progress report. Such progress report shall include a description of—

(1) any updates to or changes in the plan, strategy, vetting requirements and process, and end-use monitoring mechanisms and procedures, as required in subsection (b)(1);

(2) statistics on green-on-blue attacks and how such attacks are being mitigated;

(3) the groups receiving assistance authorized under subsection (a);

(4) the recruitment, throughput, and retention rates of recipients and equipment;

(5) any misuse or loss of provided training and equipment and how such misuse or loss is being mitigated; and

(6) an assessment of the effectiveness of the assistance authorized under subsection (a) as measured against subsections (b) and (c).

(e) For purposes of this section, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) The term ''appropriately vetted'' means, with respect to elements of the Syrian opposition and other Syrian groups and individuals, at a minimum, assessments of such elements, groups, and individuals for associations with terrorist groups, Shia militias aligned with or supporting the Government of Syria, and groups associated with the Government of Iran. Such groups include, but are not limited to, the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Jabhat al Nusrah, Ahrar al Sham, other al-Qaeda related groups, and Hezbollah.

(2) The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(f) The Department of Defense may submit a reprogramming or transfer request to the congressional defense committees for funds made available by section 101(a)(3) of this joint resolution and designated in section 114 of this joint resolution to carry out activities authorized under this section notwithstanding sections 102 and 104 of this joint resolution.

(g) The Secretary of Defense may accept and retain contributions, including assistance in-kind, from foreign governments to carry out activities as authorized by this section which shall be credited to appropriations made available by this joint resolution for the appropriate operation and maintenance accounts, except that any funds so accepted by the Secretary shall not be available for obligation until a reprogramming action is submitted to the congressional defense committees: *Provided*, That amounts made available by this subsection are designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available only if the President so designates such amounts and transmits such designations to the Congress.

(h) The authority provided in this section shall continue in effect through the earlier of the date specified in section 106(3) of this joint resolution or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense.

(i) Nothing in this section shall be construed to constitute a specific statutory authorization for the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations wherein hostilities are clearly indicated by the circumstances.

(j) Nothing in this section supersedes or alters the continuing obligations of the President to report to Congress pursuant to section 4 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1543) regarding the use of United States Armed Forces abroad.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 722, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 3 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

I rise to offer an amendment to House Joint Resolution 124 to provide authority to train and equip appropriately vetted elements of the Syrian opposition in order to defend the Syrian people from attacks by ISIL and to protect the United States and our friends and allies.

ISIL is a clear and present threat to our allies across the Middle East and to the United States. In this time of crisis, the President has asked for this authority because none of the existing Department of Defense train-and equip-programs fit the circumstances. Specifically, the President has requested the authority to train and equip nongovernmental entities fighting in the non-U.S.-led operation in Syria.

There is no doubt that any strategy to defeat ISIL must contain a Syria component. I believe that there are options to defeat ISIL in Syria short of a major U.S.-led combat operation. But the window of opportunity is closing. That is why I am supporting the President's request and have agreed to draft an amendment to the continuing resolution based on a modified version of the administration's initial proposal.

My amendment would allow the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance, including training, equipment, supplies, and the sustainment of the vetted opposition. The provision is intended to authorize activities necessary to facilitate such training and equipping activities, including the appropriate modification of existing facilities and the establishment of expeditionary facilities suitable for such training and accommodation, as well as payment of stipends to trainees.

The President's request did not specify the amount of funding that would be required for this effort and contained few oversight requirements. Therefore, my amendment would strengthen congressional oversight by requiring detailed reports, including progress reports on the plan, the vetting process, and the procedures for monitoring the end use of the training and equipment. It would also require the President to report on how this authority fits within a larger regional strategy.

This amendment does not authorize additional funds. However, it would allow the Department of Defense to submit reprogramming requests to Congress should the President require funds to execute this authority. It also permits the Secretary of Defense to accept foreign contributions.

Lastly, the amendment would state that nothing in this bill be construed to constitute a specific statutory authorization for the introduction of the United States Armed Forces into hostilities. There may be a time when we need to have an AUMF debate, but this is not it. The President has not asked for such an authority.

My amendment is narrowly focused on training and equipping Syrian opposition fighters to counter ISIL. This language was drafted in collaboration with the chairs of the national security committees and shared with the minority. Additionally, the language for this authority has been reviewed by the Department of Defense and the National Security Council.

Lastly, let me emphasize that this train-and-equip authority is a necessary part—but only one part—of what should be a larger strategy. It must be part of a larger effort in Syria, in Iraq, and across the region.

Let's also remember that it will be our men and women in uniform who will be conducting this training. We continue to ask more and more of our military, yet their funding continues to be cut. This is not sustainable and must be addressed.

Again, ISIL is a clear and present threat to the United States and our interests. My amendment is a necessary step to support what should be a larger strategy by the President to defeat ISIL.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I too rise in support of this amendment. As the chairman laid out, there is no question that ISIL is a clear threat to our interests, and they are a threat in two clear ways. Number one, a large number of foreign fighters are going over to Syria and Iraq to support them. Some of those foreign fighters—estimates are somewhere in the 100 range—have come from the U.S., and thousands have come from Western Europe. Many of those have returned to that home country, and they present a clear threat. As long as ISIS or ISIL is there to threaten us, the fighters that fight with them will become a threat to the rest of us.

But in a broader sense, if ISIL is able to control territory in Iraq and in Syria and have a safe and secure haven, they will, without question, plot and plan attacks against the West. They have already said that is their plan, and that is exactly what happened when al Qaeda had safe haven in Afghanistan. So denying ISIL safe haven is clearly in the United States' interests.

I think a humanitarian aspect of this is also worth stating. As was noted by some earlier speakers on the CR debate, you cannot imagine a more violent and dangerous and just hedonistic group of people. The number of folks that they have brutally murdered in Iraq and Syria solely because they refused to pledge allegiance to ISIS and their twisted view of their religion is staggering. This is a group that must be stopped.

Now, the sad fact is, the United States military cannot stop them on our own. This has to be primarily a local fight. The folks in the region have to take up this battle.

And I believe that they have started to in Iraq, but we need to open a front in Syria. Because the problem is, if ISIS can hold themselves out as an organization that is fighting against Western imperialism, that brings supporters to them. If, on the other hand, they are, as they clearly are, just a group of murderous thugs that are killing more Muslims than anybody has killed in a very long time, then we can build support from the local population, from the Sunni population, to oppose them.

Now, we have already seen some success on this in Iraq. And I think the President was absolutely right to take his time in Iraq and wait for a coalition to work with. If the U.S. had simply come in over the top right off the bat and had started bombing ISIS, we would have been perceived as choosing the Shia side in the Shia-Sunni civil war. And in so doing, we would have strengthened ISIS. By insisting that Prime Minister Maliki be replaced, by insisting that Iraq begin to at least start some sort of power sharing arrangement with the Sunnis, we were able to build a stronger coalition by also building support from the Kurds, a Sunni group. We could then be in support of them fighting ISIS and pushing them out.

Now, the great flaw in this theory is, the border between Iraq and Syria is nonexistent, as far as ISIS is concerned, and they can go back and forth across it.

□ 1515

If we don't have any way to get at them in Syria, it gives them an enormous advantage in continuing to press the fight in Iraq and potentially elsewhere, but the challenge is: How do we open that front? Because we face the same dilemma in Syria that we faced in Iraq.

The dominant issue that started everything in Syria was opposition to the Assad regime, a regime very much worth opposing. As the President and many on the floor here have said, Assad must go. He is an illegitimate leader.

If we were simply to come in and appear to be playing the role of Assad's air force in Syria, again, that would strengthen ISIS. That would drive Sunnis and the anti-regime elements in Syria into their arms.

Mr. Speaker, we need a partner in Syria that we can support that is an alternative to Assad and is an alternative to ISIS. The problem is that right now we don't really have one.

We have a small group of people that we have been supporting in a variety of different ways, but we need that group to grow. We need to have a partner to support if we are ever going to hope to contain ISIS in Syria in Iraq. The only way to do that is to start.

I have heard a number of complaints. People say, ''But, gosh, are there really any moderates out there? Are there enough to make a difference? What if they switch sides?''

There are all kinds of problems, but the bottom line is if you believe that we have to open a front in Syria to stop ISIS—and I don't see how you can believe otherwise—to give them Syria and say, ''We are not going to challenge you there,'' I think makes it impossible to even significantly degrade them and, certainly, to ever defeat them; so we need to open a front.

How do you do that, Mr. Speaker? Well, you can't open a front unless you start the process, and that is what Mr. MCKEON's amendment does. It starts the process. It gives the ability to train and equip a force that will be opposed to Assad and opposed to ISIS.

Now, I don't think we should have any illusions, and I know Americans—I would prefer this as well—we would say, Look, we are going to win this war, and we are going to win it in 100 days, and here is what we—this is going to be a long process. This is not something that is going to happen quickly.

It is simply the nature of the conflict in that part of the world that it is going to take time to find the people, train them, and equip them, but, if we do not try, Mr. Speaker, then ISIS is going to sit in Syria unchallenged, continuing to brutally murder civilians of all stripes and continuing to spread their unique ideology of hatred and violence. We have to start somewhere, and I think this amendment gives us the opportunity to start somewhere.

I also want to note that I like the fact that the amendment is only effective until the end of the CR and says that this should be contained in the National Defense Authorization Act. This is an authorizing action, and it should be done in an authorizing bill.

Now, we have got to get started, and we don't have time. Regrettably, the Senate has not acted, so we don't have the NDAA yet, but we will in the next month or two. I think we can then put this language into the NDAA and make it more long term in terms of the authorization; so I appreciate that.

I also feel, as the chairman does, that Congress should do a broader AUMF on the fight against ISIS, on what we are doing in Iraq and Syria. We have launched, I think, well in the hundreds, now, of bombing missions against ISIS. This is something where Congress should act.

Mr. Speaker, the only area of disagreement I have is I keep hearing colleagues say, ''Well, the President ought to ask for it. We are the legislative branch.'' I hear all the time, ''Gosh, the President is overstepping our authorities, always telling us what to do, and he is ignoring the law.''

Why does he have to ask? If this is what we want to do—we are the United States Congress. The legislative branch ought to act.

I think the President is right in saying he is going to do what he believes he has the right to do under article II to protect this country, but Congress should act; so we should act. We shouldn't wait for him to ask. We should put together an AUMF to more broadly authorize this, and that is something that should be appropriately done as well.

In the short term, we need to start a front against ISIS in Syria, and the only way to do that is to build a legitimate local force that can begin that fight. Train and equip is the first step, I believe, and then this process that regrettably will not be quick.

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

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank and congratulate the chairman and Mr. SMITH for their work on this issue.

I rise in support of this amendment. It has become urgent, Mr. Speaker, that we make serious strides against ISIL, and we must act quickly to curb their influence and to fight back against terrorism of the most brutal sort.

Chairman MCKEON's amendment which provides the authority to train and equip Syrian rebels to fight ISIL is the right approach, and I support its inclusion on this continuing resolution.

Over the past week, the House has done due diligence to ensure that this amendment language is appropriate, supporting limited yet adequate efforts to degrade and destroy ISIL.

While providing our Commander in Chief with the tools he has requested for the near term, language is also included to prevent an open-ended blank check for these efforts.

This will help ensure that Congress maintains funding authority and oversight over taxpayer dollars and the use of our military forces. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. SMITH who just spoke who gave a very eloquent and full explanation of where we are, and I support his statement.

I encourage my colleagues to support this critical amendment and then the underlying resolution today or tomorrow.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Washington State, and

I want to associate myself with his remarks, as well as the remarks of the chairman of our Armed Services Committee and the chairman of our Appropriations Committee.

All three leaders have played a consequential role over the last many years in establishing the United States military as the largest, most capable, and best-funded military in the world, in fact, larger than all the other militaries combined; so it is no wonder that the rest of the world turns to us for leadership.

That is not the major reason they turn to us for leadership, Mr. Speaker. They turn to us because they understand our profound belief and respect for human rights, democratic governance, and inclusive society.

Now, ISIS violates everything we believe in. They are opposed to respect for human rights. They are opposed to democratic governance and, certainly, to an inclusive society. That is not the reason why we support this amendment—because there are other people like that—but, in the judgment of our military, ISIS is expanding at a rate that cannot be ignored, and that has to be stopped.

ISIS is expanding in numbers exponentially. They are worth $2 billion. They are, now, the best-funded, most lethal terrorist organization that we have ever seen in modern history; so we cannot turn our backs on this. We know that we have substantial assets and, particularly, personnel in Baghdad. They will be targeting Baghdad as soon as they are capable of it.

We have to protect the capital of Iraq. We need to contribute to stability in that region because it is not going to stay static. It is only going to get worse, or it is going to get better.

The proposal before us is not to put American boots on the ground, but to use American intelligence, to use American trainers, to use American equipment, and to prepare Syrians, particularly, to do the job that needs to be done in their region of the world.

They know the geography, they know the language, and they understand the cultures. We are going to prepare them to be the best equipped and best trained to carry out a mission that they must share with us.

ISIS, if it is not confronted, will grow. It will become a greater threat. That is what we hear from our military. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that our military has earned respect for their judgment. They know how to provide the kind of security that so many Americans are able to take for granted.

If they say this is the right thing to do at this point in time, it seems to me the Congress needs to show support for them; so I stand in support of the McKeon amendment.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this amendment. Today, we face, as we know, a great and growing threat from ISIL. Never has a terrorist organization controlled so much territory, a safe haven, as well, to plan future attacks.

Never has one had access to vital natural resources. Never has a terrorist organization possessed the ready cash, the heavy weaponry, and the personnel that ISIL possesses.

We are late in responding. At least 2 years ago, the President had a proposal on his desk to arm those under threat inside Syria. It was backed by his Secretary of State, backed by his Defense Secretary, and backed by General Petraeus, then head of the CIA.

If the President had accepted this recommendation coming from his entire national security team years ago, we might be in a different position right now, but we are where we are.

The question is Syria continues to spiral out of control, Assad has hung to power, and ISIL has risen from a terrorist group to a terrorist army. That is where we were.

Caught in the middle has been the civil society types, those who are trying to defend—in Aleppo—defend themselves from the barrel bombs coming down from above from Assad while at the same time trying to defend themselves from ISIL attacks on the ground. They have been left to fend on their own.

These are the individuals—I will remind you for those who remember the tapes, who remember the programming at the time—chanting ''peaceful, peaceful'' as they were protesting the Assad regime.

Assad's soldiers opened up with automatic weapons fire on them in the streets of Damascus. After Assad began this slaughter, they took up arms to defend themselves.

The question is: Will we give them the wherewithal to fight back against the ISIL attacks that are, right now, on the borders of Aleppo?

In July, the Foreign Affairs Committee heard unprecedented testimony from a Syrian Army defector named ''Caesar.'' He showed our committee pictures of the atrocities—tens of thousands of people tortured, men, women, and children—by Assad. Assad has killed over 200,000 people now. The fact is that Assad is a protector of no one except himself. That is the bottom line.

Where ISIL operates, they have gone on a horrifying rampage, killing and beheading. Some of you have heard about the crucifixions there. In the meantime, Assad is no fool.

His regime has pursued a strategy to avoid confrontation with ISIL, focusing his efforts on wiping out these rebels in Aleppo that we are talking about supporting who are fighting ISIL; indeed, the Assad regime continues to purchase crude oil from ISIL, giving them ready cash, an average of $2 million daily for that terrorist group. His strategy is to present the world with a choice between the regime and the ISIL extremists.

Friends, we do not have to play his game. What we can do—what this amendment would do—is give the Syrian opposition what they desperately need, training and equipment. We are looking to aid these individuals who have risked their lives to combat the Assad region and to combat the ISIL terrorists that they are fighting today, but, Mr. Speaker, these fighters aren't starting from scratch.

They have been in the fight for several years. Out of sheer commitment and determination, they have hung on, but, with greater U.S. training and supplies, they will be bolstered. As an ultimate boost, this force would be supported by U.S. and coalition airpower, and that puts real spine into a fighting force which will be needed to confront and defeat ISIL. Our military has provided this type of training around the world for decades.

Mr. Speaker, let's do it here. Let's go on offense against ISIL. I ask for support for this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

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

Mr. Speaker, ISIL poses a threat of extraordinary significance to the United States. In its size, its wealth, and its barbarity, it is, in fact, a threat to all of civilization.

This week, we will be voting to fund one piece of the ongoing effort to rid the world of the cancer that is ISIL, and that is the training and equipping of the opposition in Syria. Whether to support the rebels is an important decision, but it pales in comparison to the larger question facing Congress and the Nation, and that is: Should we authorize the President to use our Armed Forces in Syria and Iraq?

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it appears that we will not be considering that larger question before we leave town in advance of the election. This is, I believe, a mistake of constitutional dimension. The administration has acknowledged that the military campaign we are about to embark upon amounts to war and will likely last years.

If Congress' power to declare war is to mean anything, it must compel us to act under circumstances such as these. If we sit on our hands, we set a precedent for future administrations that they may wage war without Congress' approval, and the declaration clause is no more than excess verbiage in our Constitution from a bygone era.

□ 1530

The President has broad authority as Commander in Chief to defend the Nation, but that authority is not without limit. As one former constitutional law professor and then Senator named Barack Obama said in 2007:

The President does not have power under the Constitution to unilaterally authorize a

military attack in a situation that does not involve stopping an actual or imminent threat to the Nation.

The administration has acknowledged that ISIL does not yet pose an imminent threat; nonetheless, it has asserted that it has the authority to act based on the 2001 authorization to use military force against al Qaeda passed in the days immediately following September 11. This reasoning is tenuous as best. That authorization addressed to a different enemy, at a different time, and at a different place does not provide the legal foundation for a war on ISIL, an organization that itself is at war with al Qaeda.

Today I have introduced a tailored and narrow authorization for the use of force in Iraq and Syria. My resolution specifies the enemy and explicitly does not authorize the large-scale deployment of ground troops to fight in either country. The resolution includes an 18-month sunset clause so that Congress can insist on its oversight role. It also immediately repeals the 2002 resolution to use force in Iraq and provides the same 18-month sunset for the 2001 authorization to use force, to harmonize the legal authority we provide to wage war against any foe and to ensure that no future President can claim to use it as a basis for unilateral action.

In matters of war, Congress is not some suitor that needs to be asked by the President to dance. Requested or not, Congress must exercise its responsibility to decide whether to send the Nation's sons and daughters to war. We should not go to war, let alone adjourn, without a vote.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to respond to my good friend from California, we have adjoining districts and we agree on many things, we disagree on a few things, but I would like to say that I agree with you. This is something that the Congress should address.

For 20 years—I have been here 22 years—whenever a President has asked for this, we have addressed it. We have not addressed it without having the request from the President.

This is something we had quite a debate a few weeks ago about what previous Presidents have done or not done and what authorities they have and what they don't have, and some of it just has not yet been decided by the Supreme Court. The President says he has the authority. He says he needs this additional authority to help in Syria. That is the question we are addressing here today. I think that we are bound to have this discussion. I know the Speaker wants to have it. Mr. SMITH said he wants to have it. I want to have it.

I think one thing that we should really probably consider in all of this, this is not going to be a 1-month or a 2-month or probably even a 1-year or 2-year commitment that we are making here. ISIL is very serious about this, and we are going to be in this fight, as we have seen in the past, for a long time. And it is a new commitment. So I am thinking that, as close as we are to the election, there are going to be a lot of new Members here that are going to be living with this discussion, this debate, this vote, potentially for a long time. And I think those are the people that probably should make that decision in January or as close as they feel comfortable to having that debate.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the McKeon amendment, but with serious reservations, reservations that have nothing to do with the substance of the amendment.

I applaud Chairman MCKEON for his very diligent work to craft an amendment that responds to our Commander in Chief's proposal to address the very real, serious threat we face in a thoughtful and responsible manner while preserving Congress' constitutional authority and oversight in these matters.

Let me be clear, the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria poses a clear and present danger to the United States, our homeland, our friends and partners in the Middle East and around the world.

The President has proposed that he be granted the authority to train and equip Syrian opposition groups in hopes that they will use their training and turn their weapons on ISIS, a truly savage and cruel cult of extremists.

We all watched the President's television address last week. That address left this Member and many constituents with more questions than answers.

The strategy the President announced is not so much a strategy as a continuation of a counterterrorism policy that relies on others to be on the front line to protect United States national security interests when their motivations, interests, and capabilities may or may not align with our interests.

I have to state here and now that I am concerned that the President's plan is, first of all, very late; secondly, may be based on unrealistic assumptions.

We have been told that there is a comprehensive strategy and a multinational coalition of the willing to fight the terrorists who have gained massive amounts of ground in both Syria and Iraq. To date, neither the Congress nor the American people have been told all of the details on that strategy or how it will be implemented.

The President has repeatedly proclaimed that there will be no American boots on the ground, but our constituents should not be misled. There are American boots on the ground currently in Iraq, and there is a strong likelihood there may be boots on the ground in Syria and, in the skies above, planes, and those who fight will remain in harm's way.

The White House is relying on so-called moderate rebel groups to fight ISIS, groups that do not and will not exist in any great numbers and whose primary target is the Syrian dictator, President Assad. How do you reconcile those competing goals?

Indeed, there are many complicated questions in a complicated region of the world with ever-shifting alliances and loyalties, but this is where the terrorists who want to do us harm have taken hold.

Despite reservations and questions, we must take action. The threat is real, and ISIS must be confronted now. I support the McKeon amendment because it will provide the experts and the Department of Defense the authority they need to put together a clearly defined, realistic strategy and address unanswered questions for both this Congress and our constituents.

That, however, does not and must not mean that Congress will cede its constitutional obligations. We must exercise our responsibilities and not give the President a blank fiscal check.

I commend Chairman MCKEON for recognizing that Congress must be informed and a full partner with the administration. This amendment does not provide the administration with the blank check they originally sought.

In this measure, we provide authority for a limited train-and-equip program with strong congressional oversight. This amendment does not allow any funds, be they appropriated funds or foreign-partner funds, without prior notification and approval to congressional defense committees in accordance with standard reprogramming procedures.

This amendment does not—I repeat, does not—provide an authorization for the use of military force. Indeed, the amendment includes language that makes it explicitly clear that this train-and-equip authority is not an authorization for the use of military force.

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

Mr. MCKEON. I yield the chairman an additional minute.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I support this amendment. ISIS needs to be confronted, and sooner rather than later. However, in the weeks and months to come, this House must use its oversight powers under the Constitution to monitor this strategy and demand changes when and if it falters.

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I listened with considerable interest to the exposition just given by our colleague. I find myself in agreement with much of what was said, particularly the concerns, the unknowns, and the fact that this amendment is going to wind up in

a CR, and we are going to be voting on the CR and the amendment, whether we like the amendment or not, or we shut down government. That causes me great concern.

My real concern is beyond just this amendment, limited as it is. And I thank the chairman for making this as limited—it ends sometime in December, I think December 11; that is good. The fact that the reporting is there; that is good. The fact that we are knowingly going to find ourselves right smack in the middle of a civil war that has gone on for 3 years and the previous 3 we couldn't figure out which side we wanted to be on and who we wanted to work with, apparently we now know who we want to work with, or at least we will find out who we want to work with. A lot of unknowns here, a lot of concerns.

The big concern is this, and that is that the administration presently does not intend to have the Congress of the United States carry out its constitutional responsibility to declare a war or not. They have figured out a way to avoid having the Congress deal with the most fundamental of issues.

They claim that the 2001–2002 authorization to use force in Afghanistan and in Iraq is sufficient to carry on what may be an unending war in Iraq and, quite possibly, in Syria. The War Powers Act has been pushed aside. We don't need to worry about that, says the administration. We don't have to vote because they have these other two authorizations to use force still in effect.

This is not right. This is a new war, a continuation of the problem that has existed in this area for more than 1400 years. So now it is in for a dime; we are going to be in for many, many dollars and many, many people.

My plea to the Congress, my plea to all my colleagues is this is not the step. This is but one small, little movement towards a much larger. And will we have the courage to carry out our constitutional responsibility and take up the larger issue of what to do with airstrikes and beyond?

For me, we ought to be voting on that larger issue. I believe the administration is dead wrong in saying they don't need to come back to Congress for a larger issue of an authorization to use force.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), my friend and colleague, the vice chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the chairman's amendment.

I am very much in sympathy with the comments that have been expressed here on the floor that we should have a larger debate about the Authorization for Use of Military Force. That is not, however, what is before us with the chairman's amendment. And I understand some people would like for it to be.

But what we have before us here is a specific request that the President has made for train-and-equip authority for certain Syrians to help provide ground forces against ISIL.

I think, just for perspective, it is important to remember that the United States has been involved in training and equipping security forces in over 40 countries. We haven't gotten into a war in all of those. This is something we know how to do, and we do it competently all around the world.

But I completely agree with those who say this is a very complex, volatile situation, and there are considerable doubts about whether the President's approach is going to be successful. There are especially doubts about whether his policy will be carried out with a seriousness of purpose and a perseverance that is required against such a formidable opponent. I confess, I share those doubts.

But, at the same time, two facts seem clear to me. One is that ISIL is a significant threat. It is not the junior varsity. It is the best-equipped, best-trained, best-financed terror organization and has several thousand people with Western passports that are a part of it.

Secondly, is that a threat like this will not be eliminated from the air. And so what that means is you are going to have to have some sort of forces from the ground. Now, some of them need to be the Kurds; some of them need to be the Iraqis. But you need to have some sort of competent ground force in Syria as well or else it becomes a safe haven. So that is where this train-and-equip authority to help develop that competent ground force inside from Syria is important. But it is only—and I think everybody acknowledges this—it is only one small part of what needs to be a much broader strategy.

□ 1545

Mr. Speaker, despite all the doubts and concerns, having a competent ground force inside Syria with whom we can talk, with whom we can work, whatever the course of events there, has got to be a useful thing.

But for the moment, between now and December 11 or so, giving the President this authority that he has asked for so he can take advantage of some offers from other countries, so he can begin the preparations for this training, seems to me to make sense. We give him this authority with all the checks and oversights that have been described and are very important. We give him this authority, and, Mr. Speaker, it is up to the President to make it work.

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

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me thank you so very much for giving me this opportunity to address the House.

I think today and tomorrow may be recorded in history as one of the most serious decisions that this Congress has had to make. Personally, I don't know enough to see where the President needs authority to do what we are about to allow him to do because of a threat to the United States of America.

I have talked with everyone that is willing to listen to me in my congressional district and they have given me a whole lot of things that they are concerned about. But I haven't come close, as much as they love this President of the United States, in convincing them that training people overseas that we don't know to fight ISIS is in their best national interest.

The point that I asked to come to the floor is that it is so easy to try to bring justice to a situation if it doesn't cause you anything or any inconvenience. Already we have lost trillions of dollars and over 6,000 lives in this area, and I don't think we have yet to declare war.

What I am suggesting on drafting legislation is that if it does reach the time that this honorable body is prepared to discuss all of the issues and determine whether or not any enemy is a threat to the United States and that we are going to go to war with them, that we should attach to that two provisions that would force every American to evaluate whether or not they believe that they are prepared to make sacrifices.

One of them, of course, is a war tax. These last wars, the only people who have suffered were those people who had boots on the ground or those people who know people or those people who went to the funerals. Certainly those that have gained profit because we needed their services overseas, they haven't made any sacrifices.

When it comes down to discretionary spending, what I consider a threat to the United States of America is our failure to provide money for research, for development, for education, for jobs, for infrastructure. But if we attach the two things to any bill where we are prepared to debate and determine whether our great Nation is being threatened, then I don't think it is asking too much of Americans to be able to say, yes, we are willing to pay taxes for it, and, yes, we are ready to have mandatory recruitment of young men and women who are prepared to say that if our Nation is in trouble we all should be doing something.

But all these people that are willing to fight with other people's kids I think is not the standard that this august body should have.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of today's amendment to authorize the training and equipping of appropriately vetted elements of Syrian opposition to combat the Islamic

State of Iraq and Syria, better known as ISIS.

I have been to the border of Turkey and Syria and met with opposition leaders and refugees, which now total more than 2 million people, and I have seen the ramifications of standing on the sidelines of this conflict, such as increased risk to our national security and interests, regional instability, and immense human suffering.

ISIS poses a serious and grave threat to the United States and it must be destroyed. This action alone will not topple ISIS, but it is a foundational element of any broad effort to root out this barbaric terrorist army and prevent its followers from taking further hold in the Middle East and one day, as they have threatened to do, bring their brutality here to our homeland.

Ongoing efforts by the brave men and women of our U.S. military, in coordination with regional partners, have blunted ISIS's territorial gains in Iraq and have granted some reprieve to persecuted Christians and other ethnic minorities.

But fully destroying ISIS will require striking at its center of gravity, which includes eliminating safe havens and bases of operation in Syria. Supporting those in Syria who are also committed to this fight is a necessary step.

I believe today's amendment does establish strict parameters and rigorous oversight to ensure that training and equipping Syrian opposition forces does not aid the Assad regime or undermine the mission to destroy ISIS.

Recent events have reminded us all that barbarity, evil, and uncertainty still exists in the world. ISIS is the latest front in civilization's struggle against radical extremists, and now is the time to act.

I want to make sure, too, that we bring to bear the weight and might of our strong Nation in cooperation with our partners to destroy ISIS and the threat it poses, understanding that we must continue to request and receive more specifics on how these efforts will be prosecuted.

This resolution, I must remind folks, does not authorize the use of military force, only the training and equipping of these forces. It is the first step of many steps in which Congress must be involved in addressing this threat. That is our constitutional responsibility. Today's effort is that first step. But we must not forget that we have to continue to remain involved as a Congress in the future efforts this Nation takes against this extremist threat and others around the world.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The subject of boots on the ground came up, and I think this is a really important point for why this debate has been so divisive. So many people are concerned about this action.

I think what we all want to do is we want to confront the threat that is ISIS, which has been well described. The violence that this group has perpetrated on people in their region and foreigners is unimaginable. Make no mistake about it: if they are allowed to spread, that violence will spread as well.

But there is concern about the U.S. getting again engaged in that part of the world because of Iraq and Afghanistan. A number of my colleagues have raised the issue of: Well, gosh, we put 150,000 U.S. troops into Iraq, we left, and 2 years later it had all fallen apart. We are in Afghanistan, there is still a raging violence of a war going on there. Here we go again, basically. Have we not learned our lessons?

I believe the boots on the ground comment shows in an odd way that we have learned our lesson. We are not going to do a full-scale military commitment to Iraq. Now, I think a lot of people are against ISIS. I think a lot of people mistake that we are not going to do that, not so much because it wouldn't work, but because we just don't want to do that. We don't want to spend the money and risk the lives.

That is not really the case. The reason we are not going to do a full-scale U.S. military commitment is because a lesson that we have learned in the last 12 years is the limitations of the ability of the U.S. military to bend cultures in this part of the world to their will. It doesn't work. That is why we are not going to send in the U.S. military.

Because then you set up a situation where you have a fight between, in the minds of the people in that part of the world, the evil West and Islam. If you set up that dynamic, we cannot win.

Now, that means that we can't do the full-scale military commitment. But what we can do is we can enable partners. I know there is considerable concern about the fact that we spent a lot of money, supposedly enabling partners in Iraq, and when ISIS came rolling across the border of Syria they simply melted away.

Now, two things:

Number one, I would submit to you that they melted away because of what the Maliki government had done to alienate the entire Sunni population. It wasn't that they couldn't fight; it is that they chose not to because they did not want to fight on behalf of what was essentially a sectarian corrupt Shia government. The Sunnis would not fight on behalf of them.

But also I want to point out, we have successfully trained militaries around the world. If you look at the Horn of Africa and the threat that we faced in Somalia, we have trained Ethiopia and Kenya and Uganda.

They have been incredibly effective fighting forces. Across the Red Sea in Yemen, we have trained the Yemenis as they confront al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula. Not as clearly effective as we have had in the Horn of Africa, but, nonetheless, they have contained the threat.

I was, on a much smaller scale, in the Philippines a number of years back where we trained the Filipino authorities to try to contain various terrorist threats down there.

It has been effective. Just because it wasn't effective in Iraq doesn't mean that it can't be effective to train an indigenous force to effectively fight the fight that we want them to fight. But it can't be just the U.S. military.

Now, the final point on the boots on the ground issue that I think is a bit misleading: we are all searching for that clear-cut way to say: We will do this but we won't do that; we won't go too far, we won't take that step that makes us too big a U.S. military engagement.

The problem is there is no black-and-white line here. There is no way to define that. There is no way to say: Well, okay, if we step across this line then there is no going back. In fact, I have heard the concern raised we are sending in advisers, and, gosh, everybody knows that when you send in advisers the next thing you know you have got 500,000 troops and 70,000 U.S. soldiers dead. That is what happened in Vietnam. That is not what happens every time you send in advisers from the cases that I cited a moment ago. It doesn't have to be that way.

The boots on the ground issue is, I think, effectively simple and straightforward. We have already had boots on the ground, but we are not going to make this a U.S. military-led fight because it cannot be. It would not be successful if it was. This is going to be an effort to train and equip and advise, to build a force that can confront ISIS. Because right now in Syria, it is a choice between Assad and ISIS for too many people. A good number of those people would love to have another option.

Don't read into the fact that some people are joining ISIS the belief that somehow they are absolutely aligned with them. They oppose Assad; ISIS is, in many cases, the only game in town. We need to give them another option: a Sunni-led indigenous force that we train and equip to help begin the process of getting to the point where they can be a legitimate force. It will not be a short process. It just won't. It is going to take time. But ISIS needs to be confronted. This is the first necessary step in doing that. We can't do it without local partners taking the lead. This is a way to get those local partners the capability to get there.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, there are many who support this amendment. There are many who feel like it is not enough.

I would like to just relay a couple of instances.

I just returned from the Middle East. I met with leaders of Israel, Jordan, Egypt, Morocco. And one of the things that I think needs to be addressed, and the people—the people—need to understand this: who ISIL is. In about 600 AD, people moved—Arab people—

moved into the area that they called Levant. They controlled that area—it took them about 50 years to conquer it—and they controlled it from about 650 AD to about 1500 AD, when they were defeated by the Ottoman Empire.

□ 1600

That area comprised what we now know as part of Egypt, Israel, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq, Iran. It was a huge area. ISIL wants to go back to that same area. They want to control that same area. They want to set up a caliphate so that they can then export terrorism around the world, and they are going to be brutal about it. They have great designs. They are willing to do anything it takes to win.

I don't know why it seems like, when the President talks, the first thing he says is, ''No boots on the ground.'' As was just mentioned by the ranking member, there are boots on the ground. We have a force of over a thousand right now in Iraq. As he explained, their army kind of wilted for the reasons that he gave.

I talked to General Petraeus the other day, and he said their army will fight, but there are certain things that they need that only we can provide, and that is what we can provide without entering into the combat, without putting in divisions, without putting in what I guess is the reference to boots on the ground, which is a certain number—and I don't know what that number is—but we are not going to do that. That is not what we are talking about.

Saying we are not going to have boots on the ground is just kind of not being totally truthful with the American people. There are and will continue to be boots on the ground. They will provide training. They will provide leadership. They will provide ISR.

They will provide the intelligence and the things necessary for the Iraqis to be successful in pushing ISIL out of the ground that they have conquered and taken. They will be able to take it back.

What we are talking about is the ability to go in and train Syrian forces so they will be able to take back territory that they have lost in Syria and, by doing so, that will deprive ISIL of having a safe haven so, as they are pushed out of Iraq, they won't be able to go into Syria.

We need to envelop them and end their mission right there. Don't let them get into Lebanon and Jordan and these other countries. Don't let them squeeze out into those countries. We need to stop them now. The leaders in that area told me how big this threat was. They said, ''Don't think the oceans are going to protect you now. They will not.''

We all know that one of the big threats over there is foreign fighters entering into this fight. A lot of them have passports and will be able to enter back into Europe and come to this country and do a lot of serious things that we don't want to see happen. We would rather fight them there than here. That is the purpose of this amendment and the thing that we are talking about right now.

ISIL is a dangerous threat right now, and we need to address them right now. They are going very rapidly. They are very well-funded and well-led. They are fighting as an army, not as a little ragtag terrorist group. We need to address them that way.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), my good friend and a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of his amendment.

Mr. Speaker, last January, ISIS retook Fallujah. Eight months later, President Barack Obama told Americans, ''We don't have a strategy yet.''

It was 7 years ago, Mr. Speaker, that George Bush warned:

> To begin withdrawing before our commanders tell us we are ready would mean surrendering the future of Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, he could not have been more right.

If you delete all the things Mr. Obama so very unwisely said he would not do, most of what remains of his plan is in keeping with the Bush doctrine.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe President Obama owes George Bush an apology, along with the men and women who freed Iraq and then watched their blood-bought gains evaporate while this administration stood by as women and children were beheaded, crucified, raped, and sold into slavery.

We must make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker. It was the vacillation and the tepid and inept leadership of President Obama that brought us where we are today, and, now, even though this administration is still inexplicably unwilling to admit it, we do, indeed, face a jihadist enemy that is more dangerous than ever, and it is now more vital than ever that this Congress, the President of the United States, and the American people commit ourselves to doing whatever is necessary to destroy this enemy before its insidious hand reaches into the heartland of America.

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

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), my friend and colleague and a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the McKeon amendment to authorize the training and equipping of appropriately vetted members of the Syrian opposition.

I believe that Chairman MCKEON has crafted language which strikes the appropriate balance between giving the President the authority he is requesting while also ensuring that Congress maintains oversight of our efforts to combat ISIL.

However, let me be clear. We are only here today because of President Obama's weak and failed leadership. My criticism of the President is not about party politics or about his style of leadership but is based, simply, on his failed foreign policy.

Syria is a case study in Obama's failed policy. He drew an arbitrary red line and spectacularly failed to enforce it. We also lost the opportunity to support moderate dissidents in Syria when it would have done the most good.

Next door, in Iraq, President Obama raced for the exit for political reasons instead of recognizing that the threat from Islamic extremists could quickly return without some sort of counterweight. He didn't end the war in Iraq; he merely abandoned it.

The bottom line is that ISIL was a regional threat that has metastasized into a threat to our allies in the region, including Israel, and to us here at home.

Unfortunately, the President's failed foreign policy is not isolated to ISIL. The President's reset with Russia was worthless. Obama's ''leading from behind'' intervention in Libya has created another haven for terrorists there.

Our allies in Europe are threatened by Russia, and our allies in Asia are threatened by China. Iran does not seem to be slowing its efforts to destroy Israel. None of these are easy problems, but President Obama has failed to provide clear and strong American leadership in each case, and, in each case, America and the world are worse off as a result.

Let's provide training to moderates who will fight ISIL and hope the President's slowness of action hasn't made it too late.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today is a very important day. Today, the House is debating on a continuing resolution and also an amendment to that resolution which would authorize under title 10 the expenditure of $500 million to train moderate Syrian opposition forces.

This is not an authorization for the use of military force. It is just simply for the limited purpose which I just stated, but I feel compelled to go a little bit further as to why it is necessary that we be in favor of that amendment to the CR as well as the CR itself.

If we do nothing against the ISIL threat, if we choose to be isolationists and take a wait-and-see attitude, the chances are great that the situation will get worse. When it gets worse, that means ISIL gets more powerful. They have been on the run lately, and they have gotten more powerful now.

I know people on the other side of the aisle will say that it is the President's fault that ISIL got this strong, but ISIL would not have gotten this strong had it not been for the instability that we created ourselves when we went into Iraq and went to war for an illegitimate purpose, and so we disrupted the stability in that region, and we are still recovering from it now.

What do we do now? I would much rather have a President that is thoughtful, deliberate, careful, and moderate in terms of the use of military force than to have a trigger-happy, shoot first, ask questions later type of President. We have seen what that got us.

Our President has taken a very reasonable, modest approach. We have not put massive amounts of armaments in Syria that could now be used against us. He was smart enough not to do that; but, now, we have the situation where, due to a number of forces outside of our control, ISIL has gotten bigger, has gotten more menacing, has gotten stronger, and it is a distant threat to our homeland, but it is a threat.

What do you do when the wolf is barking out, saying, ''I'm coming to get you,'' what do you do?

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. What do you do when the wolf is in front of the door? Do you move back from the door and then kneel down and pray and hope that everything is okay? Or do you take some action?

In this kind of situation, the wolf is not at the door yet, but the wolf is coming. The wolf has told you that he is coming. There is a lot of logic into taking preemptive measures to make sure that the wolf does not come to the door.

I would rather have the fight there than have it here. The limited fight that we are going to do is the use of our air power, once we train what is called moderate Syrians—opposition.

I don't know how that is going to turn out, but I do know that we have no choice but to do something. We must build up the ground forces over there with our partner nations to enter the fight on the ground. We support them.

I support this resolution offered by the chairman of the HASC Committee.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for yielding and for his continued leadership on this issue of grave importance to our Nation.

I support the chairman's amendment because I believe we must do everything we can to defeat this vile enemy known as ISIL. Time is of the essence here. With each passing day, ISIL continues to get stronger.

The President has finally asked for a very limited authorization, not of force, but for training and supplying. Based upon the information that I have received, I believe that arming and training Syrian rebels is an important first step.

Just a few weeks ago, I joined Chairman MCKEON and a few other colleagues on a trip to the Middle East. While there, we met with numerous foreign leaders and defense officials. One thing became very clear: there is regional interest and support for defeating ISIL, but they are waiting on our leadership.

I believe arming and training the Syrian rebels to be a necessary step, but I do not believe it alone will be sufficient. Just this morning, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin Dempsey, expressed more action will likely be needed.

Our enemy should not just be degraded or contained. Our enemy must be defeated.

□ 1615

In order to accomplish that objective, more action will be needed, including overt help from Sunni Muslims in the region and air attacks from the United States.

It is also important to note the safeguards Chairman MCKEON has written into this amendment. This amendment requires that each fighter be thoroughly vetted by the Department of Defense and that regular progress reports be provided to Congress.

I firmly believe that a new Authorization for the Use of Military Force is needed to specifically address ISIL and new action in Syria. The current AUMFs from 2001 and 2002 are simply not applicable to this conflict, and I hope the President will recognize the article I, section 8 powers of this Congress, which are exclusive, and ask us for a new AUMF. That is why this resolution explicitly states that it does not give President Obama authority to send new U.S. forces into combat in Syria.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my dear friend from California.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this amendment. The President has laid out a bold and decisive strategy to lead a multilateral operation designed to degrade and ultimately defeat ISIL.

This is a threat the United States, sooner or later, must address. I prefer sooner. ISIL's acts of genocide are undermining the stability of Iraq, threatening our partners in the Kurdistan region, and reversing gains made by moderate forces in Syria.

I believe Congress has a constructive and collaborative role to play here in the effort to eliminate the ISIL threat. I appreciate that the measure before us takes a step in that direction while addressing many concerns that have been raised about the effort to train and equip the moderate Syrian opposition.

First, the amendment provides for careful congressional oversight. The Department of Defense must report to Congress on the vetting process for trainees 15 days prior to providing any such assistance. The President must report to Congress on how this operation fits within our overall regional strategy, and the Department of Defense must submit a report every 90 days updating Congress on the status of this operation. These are prudent measures and consistent with the constitutional role of congressional oversight.

Second, this amendment does not provide a blank check for military operations. No additional funds are provided by this measure, and the Department of Defense must submit any reprogramming requests to this Congress.

Third, this is not an open-ended commitment. The limited activities authorized by this amendment will remain in effect until the earlier of the date of the expiration of the CR or the enactment of the 2015 National Defense Authorization Act.

Almost 1 year ago, in response to the President's consultation with Congress on the deepening crisis in Syria, I introduced a resolution authorizing the President to carry out airstrikes against the Assad regime. In that case, Congress chose to demur. Today I hope we act not only on this resolution, but ultimately on a new Authorization for Use of Military Force allowing the President to carry out airstrikes against ISIL. The 2001 AUMF has gone stale, and it is time for a new, focused AUMF targeting ISIL.

I believe the President would find bipartisan support here in Congress for airstrikes in Iraq and Syria. This tactic, thus far, has effectively bolstered our partners on the ground, protected American assets, and facilitated the humanitarian missions.

But instead of taking up this charge and debating issues of war and peace, we are about to break for another recess. While I support the measure before us today, I hope Congress will do more to assert its constitutional role and responsibility and act as a stakeholder in the fight against this terrorist threat.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON), my friend and colleague, a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his strong leadership of our committee.

I rise in opposition to the amendment. Certainly, the Islamic State is an evil organization and a threat to our country. There is no question on that. I saw that firsthand leading paratroopers in Iraq, al Qaeda in Iraq executing, at close range, Iraqis who were working with us just to provide for a better day for their people. This evil organization has to be defeated. The question is: How?

Well, first of all, we always reserve the right to act in self-defense. If we learn of specific intelligence that the enemy is preparing, planning an attack

on us, we always reserve that right. We will take action to protect our people. But, as the President reported when he spoke to the American people last week, the intelligence community, we do not have that specific intelligence at this moment that they are going to be able to strike our country. So then the question occurs again: What is the smartest way to deal with this threat?

I maintain, based on my experience, escalating in Syria right now is not the best approach. We should instead implement a three-point plan.

Number one, empowering the Iraqi Armed Forces and the Kurdish forces to defeat the Islamic State. We have seen in recent days, with our help, they have been begun to reverse some advances of the Islamic State, and they have a capacity.

As was mentioned earlier, the big issue that they have is they weren't willing to fight and die for that Prime Minister. They didn't have the will to stand up because they didn't believe. Now we have had a new election. They are rallying around, attendant to their constitution, a new government, and they do need our support, and we should be standing there with them.

Why is it so important that we do it that way?

Well, our enemy, the Islamic State, is trying to frame this struggle as one, in their words, between the believers and the nonbelievers. There is certainly an element here, but it goes much broader than that.

In the main, what is really at stake is what is happening to the mainstream Muslims in Iraq and Syria. Why this is so important is, when we help the Iraqi Army and the Kurdish forces to defeat militarily the Islamic State, that also lessens the ability of the Islamic State to recruit and to fundraise internationally. Long-term, that is what is key to success here.

So, number one, empower the Iraqi Armed Forces and the Kurdish forces.

Number two, we have not set the conditions for actions in Syria. There is no credible partner there. There is no political partner there, and that is really the issue.

What we should be doing is working to compel—working with our friends and our neighbors in the region, other nations across the world, to compel the Government of Syria to get to some brokered agreement with the rebel forces, including what we would call the Free Syrian Army. From that foundation, we will be in a stronger place to complete the final destruction of the Islamic State.

Here is the issue, the big idea that the administration is advancing right now. The big idea is that we need a ground element to support airstrikes.

Now, given my military experience, I understand that and I actually agree with that point. But here is the point: What they are advancing today, what we have learned, is that, at the earliest, we would see a ground force in 6 to 8 months.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, evidently I am not going to get any more time. I ask the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) for 1 minute.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GIBSON. So the issue is that here it is, the administration saying that they need a ground partner to conduct these air attacks, but we are not even going to have a ground partner for 6 to 8 months, and they are talking about launching airstrikes within a month. This is a problem.

The other problem is these forces on the ground have not shown themselves to be militarily competent nor politically trustworthy. We should work politically in Syria. That is the second point.

The third point is we ought to secure our borders, commonsense point. But look, they have expressed the desire to attack our country, and we need to protect ourselves from that.

So empower the Iraqi Armed Forces and the Kurds, work politically to get a partner in Syria, and secure our borders. And reject this amendment, with all due respect.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, taking military action is the gravest responsibility of our government, and I take my role in helping to decide our Nation's policies very seriously.

I support the current plan to engage and ultimately destroy ISIL, but it won't be successful unless we can enlist an alliance of nations within the region that are fully and demonstrably committed to true democratic inclusion and are willing to fight for their own freedom. Mr. Speaker, I don't see how we can ally ourselves with nations that turned a blind eye to having their citizens send money to the very terrorists we are about to engage.

This effort will take time and should include training potential allied military units in nonbattlefield locations and providing appropriate arms to competent and reliable allied military units. Meanwhile, the President must demonstrate America's commitment to the region by using very limited American airpower in conjunction with local military units to help prevent additional ISIL territorial gains.

I do not support the involvement of American ground troops beyond their training mission or the excessive use of American airpower. Both of these are not needed and would likely be counterproductive in the end.

While I support this amendment and I thank the chairman for proposing this amendment, I want to urge my colleagues to consider the long-term effects of authorizing force to our soldiers, to the innocent civilians, and to the sustained stability in the Middle East.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), my friend and colleague.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the McKeon amendment to train and equip vetted Syrian opposition groups.

ISIL is a terrorist group, organization, that threatens our allies, savagely murders Americans and others. It threatens our national security interests, and it must be destroyed. It must be destroyed, including in Syria.

Now, however, Mr. Speaker, I have serious reservations about the President's plan. It is no lie that there is a trust gap with this President. Unfortunately, the President has consistently ignored what was clear to just about everyone else. The President must start listening to the advice and the guidance of our senior military commanders. Against the advice of his generals, the President prematurely withdrew from Iraq so he could claim a political victory. Unfortunately, the enemy continued to fight. There is a trust gap.

More recently, according to press reports, the President has already dismissed some of the preferred recommendations of his generals in favor of a more limited role for our Armed Forces. Mr. Speaker, there is a trust gap. We know that airstrikes and training and equipping and vetting the Syrian opposition groups are necessary, but as we have heard, it is not sufficient.

Will the President do what is sufficient, what is necessary? There is a trust gap.

What President are we supposed to believe and trust, the one who, in August, said that those Syrian opposition forces were, frankly, not a real thing, or the one who now says that they are the ones who are going to defeat ISIS? There is a trust gap.

Unfortunately, the President has refused to lead until the opinion polls kind of pushed him to it. So that is why I am so grateful, Mr. Chairman, for the language that you have to have robust oversight and increased transparency and that the administration must keep Congress up to speed on planning and logistics.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can stop repeating the mistakes of the past. It is time for the President to treat this threat like what it is—a national security threat to the United States—and that he listens to his generals.

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

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the McKeon amendment to train and equip vetted Syrian

opposition groups and to confront the threat posed to our Nation by ISIL.

ISIL are thugs, murderers. They are monsters, and they must be stopped. Their trail of destruction and slaughter of innocent men, women, and children must be stopped.

ISIL has laid out their goals and their strategy, and that is to reestablish a caliphate and death to anyone who stands in their way, or, to use their motto, ''convert or die.'' They must be destroyed.

Now is the time for the United States to make clear our goals and our strategy, that we will not stand by idly. We will not watch and wait for the slaughtering of more innocent civilians.

I am pleased that the President has finally committed to some action. It should have happened months ago, if not a year ago.

□ 1630

The President has been timid for far too long. It is time to act. By coming together as a unified body to take this important step, we will tell the world that America stands together in opposition to global terrorism and to the monsters of ISIL.

This amendment to train and equip vetted Syrian opposition groups sends a clear signal to our European allies that we are committed to eradicating ISIL and that we hope they will join us in this effort. It sends a message to moderate Arabs and Muslims in the region and around the world that we stand with them against terrorism.

This amendment strengthens the Commander in Chief's request for ensuring that Congress has oversight and greater transparency, which is our constitutional duty. We must do all we can on every front to ensure these killers do not gain one more inch of ground in their pursuit of a terrorist state. With this amendment, we send a firm message that America is not going to allow this cancer to spread.

Congress must act now. For that reason, I strongly support this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting ''yes'' to send a clear, strong, overwhelming message that a bipartisan Congress stands with the President to defeat ISIL and all evil everywhere.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, we have to applaud the President and the Vice President for using all means at their disposal to track down the killers of the journalists, but it can be and should be done in the same way we tracked down Osama bin Laden—using our intelligence, using our selective capabilities, and making sure that these murderers and these killers have no safe refuge.

Having said that, launching airstrikes on another country by any standard, by any definition, is an act of war. Now, whether you think it is a good idea or not, it requires this Congress to step up and assume its responsibility and make that declaration. Have we not had enough of imperial Presidencies doing whatever they like anywhere in the world? When are we going to step up and assume our responsibility?

Now, with regard to this amendment, make no mistake about it: we have been on the side of every side in this conflict going back to al Qaeda. That was the Mujahedeen. We armed them because they were the enemy of our enemy. Then we supported Saddam Hussein. Oh, no. Wait a minute. Let's overthrow him, and let's put the Shiites in power. Then we said no, no, no. Wait a minute. They are not being nice to the Sunnis; so let's give arms and money to the Sunnis. And we refer to this Free Syrian Army as moderates?

Read the paper. I can't talk about what we saw and heard in our briefings, but that is the Muslim Brotherhood. Did you hear the latest news? It just came out over the wire. I would bet you guys haven't heard it. The founder of the Free Syrian Army, the one we are going to give $5 billion to, Riad al-Asaad—he just said we are not going to use that money to fight ISIS. No, no, no. We are fighting Assad. Oh, wait a minute. We were going to attack Assad last year, and now we want to fight people who are going to keep Assad in power? What are we doing?

The definition of ''insanity'' is doing the same thing over and over and over and over again and expecting different results. In this case, make no mistake about it, we have given arms to every element in this conflict, with the notion that somehow the enemy of our enemy is our friend. At the end of the day, we have no friends in this conflict. Either directly or inadvertently, they end up using the arms and the weapons that we have supplied against—yes, you guessed who—us.

It is time to wake up. It is time to put an end to it. It is time for this Congress to step up. It is so much responsibility that the Constitution could not be more clear on who declares war. It is the Congress of the United States, not the President of the United States.

My fellow colleagues, please, I beg you—I plead with you—to step up. Assume our obligations here. If there is a declaration to be made, let's make it. Most importantly, right now, let us reject this amendment and stop pouring money into this conflict that goes back thousands of years and can only be resolved by the people in that region and a part of that conflict.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, at the President's request and in the amendment that we are debating—we got a little bit far afield there—there is no request for money. The President says he doesn't need any additional moneys to carry this out. All he needs is the authority to go into Saudi Arabia and take their offer of training the Syrians to be able to go home and defend their homeland.

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for his leadership on this amendment even though I cannot support it. All I can say is, here we go again, committing our resources—both troops and money—to a conflict that can easily become a war without end.

ISIS is more an immediate threat to the Middle East than to our Nation. Where is the greater Middle East commitment to combat this threat? Why are they not providing the greater commitment of resources to defend their own countries? Is it not ridiculous that the United States borrows money to buy friendship, to buy arms, and to train those who could today be our friends but tomorrow be our enemies?

A former commandant of the Marine Corps recently asked me this question, and I now ask the House of Representatives: Are we simply arming and training another Taliban? That is from a former commandant of the Marine Corps.

We all agree this is a difficult and challenging issue, but a strategy with no end state is a failed strategy, and I am concerned that the commitment we make today will become an ongoing commitment for which we truly do not grasp its consequences until it is too late. That is what my concern is and the concern of the American people.

I think about the $1.7 trillion we spent in Afghanistan and Iraq. I think about the 4,000 Americans who gave their lives, the 30,000 wounded, the 100,000 Iraqis who were killed—and here we go again. I don't care if the President is a Democrat or a Republican. This is a failed policy, and it will be proven to be a failed policy.

I close with this, Mr. Speaker. I listened to Mr. RANGEL very carefully. This is a quote from Pat Buchanan: Is it not an act of senility to borrow from the world to defend the world?

It is absolute senility.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my friend from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we ought to focus on what is the appropriate foreign policy and what is the appropriate role in Congress.

I rise in support of this amendment.

In fact, the amendment is quite similar to the Free Syria Act, which was introduced by several of us, under the leadership of ELIOT ENGEL, a year and a half ago. That approach of vetting appropriate Syrian forces and of providing training was a good but difficult policy then. It is a good and even more difficult policy now.

We have to vet those we train, and it should only be certain elements of the Free Syrian Army in that we should only cooperate with those who are not only going to stand up for the Sunni majority but protect the Christian and Alawite minorities, and we have to arm

only those who are strong enough and careful enough not to lose the weapons we give them to more extremist forces.

This arming of the Syrian rebels is part of an overall plan that will include American military action. There is general agreement of no boots on the ground or at least of no boots on the front lines, but let us speak honestly to the American people. The American people are asking for a guaranteed, successful plan that would provide the immediate and total destruction of ISIS, with very few or no American casualties. Such a plan cannot be created. Instead, the policy that this amendment is part of will contain and weaken and punish ISIS and keep limited American casualties, and hopefully avoid them altogether.

We must remember that the enemies of ISIS are nearly as evil and are probably more dangerous than ISIS itself. Those enemies include Assad, who has killed well over 100,000 of his own people and gassed many of them until he faced world pressure; Iran and Hezbollah, which have killed many hundreds, if not thousands, of Americans; and the Iraqi Shiite militias, including Mr. Maliki, who created the situation on the ground in Iraq which led to the creation of ISIS.

What is the role of Congress?

We look at article I and article II of the Constitution, with different roles for the President of the United States and Congress in military policy. Thomas Jefferson determined it was necessary to get the approval from Congress before he deployed marines to the shores of Tripoli—our first non-declared war, our first intervention in the Middle East. That wisdom is reflected in the War Powers Act, adopted in 1973. That act, I think, is a fair, constitutional, and reasonable clarification of the interaction of article I and article II—the war powers of the Congress and the Commander in Chief power of the President.

Now, under some questioning, the President and his administration have finally come up with their theory as to why Congress has already authorized the military action he anticipates. And that is, this Congress, in 2001, authorized every effort to go after al Qaeda. The forces of ISIS are a group that joined al Qaeda after 2001 and left al Qaeda a year ago or so. Does this mean you can leave al Qaeda, or are you always part of al Qaeda? Do we have several al Qaedas? How many angels can dance on the head of a pin?

The President's authority to engage in this war is questionable. The fact that he is stretching the 2001 War Powers Act resolution is not commendable, but this Congress has also failed to play its role. We wrote a resolution in 2001. Instead of revising it, we leave it there, and then some of us are upset that the President stretches it or applies it to circumstances not then anticipated. We should be revising and repealing the War Powers Resolutions of 2001 and 2002, and we as a Congress should indicate what we think is the appropriate foreign and military policy. Instead, we focus only on the narrowest part of the President's policy. In doing so, we join with several administrations in being part of the multidecade decline of the role of Congress.

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

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

Mr. SHERMAN. By our failure to repeal and replace the War Powers Act resolution, which no longer fits current circumstances, we are complicit with many administrations in the multidecade decline of the role of this Congress in shaping American foreign policy.

I look forward to restoring the balance provided by our Founders, to following the policies followed in the Jefferson administration, in following the War Powers Act, and in crafting a resolution applicable to today's circumstances rather than abdicating our responsibility and sitting back as the President stretches words that were never intended to apply to the situation we face in Iraq today.

□ 1645

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

Mr. STEWART. I thank the chairman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of serving for 14 years as a pilot in the Air Force, flying both combat rescue helicopters and the B–1, an aircraft which, by the way, has dropped a disproportionate amount of the ordnance on Afghanistan and Iraq.

I have spent weeks traveling through the area, meeting with various leaders. I have listened to this debate, and I have tried to weigh all sides while we look for a solution to a very difficult problem in an impossibly difficult part of the world, and, even now, it is with reluctance that I am willing to stand and take a stance in support of this amendment, but I have simply reached the conclusion that we have no other choice.

In meeting with President el-Sisi or Prime Minister Netanyahu or King Abdullah or Foreign Ministers and military leaders, what we heard was nearly universal: Where is the United States? Can we count on you to stand by your allies and your friends?

This fight, this battle against ISIS that our President so reluctantly calls a war is a generational battle. I believe it is the defining battle of our lifetime. We cannot afford to waffle. We have been doing that for far too long now.

Yes, this is a terrible situation. There are no good options. All we have are messy and conflicted options, each of which has their own dangers, but this much is true: there is one very worse option, and that is to do nothing.

We may not trust some of the Syrian rebels. I distrust ISIS even more. We may not like some of the leaders we have to align with. Some of them may prove to be unreliable, but nothing and no one represents more of a threat.

To those who are unwilling to support this amendment, I would ask you: How can you justify doing nothing? That is the only option that we have been given. Do nothing, or do this.

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

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

Mr. STEWART. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, we owe it to our friends and our allies in the region to step up and lead. After months, even years of inaction, the President is finally doing that.

I wish that we were doing more. I wish that we were doing more, but this is the only option that we have been given, and we must at least do this.

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

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

Mr. ROSS. I thank Chairman MCKEON for his leadership on this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, prior to September 11, 2001, terrorist groups had a much different strategy. They remained virtually invisible, and their strategies were unpredictable.

Today, the terrorist threat to America and the free world is on the rise, the enemy is expanding, and that enemy is ISIL. This is an enemy that commits human atrocities and distributes video footage showing brutal human torture.

It is now very clear what threats America and all of the international community face if ISIL is not destroyed.

Two Americans and one British citizen have tragically fallen victim to ISIL's radical terrorist actions. These barbarians are the face of pure evil, and they must be crushed.

We have heard Secretary of State John Kerry call American military actions against ISIL ''significant counterterror'' operations. This is a pitifully weak way to motivate the men and women of our Armed Forces, Mr. Speaker. This is war, and the United States and the free world must be victorious.

The House's action today calls to mind a discussion I recently had with a mother in my district of Bartow, Florida. Aileen Payne is a Gold Star Mother. She is the mother of Corporal Ronald Payne, Jr., the first marine who was killed in combat in Afghanistan.

When we met last week, she exuded a passion for ensuring that Congress has a thoughtful debate on providing the President the authority required by our Constitution to take the fight to ISIL. She understands, perhaps more than most Americans, the significance of putting the lives of American soldiers at risk.

Her son's death came with a very high price, the price of freedom, the price of national security, and the price of victory. She, nor I, want the loss of her son to be in vain.

The amendment we are deliberating today is a step in the right direction. While I support this amendment, I believe the words of this Gold Star Mother must be heard and considered. If we do not develop and implement a strategy, a winning strategy to eradicate ISIL, we will be taking for granted the very freedoms that we have been afforded and defended by our brave troops, now and throughout the history of our country.

Corporal Payne would want us to defend American freedom and defeat terrorism worldwide. He gave his life for that cause.

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

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

Mr. ROSS. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, while this amendment does not represent my ideal military strategy against ISIL, I believe that Congress is fulfilling its constitutional duty today, and I stand in support of its efforts.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Chairman MCKEON, and I want to be very clear about what is at stake here today.

The terrorist group ISIL poses a direct threat to our allies and friends in the Middle East; and, of equal importance, left unchecked, their nihilistic vision could pose a direct threat to the United States, particularly given the number of individuals fighting with ISIL who have American and Western passports.

I am gravely concerned that those individuals could return home and carry out acts of violence against the homeland. We have a clear imperative to act.

These terrorists have brutally murdered two unarmed American journalists and an aid worker from the United Kingdom. They have slaughtered thousands of innocent Muslims, killed children, and committed unspeakable atrocities against women and religious minorities.

ISIL and its agents operate without regard to international borders, and any strategy to degrade and defeat these terrorists must acknowledge this reality. In Iraq, the United States and its allies are operating in support and at the request of the sovereign Government of Iraq, as well as Kurdish forces. We have friendly boots on the ground and U.S. advisers in place, but, in Syria, we lack that clear partnership.

I believe the President has rightly committed to an approach that does not involve U.S. combat troops fighting on foreign soil, but the opposition needs training and equipment that the U.S. and its allies are able to provide.

Our commitment, however, needs to be matched by that of other countries in the region, including Sunni countries with whom the United States has a rich history of partnership. After all, ISIL is not just a problem for the United States. It is also a problem for the many Western countries with citizens fighting overseas.

It is a problem for our NATO allies, for whom Syria is a neighbor, and it is a problem for the safety, security, and the stability of the entire region.

We can't simply kill terrorists and expect to see democracy flourish. We must carefully consider the full range of possible outcomes in Syria and what risks we may incur in a nation and region already riven by years of civil war, the use of weapons of mass destruction, and a terrible humanitarian crisis.

This is an exceedingly complex task but one that we must address. If we do not act, we face a darker, more uncertain future. Congress and the administration must do their parts. Today's amendments are only a down payment on what will assuredly be years of difficult oversight, debate, and discussion.

It is far from a blank check. It will require a great deal of hard work, and there are many legitimate questions that remain unanswered, but we need to act, and I believe that this amendment represents a prudent first step.

I urge my colleagues to support the McKeon amendment.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), my friend and colleague who is a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the leadership for this extended debate. This is an important conversation we should be having, and to have an unprecedented almost 6 hours of debate just reflects how great we do, in fact, consider this.

I also want to thank the leadership for allowing two different votes, a vote on this amendment and then a vote on the CR and not trying, somehow, to combine those two because I think that would have also lessened the gravity of what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, I support this amendment, but I do so with grave reservations, and, in fact, in the speech of the Intelligence Committee, I would give this low confidence that this mission will, in fact, be successful.

Mr. Speaker, there are no Boy Scouts in Syria. There is not anybody over there fighting that you would want to live next door to you in your neighborhood; but, with that said, we will go through under this President's stated plans a vetting process that will try to find those Syrian opposition teams—people, individuals, and/or groups that are secular that are not Islamic jihadist and they are not a part of the Assad regime—in order to create this force that they are talking about.

Mr. Speaker, this will not be in all likelihood the last time we will come to this Chamber and discuss the fight against radical Islam or this fight in Syria. Those discussions may very well be, as General Dempsey said today, involving the deployment of U.S. military assets other than just fighting this thing from the air.

I want to be able at that point in time to say to the American people, ''We have explored every other opportunity, every other way of getting at this, of creating ground forces in Syria, short of sending American troops into harm's way again.'' I think it is what we deserve.

We clearly want to train these Syrians to be able to defend their own country. That is the most successful model. We have had a long experience with doing that, a checkered past in some instances; but, nevertheless, the best alternative, as we see today, is to make that happen.

I would also point out to my colleagues that by December 11, when this authorization expires, we will know a whole lot more than we do today.

Today, we are looking at this whole issue from about 10,000 feet, so to speak. By December 11, if this plan is put into place, we will know what the President specifically has in place. We will know how the President intends to vet. We will know how the President—where and how these training camps will be set up.

We will have the military's evaluation of how that process will work. We will just simply know a whole lot more then than we know today.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to get us to that point. Help us understand the additional facts that we don't have in the RECORD today in order to do that, but, to do that, you will have to support this amendment.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the McKeon amendment to get us in this overall group a better sense of understanding of what might or what might not be accomplishable by this December date, whether it is through a new CR or the omnibus or the NDAA so that, at that point in time, we will make a much more informed decision than we will today.

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

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), my friend and colleague.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, first off, I would just say thank you to Chairman MCKEON for his work and for the leadership's work and, indeed, for providing this time for debate.

As was just stated by my colleague from Texas, I don't think that there is a more sacred vote out there for Members of Congress than on issues of war.

I mean, in its balance hangs life and death. In its balance hangs all kinds of financial and life considerations. In its balance hangs how allies are going to view our actions going forward. This is an incredibly important subject, and, indeed, I thank Chairman MCKEON for his work and the committee's work on this matter.

That having been said, I rise, though, in respectful opposition not to the committee's work but to the actions of the President because I think his approach has been fundamentally flawed. I say that, first off, because I think that step one of an issue of war has to be congressional approval, and I think it is so important based on what the Constitution said for the President, indeed, to come to the Congress to ask for a declaration of war, and he has, quite simply, not done so.

I would then say, ''Okay. On what basis does he move forward?'' If you look at what he and others have said, they hang a large part of their hat on the authorization of 2001, and I think what is interesting here is what the President, himself, said just 2 years ago.

He said, ''The AUMF is now nearly 12 years old. Unless we discipline our thinking, our definitions, our actions, we may be drawn into more wars we don't need to fight or continue to grant Presidents unbound powers more suited for traditional armed conflict between nation states.''

I think that the President was right. I agree with the President; yet members of the administration have been coming to Capitol Hill.

They have been, basically, making the case that with that AUMF they have the authorization to go, in essence, another 25 years. I think that that, again, is mistaken. These are not blank checks. Each war and each war effort needs to be debated in isolated form based on that effort.

□ 1700

I would thirdly say that I think that this effort is fundamentally flawed because what von Clausewitz talked about with regard to war. I don't think, at the end of the day, we are going to affect the military center of gravity of our opponent because, if you look at the center of gravity, I would argue it is their faith, it is their willpower, and it is their motivation.

As we saw with the Nazis and the bombings on London, bombing alone will not change will, and, in some cases, it strengthens resolve. What you are left with is, in the void that is created with bombings, boots on the ground, but, in this case, we are leaving that precious job of boots on the ground to what are described as ''moderate rebels,'' whatever that is, and an example, that we have to look back in what just happened.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the activities of this spring, 1,000 ISIS soldiers routed 30,000 trained soldiers after we spent $25 billion in that process. I think there are a whole host of mistakes and errors in this plan and would respectfully rise in opposition to it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

My colleagues, there are only bad choices left in Syria and Iraq, but, in my opinion, the worst choice of all would be to do nothing. This is an attempt to do something. I want to commend Chairman MCKEON.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the McKeon amendment which would authorize a train-and-equip mission for the vetted moderate Syrian opposition. Again, the worst choice would be to do nothing. This is an attempt to do something. It is urgent that we do it now.

Every day we wait is a day longer that ISIS gets stronger and the opposition gets weaker. Now, I think it should be plainly stated that this is a separate issue from an AUMF. This is separate. This is talking about aiding and abetting the vetted Syrian opposition.

Now, I was in favor of doing this 2 years ago. For 2 years, I have been working to assist the moderate opposition. In early 2013, I introduced the Free Syria Act to provide the Syrian opposition with the weapons they need to fight the Syrian regime and the extremists that now control large parts of Syria and Iraq.

This is authorizing a train-and-equip mission for the vetted moderate Syrian opposition. It isn't perfect, but it is a step forward, and it is far, far better than doing nothing.

Mr. Speaker, since I introduced that legislation, the situation in Syria has gotten much worse. More than 200,000 people have died, and millions have been driven from their homes.

Now, it is impossible to know the answers to the what-if questions. What if we had trained the moderate opposition 2 years ago? What if they had been able to hold territory against Assad and ISIS? What if and what if? We have to deal with what we have now. What might have been, no one will ever know. Right now, this is a very, very important thing for us to do.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that my colleagues are war-weary. I am war-weary. I understand the American people are war-weary. I am war-weary, but, again, I think doing nothing would invite something very similar that happened to my city, New York City, on that fateful day of September 11, 2001.

We kicked the Russians—or the world kicked the Russians out of Afghanistan when that happened; so what happened was we took our eye off the prize; and so we allowed Afghanistan to become a safe haven. We allowed the Taliban to welcome in al Qaeda, and al Qaeda had a safe haven to plot and plan attacks against the U.S. homeland.

That is replicating itself right now in Syria and in Iraq, and, if we do nothing, ISIS will plot and plan, and we will have many more September 11s in the United States, in Europe, and in the Middle East. That is why this is in the national interests, the U.S. national interests, and it is something that we really need to do.

The Foreign Affairs Committee held a hearing last month with the Syrian defector ''Caesar,'' a military photographer who smuggled thousands of images out of Syria to demonstrate the atrocities of the Assad regime. The gruesome photographs of Christians and Muslims—men, women, and children—starved, tortured, and killed by the regime demonstrate the true brutality of Assad and his cronies.

Last month, the American people and the world woke up to the brutality of ISIS which has beheaded two American journalists and murdered countless Christians and other minorities and most recently beheaded someone from the United Kingdom.

A self-financed terrorist group with highly-trained fighters willing to die, ISIS represents an immediate threat to our interests and allies and, if left unchecked, the U.S. homeland.

Terrorism, wherever it rears its ugly head—they are all the same. Whether it is ISIS or ISIL or al Qaeda or Hamas or Hezbollah, they are all terrorists, and they all want to use terror to achieve their political goals.

I see Assad and ISIS as two sides of the same coin. Fighting one must not empower the other. Only fighting Assad would allow ISIS to flourish, but only fighting ISIS would leave Assad in power, and he is the biggest magnet drawing foreign fighters to ISIS. Believe it or not, they have this symbiotic relationship from all around the globe.

This crisis does not end unless the moderate opposition is empowered to show the Syrian people that they can fight ISIS and win and, later on, they will fight Assad and win. Through this strategy, the moderate opposition can gain leverage and create the conditions on the ground to compel a political solution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity to change course in Syria and the region. This authorization can give new hope to the Syrian people and to the people of the region that the United States will stand with them against terrorism.

Like many of my colleagues, I have attended a number of briefings on these matters, and I have noticed a persistent theme.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MESSER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I hope to correct this persistent theme. I have heard from some Members that Syrian Christians would prefer to live under

Assad than the moderate opposition. This is a complete mischaracterization, in my opinion, of the situation in Syria.

Assad may profess to protect Christians, but, in reality, he buys his oil from ISIS; thereby bankrolling them and their massacres of Christians. ISIS would not be able to fund their operations without the Assad regime.

The moderate opposition has publicly stated their acceptance and tolerance of Christians, and the Syrian Christian community has welcomed the U.S. call to degrade and destroy ISIS terrorists and the efforts of moderate Syrians to defend their communities.

I understand the reticence of some of my colleagues to get involved. Again, we have no great choices here, but the worst choice is to do nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank Congressman MCKEON. Chairman ROYCE and I conduct the Foreign Affairs Committee in a very bipartisan fashion. We pride ourselves in being one of the most bipartisan committees.

Foreign policy should be bipartisan. Issues like this should be bipartisan. I think we can all be proud to be Members of Congress. This is being done in a bipartisan way. I certainly support this resolution.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the previous gentleman for his comments. He is the ranking member on the Foreign Affairs Committee. He understands this situation very well, and the only thing I would say is the reason we say ISIS/ISIL—I would just say ISIL because they are the same. We need to let the American people know who the enemy is. It is that group, ISIL, and they are the worst of all, in my opinion.

Secondly, the reason we are doing this now is twofold. The President asked for it. We only have one Commander in Chief at a time. I didn't vote for him, but he is our Commander in Chief. He asked for this. We are responding to that request as he asked us as Commander in Chief.

Secondly, and I think this is very important, Saudi Arabia stepped up and said not to keep this secret, but: we overtly will open up our territories and give you training facilities to train these Syrians.

That sends a message to people in that part of the world that this is not the big, bad Satan America against the world. This is moderate Arabs, Kurds, Sunnis, and Shi'a all joining together against terrorism that is out to destroy the world.

I think that opened up this possibility for the President to ask for this, and I am hopeful that we will be able to give him that authority.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), my friend and colleague, a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his hard work on this very difficult subject.

Mr. Speaker, several months ago, our best CIA analyst could not have predicted that large swaths of Iraq and Syria would be overrun, conquered, by a group called ISIL, the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

ISIL is better financed, better armed, commands more territory, and boasts a larger army than al Qaeda ever has in its dark history. Its twisted form of religion is eighth century barbarism wielding 21st century weaponry.

Mr. Speaker, they kill, they behead, they crucify, they rape, and they fly a black banner of death wherever they go.

Of late, appropriate American leadership has stopped their advance and prevented further humanitarian catastrophe. Now, the question is what to do next. At this point, we are debating a narrow amendment to authorize President Obama to train and arm so-called moderate Syrian rebels.

Mr. Speaker, several months ago, I offered an amendment to stop any potential arms from flowing to the Syrian opposition. At that time, there was no broad strategy. Weaponizing moderate rebels, in a battleground of shifting loyalties and no guarantee of victory, was an ad hoc idea that could have made the situation much worse.

Now, this new amendment is narrowly tailored with appropriate benchmarks and aggressive oversight; yet, in reality, we are trying to manage very low expectations, and I remain concerned. Unfortunately, this distracts us from a more complete discussion of the overall strategy as outlined by the President.

One thing has to be clear and must continually be made clear: this is the world's problem, not America's problem alone. The international coalition must be truly robust, not symbolic, and include regional Sunni Muslim nations who must fight for their own protection.

The broader answer here is a regeneration of Iraqi forces who must also fight for themselves; plus the Kurds must be truly empowered to defeat ISIL near their homes and to set up protective zones for neighboring minority and vulnerable communities. Finally, cutting off the financing and support for ISIL, hopefully, ensures that this rampage will be short-lived.

Mr. Speaker, action has risks, but the consequences of inaction are too grave. ISIL is a threat to all innocent persons and a threat to civilization itself.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from New York (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. OWENS. Thank you, Mr. GARAMENDI.

Mr. Speaker, this is a difficult decision, a difficult choice, and likely one that does not have a good or better outcome than what we can propose today. I think the American people need to understand that, as we act today, many of us do with reluctance.

I will vote in support of Mr. MCKEON's amendment, but I do so very reluctantly. I have fear that what we face is a situation in which we will arm folks who subsequently will take negative action against us; however, when weighing the consequences of taking no action, as many of my colleagues have indicated, I think we have no choice but to move forward as this amendment is recommending and the President has requested.

I also believe that we are taking back in Congress power that has drifted over many years to the President, irrespective of what party he is in—or she may be in, in the future—and I think that this is an important constitutional step that we should all support.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), my friend and colleague.

Mr. KING of New York. I thank the chairman for yielding. I thank him for his effort in putting together this amendment, and, before he leaves the floor, I would like to commend my friend, Mr. ENGEL from New York, for the very vigorous bipartisan speech that he gave here today because this is what this issue warrants. Chairman MCKEON has shown it, and I think all of us have to come together to the extent we can to support the President.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been critical of the President. I believe that action should have been taken earlier against ISIS, but we can have these debates. That is all in the past.

□ 1715

The fact is that ISIS is a real threat to the United States. As someone who comes from a district that lost over 150 people on 9/11, I never, ever want to go through that again.

I can say right now that ISIS is more powerful than al Qaeda was on 9/11. They have more financing. They have more weapons. They have more members. They have more of their fighters who have passports that will enable them to come into the United States. And we know that they are committed to destroying Western civilization, so it is essential that we take action against ISIS and take it quickly and take it emphatically.

I believe the President has the constitutional and statutory power to act, but I also think it is important for Congress to work with the President. The President has asked for this power to train moderate Syrians, and now I am not certain if that would work. I think it is going to be difficult to vet a sufficient number. It will be difficult to find them, to work with them.

Having said that, as Commander in Chief, the President is entitled, I believe. That is his prerogative, and we should stand with him on that, because if we can put together an effective fighting force on the ground, that would make our airpower all that more effective.

It is also important that we try to put together a coalition, and I believe Congress standing together as one, by

showing strong support for the President, that will encourage other countries to join with us. They will realize we are in this for real, that we are not just making empty gestures. It is important for Congress to come forward at this time.

Now, having said that, I also believe that the President should be more open with the American people and say this is going to be tough. And I believe that there are going to be boots on the ground. Now, I don't believe we have to have combat troops, per se. This is not going to be easy.

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

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, we have to realize that no matter how well a war is planned, no matter how specific our strategy is, the fact is that there are going to be tough days ahead. This is going to be very rough. This is not going to be easy. And we have to condition the American people, prepare them for that and be honest with them.

We as Republicans, I believe, have an obligation not just to be critical, but to stand with the President if we believe overall that ISIS has to be stopped, and we have to support our Commander in Chief in doing that.

So what happened in the past is in the past. I don't want the past to be prolonged, but we can work constructively and positively and to make sure that the job gets done because too many lives are dependent on it.

I am not in this for Iraq. I am not in this for Afghanistan. Yes, that is important. I am in this for the people in the United States, people who never, ever should be attacked again, and our forces overseas who are in harm's way. That is our main obligation, and that is who I am voting for today when I vote for the chairman's amendment.

Again, I thank him for the outstanding job he has done; and since this may be my last time, to also commend him for the great job he has done as chairman over the last several years.

With that, I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), my friend.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the McKeon amendment, which would permit the administration to train and equip Syrian opposition forces to confront the deadly threat posed to them and their country by ISIL.

This measure is limited, at least for another day the broader question of authorizing the use of force against ISIL. It extends only until December 11, the expiration date of the continuing resolution that it amends; but it is necessary if our country is to get underway the training of forces that are essential, if the Syrian component of the President's plan to degrade and defeat ISIL is to succeed.

The President has no intention of introducing ground combat forces into this conflict, but our strategy does depend on indigenous forces in Iraq and Syria fighting for their own countries, forces capable of taking advantage of the air and other support we will provide.

Getting such forces up to speed in Syria is one of the most difficult aspects of the challenges we face. Many speakers today have stressed these uncertainties and risks. I doubt there is a single one of them that the President hasn't recognized and considered in devising his strategy. But he has also done what we must now do: consider the consequences of letting the threat of ISIL go unchecked.

The continued spread of ISIL and its version of violent jihad present a grave threat to our national security and that of our allies in the region and around the world. The United States must work with allies to ensure that militant extremists do not further destabilize an already volatile region or establish a staging ground for terrorist activities aimed at American personnel and assets both at home and abroad.

So we have a grave responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to weigh the costs and benefits of our actions or of inaction or of this resolution being defeated. This is not a time, if I may say so, for Members to vote ''no'' and then hope the resolution, nonetheless, passes. We don't have the luxury of holding out for a perfect or assured outcome. We must make the best decision we can, countering the threat, but in a careful and measured way that maximizes the chances for success and that gives this body the ability to monitor and oversee the process so as to make course corrections when necessary.

I believe the resolution before us meets these tests, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. CHARLES BOUSTANY, my friend and colleague.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I want to put this in strategic context. We are seeing a once-in-a-century upheaval in the Middle East, and the most virulent manifestation of that is occurring in Syria today with a very complex civil war raging over several years.

On one side you have the brutal Assad regime aligned with Iran and Hezbollah, another terrorist group, and on the other side a panoply of Sunni groups of which the worst, the most barbaric, is ISIL. It is in America's national interest, our national security interest, to defeat and destroy ISIL, period, hands down.

This is going to require American unity, American resolve. And I can tell you, never, never in recent times has American leadership been more in demand. This is the time for us to step up. It will take a lot of work. It is going to take merging the fighting capabilities of the Kurdish Peshmerga with the Iraqi forces; and, yes, it will take the U.S. training and vetting moderate Syrian forces to deal with this.

This is a necessary first step, and that is why I support this amendment. It is necessary. It is not sufficient. Again, we need a broader strategy that is going to involve a coalition. This first step will show that American resolve to friends and foes alike as well as those who are on the sideline. We will demonstrate that and pull this coalition together.

This will help the President have the necessary leverage to do this and put this coalition in place to defeat this threat of ISIL, but also to get to a broader political settlement in the region, because what is going on in Syria, even beyond ISIL, is a national security threat to the United States. That is why this country, all Americans, must speak with a unified voice. A strong vote on this amendment is essential as a first step to putting this in place.

My colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I urge the President—I urge the President—to put all diplomatic efforts into putting together a strong coalition and to ask for very specific deliverables on each of these countries, whether it is Turkey or Qatar or the Saudis. These countries have to step up if we are going to have a successful strategy in the long run.

The President needs leverage. This gives him the first step. I would hope that he will come to the Congress for a broader authorization for the use of military force because I do believe that will give him all the leverage he needs to complete this diplomatic task in putting a coalition together, along with the military strategy with these allies in the region, to defeat the immediate threat of ISIL and to eliminate this major problem we are seeing with a failed state in Syria that has allowed ISIL and some of these other extremist groups to arise.

This is the time for unity. This is the time for American leadership. This is a time that we step up.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the ranking member, Mr. SMITH, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us is a fateful one. If operations planning is not executed properly, it will result in the United States becoming embroiled in a modern version of the Hundred Years' War.

Over the past decade, and indeed since the bombing of our Marine barracks in Lebanon three decades ago, our Nation's blood and treasure have been expended in growing numbers to influence Middle East foreign policy. Most recently, the result has shifted Iraq from a Sunni-led dictatorship under Saddam Hussein to be replaced by a corrupt, unrepresentative Shi'a-leaning regime led by Nouri al-Maliki. Both corrupt regimes thwarted democratic advancement, and now a new, untested government has been set in place in Baghdad, but its effectiveness is unknown. Its connectivity to its own people across its provinces is uneven and undemocratic.

Meanwhile, we witness the rise of ISIL, a barbaric Sunni force largely composed of foreign fighters from other nations that manifests the discontent of the Sunnis. ISIL's leader had been a leader inside al Qaeda Iraq.

Recognize for the most part, Iraq's huge Sunni population has been vastly ignored and purposefully excluded in Iraq's al-Maliki-led government. There is a huge chasm between Baghdad's politically unrepresentative government and the reality of the Sunni tribes not affiliated with ISIL that have dug in for the long haul and exist in key provinces in Iraq.

It is to America's peril if we miscalculate and fail to understand their importance. It is to America's peril if we underestimate who the enemy is, what ISIL is fighting for and against, and what it will take to defeat ISIL.

America must stand at liberty's side but never place our military between two warring factions whose hatred for one another is legendary and lethal. If America is pulled into a civil war on the lands of Iraq and Syria, perceived as having taken sides with the Shi'a against the Sunnis, we will be on the wrong side of history.

Our military has already lost over 6,000 valorous Americans, with 50,000 more brave wounded or incapacitated. Our Nation has spent over a trillion dollars, including training over 800,000 Iraqis to defend their own nation.

But legions of Iraq's Army that our government trained, at the first test of their mettle against ISIL, tore off their uniforms and fled. It is not disputed that an important reason for this is that the former Prime Minister of Iraq, Maliki, purposefully weakened his own Iraqi Army by putting his incompetent cronies in charge of units that ultimately were underequipped and could not fight.

To win, America cannot and must not make the mistake of ignoring the legitimate concerns of Sunni native tribal leaders in Iraq who have been summarily cut out of the decisions being made by a Baghdad government so unrepresentative and so utterly calculated against Sunni representation. This exclusion will imperil success in any coalition effort to rid the regime of ISIL's barbarism.

It has come to my attention that the exclusion of Iraq's four main Sunni-Arab tribal groups from contact with decisionmakers in Baghdad and elsewhere continues. The current government in Baghdad, led by Prime Minister Haider Abadi, does not engender nor seek their confidence. There is no contact between, for example, historic Sunni tribes and the Iraqi Government nor our government. What a gaping omission. The four main tribes are the Al-bu Khalifah, Al-bu Mar'i, the Al-bu Fahd, and the Al Sulayman. It has also come to my attention that if any Iraqi claims to speak for them in Baghdad, he does not, or he does so fraudulently.

Before I can vote on any resolution that might potentially embroil our military in taking sides in a major Shi'a-Sunni civil war across that vast region, I would seek assurances that our government has been in direct contact with the native Sunni tribes in Iraq whose mettle was proven in the first awakening.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, might I ask for an additional 30 seconds.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. To fail to understand their importance or their systematic exclusion from the machinations in Baghdad is to play a war game of chess with half the board empty.

Be aware, if certain key decisionmakers in our own government as well as Baghdad's didn't recognize that Mosul could be taken by ISIL, why depend on those same advisers to plot a forward strategy now? Our policy should be to leave no chessmen off the table.

Today, very, very, very reluctantly, I will support this resolution, but with great misgivings. I hold the sincere hope the administration will hear my pleas to measure up to the full task at hand. Leave no major Sunni interests absent from the daunting political and military coalition that must be forged to be successful in this venture.

□ 1730

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

Mr. MCALLISTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for all his hard work on getting this amendment before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I am very frustrated that I stand before you today and we can wage a war on Ebola, yet we sit back for hours and allow ISIL to wage a war against us.

A ''no'' vote is the easiest vote to cast. We cannot stand back and do nothing while ISIL continues to threaten our national security and terrorizes the Middle East.

Everyone wants to be a general, but now is not the time to argue amongst ourselves. Back home, people think all we do is argue about petty politics and get nothing accomplished. Now is the time to take action and stand unified behind House leadership and deal with this serious threat.

We are dealing with one of the most barbaric terrorist organizations we have seen in years and the American people cannot afford to have Congress go home without authorizing an effective strategy to annihilate ISIL.

This resolution does not appropriate new funding; it simply gives congressional approval to act in the best interest of our national security without acting unilaterally.

It would be a disservice to American citizens and our allies if we continue bickering while ISIL mobilizes and recruits new members. Destroying ISIL requires a coordinated effort to arm and train those fighting our enemies.

As a veteran, I do not want to see my brothers in arms' blood shed and them die in vain for where we have not completed a mission.

Mr. Speaker, 9/11 is a reminder that terrorism does not recognize boundaries. We are the United States. We must stand united to defeat all enemies, both foreign and domestic, when appropriate, on their soil and not ours.

I urge my colleagues to act now and pass this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and for his very deliberative work in leading our minority.

I am glad that we are debating the President's proposal to arm and train the Syrian rebels. But, Mr. Speaker, I am totally disappointed that a debate on something that could have such broad implications on the United States' national security and the region is being included as an amendment to the continuing resolution. When I became a member of the Appropriations Committee, the first rule I was taught was that you don't authorize on an appropriations bill.

Yet this is another instance of Congress taking a pass on its solemn constitutional obligations to weigh in on matters of war and peace.

I am reminded of the failure to have a thorough and robust debate in the wake of 9/11 and the resulting overly broad authorization which I could not vote for because it was a blank check for perpetual war, and it still is on the books and it is being used as the authority for the strikes that are taking place now. This resolution should be repealed.

And it was the rush to war against Iraq in 2002 that led us to where we are today. ISIS did not exist until the unnecessary and ill-begotten war in Iraq, which created sectarian violence and a civil war.

We should be clear what the United States is committing itself to in Iraq and Syria. The U.S. has conducted nearly 3,000 missions and more than 150 airstrikes, and has deployed more than 1,000 troops already. In a speech about the United States' mission against ISIS, the President said: ''I don't think we're going to solve this problem in weeks. This is going to take some time.''

I ask today: Does this amendment begin to help us contain ISIS or to dismantle ISIS? And what are we getting ourselves into? It is more complex than just an up-or-down vote on arming and training the members of the Free Syrian Army.

The consequences of this vote will be—whether it is written into the amendment or not—a further expansion of a war currently taking place and our further involvement in a sectarian war. That is the consequence of this amendment.

As I said earlier, no one in this body believes that we should stand by while ISIS wreaks havoc across the region. And the brutal nature of ISIS and who they are, we understand very clearly, and we must address ISIS in a big way now. No one believes that we should not deal with ISIS.

But let me just tell you, a military solution, as the President said, is not the way we are going to dismantle or disable or stop ISIS. I supported the President's plan to protect U.S. personnel and to prevent genocide. But any expansion of the military strikes and what took place during that terrible period really requires a full debate and an authorization of the use of force here on this floor, and that is not what we are doing today.

Also, what is missing from this debate are the nonmilitary solutions and options to this crisis. The President and his national security experts have stated repeatedly that there is no military solution. Yet here we are today once again only discussing more arms and more airstrikes.

There are too many unanswered questions for me to support this amendment. How will we avoid embroiling the United States in a sectarian conflict—in a deeper involvement, actually, in a sectarian conflict—in Iraq and Syria? How do we ensure different outcomes than when we spent U.S. tax dollars, mind you, to train and equip the Iraqi army?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

Ms. LEE of California. How will we ensure that the United States weapons that we are providing to Syrian rebels won't get into the wrong hands, as they did with the rebels when we supported them in Libya? How will we ensure that what we are doing now won't further destabilize the region? And how will we ensure that we do not stand here years from now debating on how to stop another ISIS—ISIS II?

Mr. Speaker, what is missing from this debate is the political, economic, and diplomatic and regionally-led solutions that will ultimately be the tools for security in the region and for any potential future threats to the United States.

These are significant questions that must be answered before Congress should vote on a proposal, no matter how limited, to intervene militarily once again in a region that is very complicated and that is very dangerous. We should not act in haste, and we must heed the lessons of the past. We must also live up to our constitutional obligation to debate authorization of the use of military force rather than authorize to send arms to Syrian rebels on a continuing resolution to keep the government open. That is why I will vote ''no'' on this amendment.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. FLEMING, my friend and colleague, a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the President's vague and inadequate strategy for dealing with ISIS; and, therefore, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

In his haste to claim credit for withdrawing our troops from Iraq, President Obama left the door open to exactly the kind of crisis that has exploded throughout the region. Instead of working hard to renew a status of forces agreement with a sufficient number of American troops to preserve the peace, President Obama was anxious to use withdrawal from Iraq as a campaign slogan in 2012. We are now reaping the whirlwind sown by that reckless policy.

This new policy is little more than an incremental strategy, not unlike the one used in Vietnam. History warns of the dangers of such approaches. By moving hesitantly, in piecemeal fashion, the enemy has more time to learn, adapt, and get stronger. This is a recipe for stalemate and failure.

There is another obvious lesson in all of this: almost since taking office, the Obama administration has been working to reduce our military. President Obama has directed over $1 trillion in cuts to the U.S. military since he took office. Under his planned cuts, senior Army leaders have testified that the Army would be unable to repeat its performance over the last decade in Iraq and Afghanistan.

And, finally, the President has acted as if dangerous and avowed enemies are either not serious threats—like the JV team of global terrorism—or he has acted as though they are reasonable enemies who are willing to negotiate peace.

Neither is true with ISIS. If we are going to degrade and destroy them it will not happen through an indecisive strategy that relies on unreliable and largely unknown help from Syrian rebels, whose own motivations and goals are mixed, and almost impossible to be certain of.

In addition, recent history has taught us that the weapons and resources we commit to other forces could easily fall into the hands of even worse enemies, like ISIS.

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

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

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

I support President Obama's authority as Commander in Chief, but his game plan is flawed. It will lead to failure and will put us more in danger.

The President's approach of using American air power and local ground troops is wise. It worked in Afghanistan and it worked in Kosovo.

However, President Obama is choosing the wrong locals to support. With this vote, Congress approves the arming and training of the Free Syrian Army, which is riddled with radical Muslims. In short, we may again be arming insurgents who will end up our enemy.

We are told that the Free Syrian Army has been vetted and that we can trust them. This is wishful thinking, not realistic planning.

The President wants to send more equipment and supplies and weapons to the Kurds. That is certainly a good concept, but proposes to send our assistance via the Iraqi Government in Baghdad. Rest assured, Baghdad will pass on whatever it doesn't want to keep for itself. And remember, they wasted most of what we have already given them. Arming radical Islamists is bad enough; depending on Baghdad to distribute our military equipment to the right people makes even less sense.

We should arm the Kurds directly; then, instead of relying on an unknown and perhaps radical force, we should instead reach out to the Assad regime and enlist his support in a fight against the common enemy. Perhaps we should consult President Putin in Russia about this issue rather than consult the mullahs in Iran.

The President's proposal will not work. I will not support it. Yet another infusion of American troops into this never-ending conflict in the Middle East is a wrong move. It is wrong for the people of the United States and will not succeed.

I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

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

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER), my friend and colleague.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman. Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge the tremendous leadership that you have given to this Nation. I am grateful for what you have done as a servant in our Congress to protect this Nation, to provide the security that is needed, and I admire you greatly for your work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this amendment.

This amendment is critical to begin the needed process to destroy ISIS. Yes, it is limited in scope of what the President has designated the Congress to approve, but it is necessary. We must convey to the world our commitment to destroy ISIS, the gravest threat that we have ever seen in the history of this country.

But a grave threat, Mr. Speaker, requires a commitment, a thorough commitment, to make sure the job is done. What we are doing today is limited in scope, but yet it is very important. We cannot, however, have a commitment

that is limited, we cannot have the mindset of a Neville Chamberlain, who never recognized the threat and the force of Adolf Hitler in Germany.

We have an enormous threat before us today. The President gratefully acknowledges the threat. However, he has been long in coming to that reality of what we face in the world today.

□ 1745

Yes, he did stand down on missile defense in Poland and Czechoslovakia. Yes, he did stand down our military to the lowest levels since World War II. Yes, he has appeased the Iranians and given them additional time to build up their economy, to build up their nuclear capacity.

He has a scope of the world and understanding that is foreign to me. There are real adversaries out there. Gratefully, he understands the adversaries that we have in ISIS today. They are but yet a part of the dimension of what we are forced to encounter. It must be done, and it must be done with this initial amendment. We will need to come back. We will need to be honest with the American people of what is required to secure this country.

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

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), my friend and colleague.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, thank you for your leadership.

The Obama administration is so out of touch with reality, it is disturbing. Just last year, President Obama said the war on terror is over. Last month, the official White House spokesperson said Obama's policies have enhanced the world's tranquility, even though there are serious growing conflicts in Gaza, Syria, Iraq, Iran, Ukraine, and China.

Today, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Martin Dempsey publicly recommended deploying U.S. combat troops to Iraq should the President's coalition-building efforts fail to curb the threat of ISIS.

If there ever was a time to ensure that America's military was well-prepared, highly trained, and fully equipped, it would be right now. Our enemies are growing stronger, our allies aren't stepping up, and the President's sequester has strained our military's ability to plan and prepare for all potential threats.

The President was caught off guard, leaving our troops underfunded. He must have a clearly defined strategy that fully funds and equips our military.

My district, the 25th District of Texas, is home to Fort Hood, the largest military base in America and home to some of the greatest young men and women the country has ever known. These soldiers and all who wear the uniform need to have the full support of their Congress and their President.

They need adequate funding, training, and the best armored trucks, planes, weapons, and ammunition in the whole wide world. We need to have an unbeatable military readiness and the highest quality of life for the greatest military in the history of the world.

Before President Obama takes any more actions to combat our terrorist enemies, he must work with Congress to roll back his sequester cuts and provide our troops with the support and resources they need and deserve.

In God we trust.

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

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire how much time we have remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 1 hour and 50 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 1 hour and 55 minutes remaining.

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

A lot has been said today on both sides of this issue. As I have listened carefully to all of the arguments, it seems to me that the main argument, as I have heard it, against acting on this amendment at this time is that it doesn't go far enough or we don't know for sure if it would be successful.

I have been in this body now for 22 years. I wish that I had the foresight every time we come to this floor to know exactly what is going to happen after we take action, but it seems to me that none of us really has that foresight.

We can think about it, we can project, but we really don't know what is going to happen if we take action. Sometimes, we know what is going to happen if we don't take action. I think that is probably what we ought to be thinking a little bit about today.

There were some comments made about Iraq and Syria. One thing that I think hasn't been mentioned that I think we know is that we left Iraq precipitously. We can talk about blame. We can place it on President Obama.

I could criticize him for a lot of things, but I sure wouldn't want his job, and I think, because we did leave early, we didn't leave any residual force behind. Maliki did some things that we probably all would have changed.

Saddam Hussein, who was a Sunni—Sunnis are the minority in Iraq—oppressed the Shi'a; so, when Maliki came in, a Shi'a, he oppressed the Sunnis. I think one thing that we do know is that the new Prime Minister, Haider al-Abadi, is really making an effort to reach out to the Sunnis, the Shi'a, and the Kurds to bring a legitimate government that will look out for all of its people.

I think that has given us the opportunity to go into Iraq. The President has put over a thousand of our troops in there, bucked them up, and helped them with the things that they need to be successful in fighting off the terrorists, ISIL, and I think that there are things that they cannot do that we can help them with.

They need intelligence. They need ISR. They need logistics. They need air support. If we provide those things and they see that they are getting good support from their government and that it is not a fight between different sects or different regions and yet they can actually fight together as Iraqis, they will be successful in pushing ISIL back which would be a good thing. They can retake the territory that has been lost.

In the meantime, if we vote for this amendment, we give the President the authority to train Syrians that are thoroughly vetted in Saudi Arabia and then put them back into the fight.

These people are fighting for their homeland. These are people that are fighting for their villages, and they are fighting for their families. Are they perfect? We don't know, but I was talking to one of our retired generals who has been in the fight, and he told me that, sometimes, you have to work with people that are willing to fight the same enemy that you are willing to fight.

In this case, these people that we are looking at are willing to fight ISIL. If they have the help that we can provide, they can be successful, and then the people that we train can go back into the fight in Syria, and we can squeeze ISIL in between Syria and Iraq and keep them from entering into other nations where we do not wish to fight at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), my friend and colleague.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate all the time and energy that our House Republican leaders have put into this issue, trying to work with the President, but the truth is that, if you look back under this President as Commander in Chief, we trained people in Libya. We provided weapons to Libya that were then used against us in Benghazi.

There are Americans dead because this administration felt compelled to go in and take out Qadhafi. Sure, it was under the guise of NATO, but we did it. This administration saw to the bombing of Qadhafi. It refused to allow him to leave peacefully, and it has cost us.

Because Libya fell, so did Algeria and Tunisia, and it jump-started, as I have said before, the new Ottoman Empire, the new caliphate that the Muslim brothers and so many of the radicals are saying they are going for.

One of the big problems, too, when we go in and train, as this President wants to do for the Syrians, they learn our tradecraft. They use it against us, as they did at Benghazi.

Al Qaeda today has indicated that all jihadists must combine together. That pressure is going to get greater and

greater. Also, today, the Muslim Brotherhood cleric who had been kicked out of Qatar—I believe he is now in Turkey—is calling for an all-out Muslim Brotherhood opposition to the United States.

Yusuf al-Qaradawi, the head of the Muslim Brotherhood, is likewise begging jihadists to combine together in their fight against the United States.

Where is Qaradawi? He is in Turkey. Yes, that is the Turkey that this President says we are going to count on as one of our allies, and yet Turkey has announced last week that they will not allow the U.S. to conduct air strikes against ISIS from Turkish air bases.

We are in big trouble here. Our action will unify radicals against us. It has already been announced that Colonel Riad al-Asaad, the leader of the Free Syrian Army, has said it would not join the alliance against the Islamic State unless it receives assurances on toppling the Syrian regime. That was reported by Anadolu, the Turkish news agency, just in the last few days.

This is serious stuff. We are uniting the jihadists of the world to come against us. Why? Because there is nothing lower to these jihadists than infidels that help invade what they consider to be a Muslim country.

We are about to ask for more than this administration knows. Why? Because it continues to purge our training material. They are not allowed to understand what it is we are up against.

When you lose The New York Times, as this administration has, you are in big trouble if you are President Obama.

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

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, let me just say again that most of the arguments I have heard are, ''Don't do this.'' I haven't heard an alternative.

I think what we need to remember—and we hear it a lot around here—is let's not make the perfect the enemy of the good. The President, the Commander in Chief, has asked for this authority. Saudi Arabia is willing to work with us on this. We need to develop the coalition. We are working hard to make that happen.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I agree very strongly with Chairman MCKEON on one point. You can raise all manner of different questions, but there are no guarantees. If you are trying to figure out how to vote on this and you won't vote in favor until we are guaranteed nothing can go wrong, then save yourself the argument and just vote ''no.'' This is a very dangerous part of the world, and, in any part of the world, something can always go wrong. We cannot guarantee that there will be no bad outcomes.

I think one of the things that has been lost in all this is that train and equip has been equated simply with Iraq and Afghanistan and has been deemed a failure. I really want to point out to people that the U.S. military—and the U.S. Government more broadly—has engaged in many very successful train-and-equip missions.

In fact, this is the way out of Iraq and Afghanistan, the way out of committing over 100,000 U.S. troops to a battle to try to fundamentally change a country. You build partnerships, and those partners in those local areas are the ones that do the fighting and pursue the interests.

In Somalia, we have a very significant problem with al-Shabaab. We have not, I believe, lost a U.S. life in that region. We have trained and equipped Ethiopia, Kenya, and Uganda. They have helped take the fight to al-Shabaab in Somalia in a very successful manner.

□ 1800

We are working with the Yemeni Government right now to help defeat al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula within Yemen. And believe me, the country of Yemen is not a model of anything. It has all manner of different challenges in terms of its governance. And you certainly could have looked at that and said, Wow, we are going to work with those guys?

But we did not want al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula to continue to grow and continue to threaten us, where at least two terror attacks against the U.S. were launched, so we trained and have worked with the Yemen Government in a way that has helped contain AQAP. Train and equip absolutely is a policy that can work, and that is what we are going to try and do in Syria.

So backing up to the policy there, there are several steps to this.

First of all, should we confront ISIS? I mean, that is an initial decision. And I suppose you can decide that it is way across the world. You have got Sunnis fighting Shi'as. You have got Syria. You have got Iran. You have got all manner of different people all mixed up in this. Let's just wash our hands of it and hope it works out.

The problem with that is ISIS has made it clear that they will kill Americans and that they will threaten us. And if they continue to grow and continue to hold territory, they will absolutely plan and plot attacks against the United States. So simply allowing ISIS to go forward doesn't strike me as a good option, which brings us to the second question.

Okay, if you want to try to contain them, how do you do it? And I completely agree with the cautionary notes that have been cited about just sending in the U.S. military to do it. I think the risks there are enormous, and it would not be successful because it would unite all—not all, but would unite a fair number of Sunnis and radicals against us.

So the option on the table is to train and equip local partners to do the fighting. We have done it successfully with the Kurds. We are making progress now with Iraq now that we have got Maliki out as Prime Minister and we have a new government that at least gives the Sunnis some hope that they will be included in the Iraqi Government.

In Syria, we will have to work with the Free Syria movement. Now, we have already been working with a lot of these folks. We have already been providing humanitarian assistance and some other assistance as well, so it is not like we don't have anybody over there. We do know some folks and we should work with them, because the alternative is allowing Syria to be divided up between Assad and ISIS, and that alternative is unacceptable.

Lastly, I want to say that I fully understand the concerns about mission creep. I fully understand the concerns about open-ended warfare, but this is not what we are talking about.

As the chairman and many others have said, we should have a debate about an AUMF on this floor. This is not an AUMF. This in no way authorizes any U.S. military action against anybody. All it does is it authorizes the Department of Defense to train and equip other forces. Our forces will be hundreds of miles from the battlefield, training and equipping other forces.

So I agree, there is a much larger debate to have if an AUMF is put out on the floor, and we have to think about will this be taken and interpreted way too broadly. We have seen that happen with the 2001 AUMF, for instance. So that will be a worthy debate.

That is not what we are doing here. In fact, this is something that 3 years ago many people suggested that the U.S. Government should do. But we cannot do it unless Congress authorizes the Department of Defense to do it.

So I think this is much more narrow in scope than the broader debate, and the broader debate is one we should have. But here we are talking about a very narrow approach of train and equip that, frankly, can help limit U.S. action.

I have heard some of my colleagues say, well, you know, we understand the bombing. We need to do the bombing because ISIS is a threat and all that. But we don't want to do the train and equip which, to me, is just completely backwards.

If you are concerned about mission creep, if you are concerned about the U.S. getting too involved, then direct military action is certainly a heck of a lot more involvement than training and equipping others in the region to lead the fight.

I think that is an appropriate policy. I applaud the chairman for his work in putting this together.

We do have more work to do. This only authorizes this until the CR runs out, December 11, I believe, so we will have to do this in the National Defense Authorization Act. But I think it is a modest and appropriate step, and whatever criticism you have of all manner

of different mistakes, perceived and actual, that the President may have made before, please don't let that color what is an incredibly important policy decision as we try to decide how to confront a very real threat in ISIS.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.J. Res. 124 is postponed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2, AMERICAN ENERGY SOLUTIONS FOR LOWER COSTS AND MORE AMERICAN JOBS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4, JOBS FOR AMERICA ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM SEPTEMBER 22, 2014, THROUGH NOVEMBER 11, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–601) on the resolution (H. Res. 727) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to remove Federal Government obstacles to the production of more domestic energy; to ensure transport of that energy reliably to businesses, consumers, and other end users; to lower the cost of energy to consumers; to enable manufacturers and other businesses to access domestically produced energy affordably and reliably in order to create and sustain more secure and well-paying American jobs; and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) to make revisions to Federal law to improve the conditions necessary for economic growth and job creation, and for other purposes; and providing for proceedings during the period from September 22, 2014, through November 11, 2014, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 5405, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 5461, by the yeas and nays;

S. 1603, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROMOTING JOB CREATION AND REDUCING SMALL BUSINESS BURDENS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5405) to make technical corrections to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, to enhance the ability of small and emerging growth companies to access capital through public and private markets, to reduce regulatory burdens, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 320, nays 102, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 501]

YEAS—320

Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—102

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Courtney
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Hinojosa
Horsford
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lynch
McDermott
McGovern
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Smith (WA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch

NOT VOTING—9

Aderholt
Barton
Capito
Castor (FL)
Collins (GA)
DesJarlais
Holt
Nunnelee
Rush

□ 1841

Ms. KAPTUR, Messrs. SMITH of Washington, RICHMOND, GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, and Messrs. BUTTERFIELD and SCHIFF changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. POLIS, THOMPSON of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. FARR, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. LANGEVIN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''