itself isn’t following the law that Congress passed. I am referring specifically to section 132(d) in the bill. It says:

Members of Congress in the exchange requirement notwithstanding any other provision in law, after the effective date of this subtitle, the only health plans that the Federal Government may make available to Members of Congress shall be health plans that are (one or two) offered through an exchange established under this act. The term “Member of Congress” means any Member of the House of Representatives or the Senate.

The fact of the matter is most people don’t follow the law. I did, Mr. Speaker, and I think it was important to follow the law. I bought my health care in the individual market, in healthcare.gov, started October 1 of 2013. You may remember that night. That was the night the fiscal year ended and the famous government shutdown began. I began early that morning in trying to sign up for the Affordable Care Act. I knew that if I was a Member of Congress, we were supposed to sign up through healthcare.gov, an unsubsidized policy in the individual market. So I performed as indicated.

It took 3½ months for the check to clear. It was one of the most uncomfortable, god-awful experiences I have ever been through in my life. What is the final result? I have a bronze plan in the individual market in the Federal fallback provision in the State of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, that plan cost $560 a month the first year that I was enrolled, and then it went up 24 percent the next year. It is now up to $700 a month for me, an individual. These are after-tax dollars. Do you know the worst part, Mr. Speaker? The worst part is that the deductible is $6,000.
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Mr. Speaker, no one is eager for this commitment, but ISIS is on the march; and this radical jihadist group is taking more territory, more weapons, and more resources, threatening the government in Baghdad and, indeed, threatening to destabilize this entire critical region, and to create a safe haven from which ISIS can plot attacks against the United States.

And ISIS has used the “virtual caliphate” on the Internet to recruit foreign fighters at an unprecedented rate. Some 20,000 of their fighters are, in fact, from offshore, are foreign fighters drawn to the area from some 90 countries. Those are the numbers that now are being added daily to intelligence estimates, this includes at least 150 Americans that we know of.

Yet over the last 10 or so months, the administration has put forth a reluctant and half-hearted and ineffective turn in our own strategy. I think we all recognize that this is up to the Iraqi Government to fight to win this. We understand that. They are in the lead. But they desperately need help. And I am not prepared to say that we shouldn’t be providing any military support to the Kurds strung along a 180-mile, or several hundred mile, front, with 180,000 soldiers. Thirty percent of those Kurdish soldiers are female. And those young women are, with small arms trying to hold off ISIS fighters along that line. I am not prepared to say that we should not be providing any military support for those Kurds or for the Iraqi forces and any air support whatsoever. That is what this resolution does.

It didn’t have to be this dire. Well over a year ago, when ISIS was building its force in the desert in Syria, it wasn’t bombed and devastated when it could have been. We’ve been down this road before. Many called for an effort at that point to have an air campaign by the U.S. and our partners to pummel ISIS as it moved across the desert in these long columns and begin the process to take city after city. It came out of Syria. First it headed to Fallujah, and there was a call to use air power to suppress and use ISIS then. That step was not taken. And for 14 separate cities, city after city, all the way to Mosul, we watched every time the request be made for air power, and that was turned down.

Well, we are where we are now. And, frankly, the air campaign by the U.S. and our partners isn’t pummeling the enemy now, as it should. Daily airstrikes against the Islamic State are one-sixth of what they were in the first campaign against the Taliban back in 2001. U.S. Special Forces should be authorized to call in airstrikes. Most Americans would be puzzled to learn that Canadian Special Forces are doing this, but we are not. Pilots complain of having their hands tied. It has been estimated that three-quarters of U.S. aircraft return to base without discharging their weapons because of overly restrictive rules of engagement that don’t allow them to engage ISIS. As one observer notes, with just “piecemeal attacks, the Obama administration has been systematically squandering our air power advantage.”

Adding to the problem, the regional forces on the ground that these air strikes are supposed to be supporting...
I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 55. Let me first say that I believe Congress needs to do its job and pass an AUMF, which is the Authorization for Use of Military Force. We should have acted on this months ago. So this is the right message. But, with only the help that we have from the United States, I believe that withdrawal by a date certain at this time is the wrong policy.

This measure would direct the President to remove United States Armed Forces deployed to Iraq or Syria since August 7, 2014, except those needed to protect American diplomatic facilities and personnel. That is no way to defeat ISIS or to help the people of Iraq and Syria. I cannot vote for a policy I do not support. However, I share the frustration voiced by Mr. McGovern, Ms. Lee, and many others.

I have said time and time again that Congress should pass a new AUMF. We owe it to the American people, we owe it to our men and women in uniform. Congressional inaction on an AUMF is inexcusable. Congress has had months to consider the President’s language, and it is past time we act.

Richard, the administration is using the resolution we passed after September 11, 2001, as the legal justification to fight ISIS. This is deeply problematic. First of all, the 2001 AUMF has none of the limits many of us are seeking. The American people have no stomach for another large-scale, open-ended commitment of American troops in the Middle East. It was our disastrous intervention in Iraq last decade that set the stage for the rise of ISIS in the first place. This is a new challenge, and we need new parameters to define our mission and our goals.

At the same time, using a 2001 authorization for a 2015 conflict sets a terrible precedent. Three years when the next administration does the same thing and 5 years after that and 5 years after that? We didn’t vote for perpetual war, and we need a new AUMF.

We cannot allow that outcome. With a new AUMF, I hope it will be a bipartisan effort. I hope it will be the hallmark of our work on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I commend my friend, Mr. McGovern, for taking a stand on this issue, and we are in agreement that the United States must avoid another failed open-ended war in the Middle East. But there is a role for the United States in this region, and we should not just vote to withdraw. I believe that would be cutting off our nose to spite our face. The United States has already made a difference by supporting the Iraqis and the Syrians who are fighting ISIS. It is a difficult fight, but I don’t think we can walk away.

With American leadership, we were able to prevent a wholesale slaughter of Yazidi people. With American help, our Iraqi partners were able to maintain control of the Mosul Dam, which, if breached by ISIS, could have resulted in the death and displacement of up to 2 million people. With American assistance, the Iraqi Security Forces and the moderate Syrian opposition have been able to move too slowly, but they are taking back territory, particularly in the south.

The Foreign Affairs Committee just had a hearing earlier this morning and we saw horrific situations of children being gassed in Syria. There is no good side in Syria. We have got to somehow let the Free Syrian Army or the rebels, the well-vetted moderate rebels, we have got to help them, and that is why I believe there is still a role for us to play. A precipitous withdrawal by turning our heads away because we are fed up and disgusted, I think, is not the right move. So this fight is far from over, and the United States has a critical role to play. We need an AUMF that defines a role for the United States, a limited role, and that is the measure I will support.

I, again, do want to thank Mr. McGovern for bringing this issue to the floor. He is a thoughtful, effective colleague. And when I appreciate his resolution, I commend him for focusing this Congress on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. Speaker, the truth is that it is complicating, by the way, the effort to defeat the 2001 authorization—continuously—under prior statutes to use our military forces from Iraq and Syria to fight ISIS and possibly die there, then, for heaven’s sake, we should do our duty—should do our job—and bring an AUMF to the House floor, debate it, and take some responsibility for this war.

That is all this resolution is trying to do. Give the leadership of this House a deadline that even it can’t ignore. Either enact an AUMF over the next 6 months or withdraw our forces from Iraq and Syria, one or the other.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

Again, the resolution before us today has nothing to do with an Authorization for Use of Military Force; it is a withdrawal resolution. I don’t want to leave some of the oversimplified Authorization for Use of Military Force rhetoric here unaddressed.

The real question that the proponents are begging is: What should the United States be doing to combat ISIS? The answer with regard to today’s resolution would be nothing and that we should withdraw from combating the ISIS threat. That would be irresponsible and dangerous.

I don’t disagree that the current state of the legal authorities the President is using against ISIS is less than ideal from our institution’s perspective, but that does not equal illegal and unconstitutional. I say this as someone who is deeply concerned about the President’s use of executive authorities to respond to the ISIS threat.

The President has short-circuited this debate by claiming complete authority under prior statutes to use our Armed Forces against ISIS. His administration has made the case that ISIS, which was previously known as al Qaeda in Iraq, “has been an enemy of the United States within the scope of the 2001 authorization—continuously—since at least 2004.” He has made the case that ISIS grew out of al Qaeda in Iraq and, in point of fact, that that is where ISIS came from.

No AUMF we could draft could give the President more operational authority than he already claims. Indeed, the draft text he sent asks us to constrain the President more operational authority than he already claims. Indeed, the draft text he sent asks us to constrain the President in ways that the President opposes, for example by threatening allies, such as Jordan, and create a largely uncontested safe haven from which ISIS could plot attacks against the United States.

This resolution would do more than have the unilateral withdrawal of U.S. forces from the fight against ISIS and leave this growing evil to continue to expand, terrorizing millions.

This resolution would leave ISIS unchecked by U.S. airpower and allow the vicious terrorist group to gain strength as it would further destabilize the region by threatening our forces from the fight against ISIL and leaving them alone to fight against the brutal and barbaric terrorist group, leaving them alone to stop this threat.

This would allow the continued brutality of a group that beheads innocents, including Americans, that forces women and children into sexual slavery, that destroys religious heritage sites, and that targets Christians and others.

This resolution has nothing to do with authorizing the use of U.S. military force against ISIS; instead, this resolution simply unilaterally withdraws our U.S. forces from fighting back against this evil.
I urge opposition to this resolution. Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, again, let me say that what we have here, as well-intentioned as I know it is, is a unilateral withdrawal, clean and simple. I understand the frustration, but this is like cutting off your nose to spite your face. I think we need to be very, very careful before we do these things unilaterally.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in reluctant opposition to the measure offered by my friend from my home State of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, whose sincerity can never be questioned in this body.

I understand the purpose underlying this legislation, and I identify with the frustration that it expresses as, I think, do all of us.

Proponents of the measure want Congress to debate and vote on the use of military force in Iraq and Syria, and so do I. Proponents of this measure believe that Congress has failed to perform its constitutional duty by not taking up the Authorization for Use of Military Force against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and so do I.

In fact, I believe the failure to debate an AUMF against ISIL is a continuation of a sad but 60-year pattern of Congress’ abrogating one of its most fundamental constitutional roles and responsibilities. For an institution that constantly laments its subjugation at the hands of the executive branch, the retreat from its constitutional responsibilities, in my view, is jaw-dropping.

It is time Congress makes crystal clear to the administration, to our allies, to our constituents, and to our military families the circumstances and parameters under which we would, once again, authorize engagement for our and by our men and women in uniform in this tumultuous region of the world or, for that matter, anywhere; but one cannot endorse the tactic of this measure.

This is constructed to be a sort of sword of Damocles that threatens us, Congress, with the automatic withdrawal of our forces in the region in order to force congressional action with an AUMF.

Congress should not heed such a message, nor should it cater to such a sword hanging over its head in order to do its job. An ill-defined mission with no clear mandate and conflicting objectives is not a formula for a military or a political victory.

We should welcome a robust and transparent debate on the matter of an AUMF but not at any cost on the battlefield itself—a withdrawal, as this resolution proposes, mandated irrespective of battlefield reality, of battlefield progress lately against ISIS, a withdrawal mandated irrespective of our commitments to the Kurds or, for that matter, to the Iraqi Government itself.

That would be irresponsible and unworthy of a great power, however noble the underlying cause is. We have responsibilities on the ground.

This resolution was drafted, as they say in Latin, ceteris paribus—all other things being equal. That is to say, in a perfect world. We don’t live in a perfect world. Our engagements are what they are. Our commitments are what they are.

I don’t share the distinguished chairman’s criticism of this administration. It is a workshop we will work with. Our leverage is limited; our choices are dark and complicated. But we are making progress in the region as we speak. To simply ignore all of that and insist we withdraw, in my view, would be irresponsible and unworthy of this great Nation.

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

Let me just say to my colleagues, while I appreciate their thoughtful statements, that we are debating here today would have no standing if there were an AUMF. We wouldn’t even be allowed to bring this to the floor.

I guess my question is: What do we have to do? What do Members of this House, both Democrats and Republicans, have to do to force the leadership here to bring to the floor an AUMF so we can do our job? That is all we are asking for. And, yes, this is a blunt instrument to do it, but I don’t know what else I would take to force this issue. I think we owe it to our servicemen and -women to have this debate and to have this vote.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), a co-sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. JONES. I thank Mr. MCGOVERN for the time.

Mr. Speaker, as many people have said today, even those who are for the resolution and against the resolution, we have a duty. That duty is to debate. I want to quote James Madison, to put the context on what we are trying to say today: ‘The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature.’ Not the executive branch, but the legislature.

The frustration that we have felt goes back to August of 2014, when Jim McGovern and Barbara Lee and Walter Jones wrote asking the Speaker of the House if we have a debate. That is why Mr. McGovern, Barbara Lee, and I have put this resolution in today, to force a debate. We wouldn’t be talking about the Middle East if it weren’t for this resolution.

In September, I sent my own letter to Speaker BOEHNER and asked for a full debate on an Authorization for Use of Military Force in the region. None of these letters have been answered. None of these letters. Last Speaker BOEHNER told The New York Times that he wanted to wait until 2015 to bring an AUMF to the floor of the House for a debate and a vote to avoid bringing it up during a lame duck session. Okay, I can respect that, that makes good sense. It does.

In December, Speaker BOEHNER said the House Republicans would work with the President to get an AUMF request approved if the President sent one to Congress. As Mr. McGovern just said, he did send us one in February. Most people—Democrat and Republican—didn’t particularly like what was in the AUMF, but at least it was the vehicle for the debate. But then in February when the Speaker of the House received it, we didn’t do anything with it. Nothing has happened.

As has been said by speakers before me, last month Jim McGovern, Barbara Lee, and I sent another letter to the Speaker of the House asking for a debate. Nothing happened. That is the reason this resolution is on the floor. It is because, as Madison said: House, do your job. He didn’t say: Executive branch, do your job. He said the legislative branch. That is us. We need to do this on behalf of the Constitution and on behalf of our young men and women in uniform who will give their life for this country.

As has been said before me, it has been 314 days since President Obama started launching airstrikes and putting troops in Iraq and Syria without request from the Congress. According to the Pentagon, we have spent over $9 million a day fighting ISIS, for a total of $2.7 billion. Isn’t this another reason that we should be debating the Middle East and our role in the Middle East? I think so.

Let me repeat James Madison: ‘The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature.’

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I bring these pictures to the floor of those who give their life for this country. This is a flag-draped coffin being pulled off a transport plane in Dover, Delaware, and it is time that we meet our obligation and debate this issue of war because we are not doing the job we owe it to the American people, to the Constitution, and to those who wear the uniform.

I thank Mr. McGovern for the time.
Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and chairman of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. I thank Chairman ROYCE for his leadership, along with Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL.

I am in opposition to H. Con. Res. 55, which would withdraw U.S. forces currently deployed to Iraq and Syria, which are providing regional stability to protect American families. Sadly, this resolution will undermine America’s current campaign to fight jihadist extremists overseas. It would end our air campaign in Iraq and Syria, stop our training and equipping of Iraqi Kurdish Peshmerga and Sunni tribal forces, as well as moderate Syrian opposition forces, and abandon our commitment to our partners in the region.

The resolution would promote ISIS/Daesh’s momentum, create safe havens for terrorist fighters to attack American families, and increase the Turkish regime’s influence of a murderous ideology that declares: Death to America, death to Israel. It would allow Daesh to become an even bigger threat to American families, as we have seen with attacks from New York to Boston. Retreat will create safe havens to enable more attacks on American families. We must remember September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. Unilateral withdrawal will not stop the war, as our enemies will continue their attacks.

The resolution does not consider the situation on the ground in Iraq or Syria or the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Indeed, this administration and General Dempsey said that withdrawing the troops would be a mistake and put America at greater risk.

As the grateful dad of two sons who have served in Iraq, I would prefer a clear strategy of victory for our mission. I was deeply disappointed, as an American citizen, and, quite frankly, back to London to debate a war resolution. Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), who believes Congress ought to do its job and pass an AUMF.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE), a rising star on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE), a rising star on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, before I entered this body, when I was a State legislator and a candidate, I noticed back last August—September, as the ISIS/Daesh movement was growing in Iraq and Syria and other parts of the Middle East, the British Parliament rushed back to London to debate a war resolution. I was deeply disappointed, as an American citizen, and, quite frankly, shocked that the United States Congress did not do exactly the same thing; to come here and debate this issue right here on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, several months ago—I think it might have been back in January—President Obama did submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am proudly a member, an Authorization for Use of Military Force. Unfortunately, that AUMF, somewhat predictably, got attacked by some on the right as insufficient in some areas; and, frankly, got attacked by some on the left as insufficient in other areas. Both sides had legitimate discussions and concerns.

What went wrong after that is that we didn’t actually have that discussion or debate right here on the House floor. It was too easy for Members of this body to just say: ‘This is too difficult; we are going to let the President handle it, and we are going to shirk our responsibility. That is wrong.’

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. I do not support the resolution that is in front of us and will not be voting for it. I think an outright withdrawal of troops within the next 6 weeks would be a terrible mistake and is not the approach that we should take, but I do believe it is about time we do our duty and responsibility and have this discussion and debate. It is about time we, the Congress of the United States, on a bipartisan basis, come up with an actionable plan to fight and defeat ISIS, one that is consistent with our values and an ability plan to fight and defeat those that we are inadvertently commit us to 5 and 10 years down the road responsibilities that we do not envision today.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), who believes Congress ought to do its job and pass an AUMF.
they lose their lives, when we send them overseas. When they come back wounded or deranged, we have an obligation in this body to justify why we have done it.

I may be wrong, but the reason I think we run away from this responsibility is because we don’t really feel the pain of the people we are sending all over the world and exposing them to losing their lives. Why don’t we feel it? Don’t we say, “Thank you for your service”? Do we thank the people who don’t come back? Do we explain and go to the funerals that I go to as to why they were there? Do we explain that the President of the United States and the Members of this House believe it is important for them to be there? All you have to do is come here, declare war, or justify why the security of the United States is being threatened, and I then will be prepared to send somebody else’s kids to fight this war to protect the rest of our country. We don’t have a draft. We don’t pay for the war.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. I conclude by saying that, when issues are serious enough for us to draft other people’s kids, when they are serious enough for us to say that we are not going to borrow money from Communist China to pay for those wars, then I can be convinced, even if I disagree, that when this Congress and this President believes my country is being threatened, you count me in.

Until such time, we are waiting to hear about the threat to our national security so that we can make up our minds.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, only in Congress do you have a resolution presented to deauthorize the use of force because you want to authorize the use of force.

It is, quite frankly, pretty insulting that you would present a proposal to this body to withdraw troops and then accuse the other side of having moral cowardice for opposing the resolution.

There needs to be no more belief of the President’s strategy to defeat ISIS—or lack thereof. We have a duty here in Congress to set our troops up to succeed, not to fail.

There has been a lot of debate with regard to the Authorization for Use of Military Force. I am proud to serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee. Chairman ROYCE has had multiple hearings discussing the Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Secretary Kerry was before the committee. He was asked: “Does this authorization authorize offensive action’?”

He said: “No.”

There was a five-paragraph letter—talking about the need to use Special Forces. We can’t get a straight answer from this administration as to whether or not he is referring to this.

Yes, it has to happen to set our troops up to succeed, and not fail. We had a Marine general in front of the Foreign Affairs Committee. When asked whether or not the general in charge of our troops overseas in Iraq has the ability to authorize to take out Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi or capture actionable intelligence, he read a paragraph that simply said that that general can make a recommendation.

What is further insulting is just how many people don’t even know the name of that two-star general. Not only does he not have the flexibility and resources he needs to accomplish the mission from the administration that is in charge right now, led by the Commander in Chief, my constituents—Americans—don’t even know that gentleman’s name.

Yes, there has been a lot of debate. We have a need to protect our troops. That is why I oppose this resolution.

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

Let me just reiterate that I agree that Congress should do its job and pass a new AUMF. The question is: Is this the best way to do it? We ought to pass the right AUMF, not just any AUMF, and we are told we should force the issue.

I had a friend who used to say: “Be careful what you wish for.” If we pass this resolution, it is more than possible the Republican leadership will force through language that we on this side of the aisle cannot accept, something that does not have the limits the Democrats are seeking, or worse, just ratify the administration’s argument that the 2001 AUMF applies to ISIL.

We need an AUMF. I agree, but we need to pass the right AUMF, even if that means we can’t do it within 6 months. I hope we can get together and do that—and we should—and that is why I think this debate is good; but I think passing any AUMF is like buying a pig in a poke, and I am not ready to go down that line.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, we should have passed an AUMF before we got into this latest war. We have been at it for 10 months. We are asking Congress to do its job in the next 6 months. How much longer do we want?

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

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

I think some words from James Madison are instructive to this debate. He said:

In no part of the Constitution is more wisdom to be found than in the clause which confines the power of war and peace to the legislature, and not to the executive department. Beside the objection to such a mixture of heterogeneous powers, the trust and the temptation would be too great for any one man. . . . War is in fact the true nurser of executive aggrandizement. In war, a physical force is to be created; and the executive which is to direct it. In war, the public treasures are to be unlocked; and it is the executive hand which is to dispense them. To the people who are against this resolution, I say you could be right. You might be right. If this resolution fails, I hope you are right. If this resolution wasn’t necessary, and we do assert our constitutional prerogative, our responsibility, and have that debate and therefore instruct the President on the reasons for this engagement and what his directives are.

I just want to remind my colleagues this is a strategy, this is a parliamentary tactic that is necessary to force the debate, and let’s have the debate.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Judge Poe, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Non-proliferation, and Trade.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I, as one of the author of this resolution, am concerned about our troops that have been in Iraq and Afghanistan for a long time.

In my office, I have photographs of the 37 Texans with connections to my district who have been killed in Iraq or Afghanistan, of all races, both sexes, and all branches of the service. Here we are, years later, and we are still there. I am also concerned about this group ISIS. The question is: Is ISIS a national security threat to the United States? I believe they are doing things to other people that we haven’t seen in world history since the barbarians, and they are doing things much worse than even the barbarians did.

ISIS wants to establish a caliphate in the Middle East. It wants to kill us in the United States. They have made that clear.

If ISIS is a national security threat to the U.S., which I believe it is, then let’s have a plan to defeat them, a plan that makes sense. Why are we in the position of having to make this decision? Have the debate on the House floor: Are they a national security threat? If yes, go after them; if
Mr. GARAMENDI. The President did his part. He submitted a draft to us in February. Since then, we have had a few committee hearings, but no real action. Leadership in both Houses has refused to schedule votes on this issue, either in committee or on the floor. That is unacceptable.

We have already run up significant costs, $2.7 billion on operations to continue the fight against ISIS in Iraq and Syria. We have begun delivering $1.7 billion of weapons. More importantly, we have lost 7 servicemembers already. This resolution is to empower the President to use force against the terrorists who threaten the security of our country and our allies. Congress has no greater responsibility.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this debate is personal to me. I watched my son Ben, then a proud United States marine, being sent off to two wars, Afghanistan and Iraq. My family was blessed; he returned safely.

Both sides of the aisle know the price of the battle: too many killed, too many wounded, too many lives cut short. Too many families have been disrupted, trillions of dollars spent, and the reputation of our country at stake—sometimes for good reasons and sometimes in tragic error.

I will agree with those who say that, when terror strikes in the world, it is our concern and it does require our leadership. There are times when we must risk brave lives to save many more.

With that said, when I came to Washington, I vowed not to send any other sons or daughters in harm's way unless I understood the mission and the end game, too.

We owe this to all our children. That is why I urge my colleagues to take the time to deliberate and debate on the use of force against the terrorists who threaten the security of our country and our allies. Congress has no greater responsibility.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI). Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution is clear: Congress, and Congress alone, shall have the power to declare war.

Make no mistake, the current campaign against ISIS is a war.

Mr. Speaker, our esteemed colleague from Texas made a very cogent argument about why we need clarity. The inability to make a clear plan is based upon the fact that Congress has not yet articulated an authorization to use force that would lay out the parameters and the extent of what we would expect the President to do.

The President says he has the authorization under the 2001 and 2002 authorizations. Ambiguity, clearly, is present. I disagree with the President on those as an authorization. I have argued for more than 10 months that our military operations against ISIS need their own authorization.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution brought to the floor by my colleague Mr. MCGOVERN. No one disputes the horrific nature of the activities being described today and the sickening violence in this region of the world. No one disputes they must be defeated. The question is: What is this President's strategy—a rigorous debate in full public view?

The United States, along with our partners, has struggled to beat back ISIS advances, and the adoption of this resolution would effectively end our operations against ISIS, thus creating a direct threat to our national security and our interests.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is misguided and unwise, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE). Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution brought to the floor by my colleague Mr. MCGOVERN. No one disputes the horrific nature of the activities being described today and the sickening violence in this region of the world. No one disputes they must be defeated. The question is: What is this President's strategy?

This is exactly the purpose of a full, thoughtful debate on the use of military force.
This is an important resolution. We need the debate, and we need to understand that our soldiers need to be protected and ultimately brought home.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 55, directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to return all United States Armed Forces deployed to Iraq or Syria or on or after August 7, 2014, other than Armed Forces required to protect United States diplomatic facilities and personnel, from Iraq and Syria.

This resolution provides a procedural mechanism for Congress to do its job. Specifically, the resolution gives the House leadership 6 months to take up an AUMF, debate it and vote up or voted down. This time frame allows the President the opportunity to revise the AUMF to state his objectives and goals for consideration by Congress.

As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee and the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security and Investigations, I stand in strong support of our country's armed forces and armed personnel who have fought to protect our country. I also stand with the American people and taxpayers, who have placed their trust in the President and his Administration through war and peace.

After all, not too long ago, he was one of us grappling with the war logic we were presented by the prior administration. President Obama inherited this war, along with a problematic economy and we applaud all his good faith efforts to do “damage control” to fix a problem he did not create as it relates to ending war and facilitating a better economy for the American people.

I recognize that it is not an easy feat to fix our problematic war policies under enormous pressure from both sides of the aisle. We recognize that the President has been thoughtful, deliberative and judicious about our presence in Iraq and Syria.

We appreciate the threat to the United States posed by the current instability in the Middle East, especially with events in the recent past: the Arab Spring, ISIS in Iraq and Syria.

We have spent nearly trillions of dollars in wars against ISIS in Iraq and Syria.

Let me be clear the threat of ISIS and terrorism is clear.

That is why we need to have a full and comprehensive debate on what the plan is.

We have six months to do it and thus we can be thoughtful and deliberate about it.

To do this, we must be able to defeat and destroy ISIS.

Over 7,000 fallen heroes have sacrificed their lives to protect our country and help facilitate democracy in Iraq and Syria.

Their devotion to our country is remarkable and inspiring.

The Islamic State, also known as ISIS is gobbling up land in Iraq and Syria.

In 2007, I introduced H.R. 930, the “Military Success in Iraq and Diplomatic Surge for Political and National Reconciliation in Iraq Act of 2007.”

Among other things, H.R. 930, would require a diplomatic full-court press designed to engage all six of Iraq’s neighbors—Iran, Turkey, Syria, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait—more constructively in stabilizing Iraq. These countries are already involved in a bilateral, self-interested and disorganized way.

The MSIA Act would ensure that never again will the American people or the Congress be bamboozled into rubber-stamping an ill-advised, ill-planned, preemptive war. In the Eastern Congressional District of Texas alone, more than 300 Texans have made the ultimate sacrifice for their country. Indeed, more than 3,000 Texans have been wounded.

The cost of war is brutal on our communities.

In my state, of the over 3,000 lives that have been lost, I can assure you that thousands more are affected.

To date, the war in Iraq alone has claimed the lives of over 4,000 brave servicemen and women. More than 30,000 Americans have been wounded, many suffering the most horrific injuries.

The mothers, fathers, wives, brothers, sisters, children, cousins, aunts, uncles and friends of those of our fallen soldiers are affected.

How do they manage? How do they cope after losing their loved ones?

How does a mother deal with the reality of burying her son or daughter?

How does one return the loss of his adult child, whose bright future carried a lot of his aspirations for a better and safer America?

That is just the human cost.

We are grateful to various U.S. agencies and non-profit organizations like the wounded warriors organizations that are helping these brave men and women attempt to put the pieces together.

We made the point that it was essential for this and prior Administrations to develop “a plan” for any war we sought to embark upon.

Yes, we understand that the Armed Forces of the United States is unparalleled on the battlefield and would decisively defeat Iraq’s forces and remove Saddam Hussein, which in fact we did.

But the existential question was what do we do next?

This resolution allows time for the President to come up with a plan for Congress to look at and consider.

Just consider these facts. Since the war began in Iraq and Syria:

In addition to our American causalities, hundreds of thousands of Iraqi and Syrian civilians have been killed.

About 13.6 million people, equivalent to the population of London, have been displaced by the conflicts in Syria and Iraq, and many are without food or shelter according to the UNHCR.

More than a trillion dollars has been expended on both wars;

On the operations against ISIS, it is estimated that we are spending as much as $22 billion a year.

Could this money be put to better use?

Well, consider the following:

How about fully funding the last week’s Trade Adjustment Bill voted on to protect over 280,000 American workers displaced by U.S. involvement in global trade.

A well funded TAA is designed to help train American workers displaced into new career paths so that they are able to make a living and support their families;

Programs funded by the TAA provide a path for employment growth and opportunity through aid to U.S. workers who have lost their jobs as a result of foreign trade.

The TAA provide our trade-affected workers with opportunities to obtain the skills, resources and support they need to become reemployed.

According to the DOL, over 5 percent of Americans are still looking for work and are unemployed or underemployed.

That means 1.5 million Americans are struggling financially.

This translates to millions of families.

Should we not be working to improve the livelihood of Americans?

Mr. Speaker, opponents of the resolution before us contend that it gives comfort to the enemy and undermines the President’s strategy for success in war in Iraq and Syria.

What we need is a solid strategy that is supported by the Administration, Congress and the American people.

This starts with a plan put forth by the President and debated and approved by the Congress.

This is why we should afford the President the opportunity to come up with this plan.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, exiles and militia leaders have found their way into Iraq and Syria in the likes of ISIS and are now a menace to peace loving people everywhere.

Peace, security, and the protection of lives is and should be our priority.

That is why I strongly and proudly support our magnificent, heroic, and selfless service men and women.

That is why I strongly support H. Con. Res. 55 which provides a procedural mechanism for Congress to do its job, by giving House leadership 6 months to take up an AUMF, debate it and vote up or voted down.

I urge all members to support the resolution before the House.

Mr. ROYCE, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, who also served in the U.S. Air Force in Iraq and Afghanistan and was one of the earliest voices calling for air-strikes against ISIS.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue for, unfortunately, the long time that we have been having to deal with this.

I am surprised. We watch the news. We see what is happening overseas and from afar, and we see the human tragedy occurring; yet we are here debating an isolationism resolution to withdraw all military actions from the Middle East at a time when we see utter human tragedies. This is not the time, in fact, to halt military operations.

I would like to speak out quickly on an issue that I think underlines this debate. There are some that believe that if our foreign policy were simply nicer, if our foreign policy were more accommodating or less focused on military power, then the world and, more importantly, our enemies would suddenly view America in a much different light, or that the problems that we are facing today, we wouldn’t be facing them at all. This is a view of pacifism or disengagement in the world,
and it represents at best a naive worldview, and I think it is certainly an illusion.

Ironically, as we debate the merits of this resolution, we have a case study in the illusion of pacifism or disengagement. The President laid down a line in the sand against al-Assad in Syria, and, in fact, the Russians supposedly gave the President an off-ramp in which he was able to exit and allow Bashar al-Assad to simply give up his chemical weapons.

What we saw that nicer new engagement by the United States, we did not see a peaceful Bashar al-Assad emerge realizing that he had simply misunderstood the United States. We saw the same brutal dictator that murdered his own people continued to be brutal and murderous.

Before we withdrew troops completely from Iraq, many implored the President to leave a residual force. We didn’t do it, and we have now the next iteration of al Qaeda, named ISIS. Now, that may be a bit of an oversimplification, but it is, in essence, what we see.

I think it is fine to have a debate about AUMF in this Chamber, and we should do so. The President gave us an AUMF that not only limited his ability to fight ISIS, but limited the ability of the next President of the United States to fight and destroy ISIS. I personally won’t be a party to tying the President’s hands.

Mr. Speaker, I was in Iraq just a few months ago, and I saw the human tragedy that occurred. I stood in the U.N. refugee camp and had a little girl come up to me and explain through a translator how her parents were killed by ISIS and how she ran away fleeing for security, and I realized the important role that the United States of America plays, the unfortunate burden that we must bear for world security.

Mr. Speaker, we either stand up and fight ISIS now, or we sit on our knees and cower before them later.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), a senior member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is unacceptable that we have not debated in committee and on the floor of the House an AUMF and a foreign policy designed to fit current circumstances, designed to fit an Assad regime that has killed nearly 200,000 of its own people, designed to fit ISIS, which either is or isn’t a part or a former part of al Qaeda. Instead, we operate under a resolution passed in the wake of the attacks in 2001.

The resolution before us I do not think is the answer to the fact that Congress has not debated a new AUMF.

The reason I rise to oppose it is because I urge Members to read it. It says that it ends all days unless there is some threat to our security. It says that it ends all deployment, but it is not clear how it applies to Air Force operations or Naval air operations. Presumably, we would stop all bombing under all circumstances.

How does it apply to the rights of the President under current law to deploy our forces for 60 to 90 days if there would be further outrage from the Assad regime?

We need a new resolution that does Congress’ best job to deal with the current circumstances. What we don’t need is the idea that blaming Obama for everything constitutes a foreign policy strategy.

The fact is that it was the Bush administration that installed and left al-Maliki in power. It is al-Maliki that expelled all our forces and would not allow a residual force. Would we have gone to war with the Iraqi Army under al-Maliki if he expelled our forces? I have yet to hear that suggested by the blame Obama side.

The fact is that we cannot leave our forces in a country that will not sign a status of forces agreement with us.

The great problem with Iraq today is what al-Maliki did to that country, and the person who installed al-Maliki was the former President of the United States, President W. Bush. So I speak forward, first, to the defeat of this resolution but, second, to consideration of a new AUMF that focuses on whether we will do anything about Assad or only go after ISIS, whether we will use ground forces or our Air Forces. That debate needs to start in our committee, but this resolution is not an answer.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I don’t appreciate this resolution being mischaracterized. The troops don’t have to be withdrawn for 6 months, and the point of this resolution is to force this House to do its job and pass an AUMF. If my colleagues are so upset that we haven’t debated and voted on an AUMF, they ought to support this resolution because the only way we are going to force the leadership in this House to do its job.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O’ROURKE).

Mr. O’ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, this is the best way I can think of of supporting our servicemembers and their families in this time of war, because I can think of no greater way to support them, to ensure that we have a strategy with defined, achievable goals when we are going to put their lives on the line. Today, I don’t know that we have that.

Do we have a partner in Iraq that has the will to fight? Do we have the resources necessary across two different battlefields in Iraq and Syria to achieve the President’s goal of degrading, defeating, and destroying ISIS? Do we have a strategy that is worthy of the loss of even one American servicemember’s life?

I think all of those questions are worthy of discussion and debate, a debate that would hopefully lead to an intelligent use of military force with that defined strategy.

This, Mr. Speaker, I believe, is our way of supporting soldiers and their families. It is also a way that the American people can hold us accountable by making the most important, awesome decision that a Member of Congress can, which is a U.S. servicemember in harm’s way.

I want to make sure that we can source the judgment and wisdom of the people that we represent. I, for one, if we have that debate and have that vote, will go back to my House of my community. I will talk to veterans who have served in our wars. I will talk to the parents of future servicemembers whose children’s lives will be put on the line, some which will be lost, some which will not.

Do we have a partner in Iraq that has the will to fight? Do we have the resources necessary across two different battlefields in Iraq and Syria to achieve the President’s goal of degrading, defeating, and destroying ISIS? Do we have a strategy that is worthy of the loss of even one American servicemember’s life?

I think all of those questions are worthy of discussion and debate, a debate that would hopefully lead to an intelligent use of military force with that defined strategy.
Now, that certainly applies to all our naval forces and all our air forces. But then it goes on to say, if the President determines that it is not safe to remove forces, he can have an additional period up to the end of the year. That assumes that our ground forces cannot be withdrawn within a 30-day period.

Our forces are mobile. They are capable. They are currently behind the front lines. And they can, indeed, leave within 30 days. So clause 2 is applicable only to a military that is engaged in combat or is immobile. Our military is neither.

Clause 1: "30 days beginning on the day on which this concurrent resolution is adopted."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I urge my colleagues to read the resolution because basically what it does, it gives the President up through the end of the year, if he so chooses. I mean, that is what the resolution says. And if the Congress believes that in 6 months we could come together and pass an AUMF. I would hope that all my colleagues—who are complaining here that we don't have an AUMF—would actually come together in the next 6 months and pass something because it hasn't happened in the first 10 months. We can point fingers all we want, but it is not getting done.

And this is a way to force this Congress to do its job. It is that simple. This is not about walking away from the conflict in the Middle East. This is about making sure that the men and women who serve in the United States Congress live up to our constitutional responsibilities and do our job. I am sorry that so many people think that is a radical idea, but we haven't done our job. And I think it is a disservice to the men and women who serve in our Armed Forces, and it is a disservice to our duty as Members of Congress.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, one of the great failures of this Congress in our time has been the abdication of our responsibility, which could not be more clearly defined by our Founders, for declarations of war and, subsequently, resolutions authorizing the use of force.

Clause 1 is long overdue for this Congress to step up and assume its responsibility for these declarations, these seemingly endless wars of choice that are so costly in blood and in treasure. It is time that this Congress step up and have that debate on whether or not it is in our interest to continue our involvement in these wars. We need to be presented with a rationale. We need to be presented with a strategy. Or, in fact, it is time to put an end to them and to bring our troops home.

Mr. Speaker, my fellow colleagues, we owe it to our taxpayers, who have spent trillions of dollars in these ventures. We owe it to our Founders, who knew and understood the importance of having the Congress make these decisions—not executives. And we owe it to our troops.

It is time to have that resolution debated and decided here, or it is time to bring the troops home, Mr. Speaker. As Judge Poe would say, "And that is just the way it is." Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. Lee), one of the co-authors of this resolution.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank Congressman MCGOVERN for yielding and for his tireless effort and leadership. Also, I am proud to join with Congressman WALTER JONES and, again, Mr. MCGOVERN on this bipartisan resolution.

This resolution calls only for the withdrawal of U.S. Armed Forces from Iraq and Syria by the end of the year absent, mind you—absent—the passage of an Authorization for Use of Military Force against ISIS.

However, this resolution is also about reclaiming a fundamental constitutional responsibility: the constitutionally protected right of Congress to debate and determine whether and when this country enters into war. For the past 450 more American troops to train and assist Iraqi forces in the fight against ISIS.

Mr. Speaker, this is a textbook mission creep. Mr. Speaker, we are here to say, enough is enough. After more than a decade of wars in the Middle East, thousands of U.S. lives and billions of dollars lost, the need for Congress to reclaim its war-making powers is more critical than ever.

If members of Congress are sent to Washington, D.C., to make hard decisions, but in the case of war, Congress, instead, has chosen to duck its responsibilities.

And let me just say, the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force—which is a blank check for endless war—has been cited as the authorization for the ongoing war against ISIS. That is why, of course, I voted against it 14 years ago and have introduced legislation every Congress to repeal this blank check for endless war.

Keeping this authorization on the books indefinitely without repealing or replacing it has allowed Congress to avoid its constitutional responsibility to declare war. It is about taking up an authorization against ISIS.

From what I remember, we only had 1 hour of debate in 2001. At least, Mr. Speaker, we have 2 hours now to debate whether or not to debate an Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Congress must have a role in how we do our work and what we are required to do, and that is exactly what this resolution is about. Many of us agree that a robust debate and a vote is necessary, long overdue.

During the full committee markup last week of the Defense Appropriations bill, I offered a sense of Congress amendment that simply reaffirmed that Congress has a constitutional duty to debate and determine whether or not to authorize the use of military force against ISIS. This amendment was adopted with the support of six Republicans on the committee.

While we may all not agree on what an AUMF should look like, we know there is bipartisan agreement around the need for Congress to debate on a specific AUMF.

We need to do our job. We know full well there is no military solution in Iraq or Syria, for that matter, and that any lasting solution must be settled in the region among warring factions.

The American people deserve to know the costs and the consequences of this new war, and Members of Congress have a responsibility to represent their constituents by saying "yes" or "no."

This resolution is a procedural mechanism. It is unfortunate, again, that we have to do this to make us live up to our constitutional job and duty in the matters of war and peace.

We need to vote "yes" on this resolution. It is simple. It is bipartisan. It just requires us to do our job and to exercise our constitutional responsibilities. Enough is enough. We cannot allow the American people to have no voice in what is said and what is being done with their taxpayer dollars.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas
(Mr. McCaul), the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us here today, in my judgment, is dangerous and should be defeated.

For months, Congress and the American people have demanded a strategy from this administration to defeat and destroy ISIS, a barbaric and growing terrorist empire that threatens not only the people of Iraq and Syria but also in the United States.

Today the Secretary of Defense testified that "ISIS is a threat to the homeland because of its avowed intentions to strike and recruit in this country. ISIS must be and will be dealt a lasting defeat."

But this President does not have a strategy to accomplish this. We continue to fight the terrorists with one hand tied behind our back, and the only thing worse would be to disengage completely, which is exactly what this resolution would do.

I recently led a bipartisan delegation to the Middle East, where I visited Iraq, ground zero in the fight against ISIS, a week before Ramadi was over-taken by ISIS, and I spoke with Prime Minister Abadi. Unfortunately, the current strategy, in my opinion, relies too heavily on Shia militias, a proxy of Iran, to defeat ISIS.

We now have over 3,000 American service members there to advise and assist the Iraqi national military. But the President has restricted our ability to take the fight to the enemy because he is more committed to his campaign pledge to end the wars in the Middle East than he is to ending ISIS. The President has, in fact, made the situation more dangerous. His failure to negotiate a status of forces agreement and the complete failure of Prime Minister Maliki to govern effectively created a vacuum that ISIS now fills. Unfortunately, the current strategy, in my opinion, relies too heavily on Shia militias, a proxy of Iran, to defeat ISIS.

We met the White House counsel. He presented a very different AUMF that would restrict further the President’s current abilities to destroy and defeat ISIS, I cannot support that. And this resolution, with all due respect, is the wrong way to accomplish the goal of defeating ISIS through a strong Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Mr. Engel. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Nadler), my friend and colleague.

Mr. Nadler. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, and I commend the sponsors, Mr. McGovern and Ms. Lee, for introducing it. And I do so not because I necessarily think we ought to withdraw all our troops in 6 months. Maybe we should. I am not sure of that yet. But I do know that we are waging a war that is probably unconstitutional, as we did in Libya.

Since World War II, we have time after time gotten away from the constitutional command that Congress shall declare war. The Framers said it is important to allow the American people to decide the war—and the President—to decide on it. But we have gotten away from that. We got away from it because we didn’t have time. That was the excuse. With the missiles flying over the poles, you didn’t have time. That was the excuse. With the missiles flying over the poles, you couldn’t call Congress into session.

But then came Iraq. We had a resolution for the use of military force. Then came Libya. No excuse. Plenty of time to consult with NATO. Plenty of time to consult with Arab countries. No time to consult with Congress. I believe that was constitutional and a foolish, as it turns out—but an unconstitutional use of force.

Mr. Speaker, now we have this force in the Middle East, in Iraq and in Syria. We are getting more and more into a war. I am not commenting on the intelligence of that right now. It may be that we have no choice but to fight ISIS. Maybe, as the Republicans seem to want without saying so, we should have a lot of boots on the ground, because that is what they are really saying when they say the President is doing it halfway. Or maybe the bigger threat is Iran, and we should turn our attentions to Iran instead of tacitly allying with Iran against ISIS. Or maybe we should say it is up to the Middle Eastern people—they can handle it—and pull our troops out altogether. That is the debate we ought to have.

Congress ought to make these decisions in the name of the American people, not the President. Now, because we haven’t had an AUMF on the floor, we must have this resolution.

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

Mr. Nadler. This resolution is not intended to force a pullout in 6 months. It is intended to force a debate in Congress in 6 months. Let’s go back to our constitutional tradition. Let Congress do its job, and if the President submitted an AUMF that is too strong or too weak, let’s bring up a different one. But it is our job to make those decisions. It is our job to stand before our constituents to say we believe this is important enough to go to war with ISIS or with Iran, to send more troops there or not, and here is why and here are the limitations, we shouldn’t have boots on the ground or we should.

Mr. Speaker, those are our decisions to make, and our decisions we shouldn’t be able to avoid. That is what this is about. We have had 10 years of war, 13 years of war. The 2001 AUMF cannot possibly be relevant now. We thought we were voting for, and we were voting for 3 weeks of strikes against bases in Afghanistan. The 2002 AUMF was to topple Saddam Hussein. He is gone. I didn’t think that was a good idea, but it is over. The consequences are not over.

We ought to debate this. We ought to debate an AUMF. We ought to pass one or not. That is our decision, but let’s pass this resolution that supports that decision on us.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Lewis).

Mr. Lewis. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

First let me thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Lee), and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Jones) for their tireless leadership on this issue.

Thank you, Mr. McGovern.

For 14 long years, our Nation has been at war. Our people are sick and tired of war. This resolution simply opens the door to bring American soldiers home.

Let me be clear. We must maintain a strong national defense. We have a responsibility to protect our borders, our diplomats, and Americans at home and abroad. But the end to terrorism is not found through the barrel of a gun or more boots on the ground. More weapons cannot stop the root causes of terrorism, and more bombs cannot eradicate the seeds of hate.

Over and over again, I have stood on this very floor and reminded my colleagues that the use of force cannot—must not—be taken lightly, especially when the stakes are so great, and the sea of terrorism is so vast.

President John F. Kennedy once said, "Those who make a peaceful revolution irresponsible or damaging to our interests. But let me say this in response to those who say this is a vote to urge an AUMF vote. I personally support a strong AUMF, an authorization, but one to defeat ISIS.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, and I commend the sponsors, Mr. McGovern and Ms. Lee, for introducing it. And I do so not because I necessarily think we ought to withdraw all our troops in 6 months. Maybe we should. I am not sure of that yet. But I do know that we are waging a war that is probably unconstitutional, as we did in Libya.

Since World War II, we have time after time gotten away from the constitutional command that Congress shall declare war. The Framers said it is important to allow the American people to decide the war—and the President—to decide on it. But we have gotten away from that. We got away from it because we didn’t have time. That was the excuse. With the missiles flying over the poles, you didn’t have time. That was the excuse. With the missiles flying over the poles, you couldn’t call Congress into session.

But then came Iraq. We had a resolution for the use of military force. Then came Libya. No excuse. Plenty of time to consult with NATO. Plenty of time to consult with Arab countries. No time to consult with Congress. I believe that was constitutional and a foolish, as it turns out—but an unconstitutional use of force.

Mr. Speaker, now we have this force in the Middle East, in Iraq and in Syria. We are getting more and more into a war. I am not commenting on the intelligence of that right now. It may be that we have no choice but to fight ISIS. Maybe, as the Republicans seem to want without saying so, we should have a lot of boots on the ground, because that is what they are really saying when they say the President is doing it halfway. Or maybe the bigger threat is Iran, and we should turn our attentions to Iran instead of tacitly allying with Iran against ISIS. Or maybe we should say it is up to the Middle Eastern people—they can handle it—and pull our troops out altogether. That is the debate we ought to have. That ought to be debated in Congress. Congress ought to make these decisions in the name of the American people, not just the President.

Now, because we haven’t had an AUMF on the floor, we must have this resolution.

The Speaker pro tempore. The time for the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Nadler. This resolution is not intended to force a pullout in 6 months. It is intended to force a debate in Congress in 6 months. Let’s go back to our constitutional tradition. Let Congress do its job, and if the President submitted an AUMF that is too strong or too weak, let’s bring up a different one. But it is our job to make those decisions. It is our job to stand before our constituents to say we believe this is important enough to go to war with ISIS or with Iran, to send more troops there or not, and here is why and here are the limitations, we shouldn’t have boots on the ground or we should.

Mr. Speaker, those are our decisions to make, and our decisions we shouldn’t be able to avoid. That is what this is about. We have had 10 years of war, 13 years of war. The 2001 AUMF cannot possibly be relevant now. We thought we were voting for 3 weeks of strikes against bases in Afghanistan. The 2002 AUMF was to topple Saddam Hussein. He is gone. I didn’t think that was a good idea, but it is over. The consequences are not over.

We ought to debate this. We ought to debate an AUMF. We ought to pass one or not. That is our decision, but let’s pass this resolution that supports that decision on us.

First let me thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Lee), and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Jones) for their tireless leadership on this issue.

Thank you, Mr. McGovern.

For 14 long years, our Nation has been at war. Our people are sick and tired of war. This resolution simply opens the door to bring American soldiers home.

Let me be clear. We must maintain a strong national defense. We have a responsibility to protect our borders, our diplomats, and Americans at home and abroad. But the end to terrorism is not found through the barrel of a gun or more boots on the ground. More weapons cannot stop the root causes of terrorism, and more bombs cannot eradicate the seeds of hate.

Over and over again, I have stood on this very floor and reminded my colleagues that the use of force cannot—must not—be taken lightly, especially when the stakes are so great, and the sea of terrorism is so vast.
impossible will make violent revolution inevitable.”

Many years ago, I shared my concern with you that young people in the Middle East would never forget the violence that they have experienced in their youth. I feared that they would grow up hating our children, our grandchildren, and generations yet unborn. I feared those young people would have very little faith in the idea of democracy, in the values of inclusion, or the hope for lasting peace.

“Hate begets hate,” as Martin Luther King, Jr., would say, “violence begets violence; toughness begets a greater toughness. We must meet the forces of hate with the power of love.”

These young people must be our focus. We must lift them up and listen to regional voices for peace. We must counter the consequences of violence by demonstrating that diplomacy and the spread of true democracy are the most effective weapons against terrorism.

Yes, I will say it again. Our people are sick and tired of war. I hope that all of my colleagues will support this resolution and vote “yes” for a method to build on a long time and for years and generations to come.

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

Mr. ENGEL. It is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, Ms. ELANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from New York for yielding to me. I have something special to say.

Mr. Speaker, as the United States has increasingly drifted into war without the usual congressional authorization, I appreciate that today’s resolution permits the House to assert its appropriate role. I only ask that the residents of Columbia be permitted to be heard in the same way as other Americans. My colleagues will not only speak today, they also will vote the will of their constituents. Although District residents are already serving in Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere, I am limited to speaking without a vote.

What an outrage, especially to our veterans. That outrage is amplified, considering that District residents pay $12,000 annually per capita in Federal taxes and no Federal taxes support our residents of any State in the Union, to support our government in war and in peace. Regardless of what is decided on this resolution, Mr. Speaker, District residents will be there for America, as they have been for every war ever since the Nation was created. It is time that Congress was there for District residents.

Nearly 200,000 D.C. residents have fought for America’s freedom in time of war, yet our residents, including our veterans, have been denied a vote in the national legislature that sent them to war. In fact, D.C. servicemembers fought and won the vote for citizens in Iraq and Afghanistan, yet our veterans came home without the same voting rights for themselves. The Nation willingly accepts their sacrifices and demands their tax dollars but denies them representation in Congress.

D.C. residents have not only given their lives for this country since its creation as a nation, they have died in disproportionate numbers in all of the 21st century wars; yet these veterans, among the 650,000 Americans who live in the District of Columbia, still have no vote on national security, no vote on defense spending, no vote in the decision to send our country to war, and no vote on anything else in this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore.

The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. NORTON. I protest, Mr. Speaker. I protest continuing to demand full citizenship costs from the residents of our Nation’s Capital while denying them the ability to elect representatives.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD.)

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for offering this important proposal that he is joined with by colleagues from California, New York, North Carolina, and other places.

I am a Republican whostands profoundly with this Democrat because I think he is hitting the nail on the head. I do so because, in this instance, it has been argued against as a blunt instrument. But what the Founding Fathers were incredibly deliberate about—very blunt about, if you will—was that only Congress had the ability to declare war. And so this one blunt instrument is ultimately about backing up the blunt instrument. It is absolutely being declarative in suggesting that only Congress has the power to authorize war.

What the Founding Fathers knew was that, at the end of the day, body bags don’t come back to Washington, D.C., when something goes wrong in some far-off battlefield; they come back to congressional districts across this country. So they wanted a check and a balance wherein people from those places could report into Congress and say that this is or this isn’t working for folks back home.

Again, the Founding Fathers were so blunt. I look here at a document that is 250 days beyond the authorization of war that is even granted in the War Powers Act. I look at an administration and the Congress that is hinging, it is building and sustaining of war in the Middle East based on a 14-year-old document, in essence, a blank check, and there are no blank checks in this process.

I look at what James Madison said years ago. He said: “The Constitution supposes what the history of all governments demonstrates, that the executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it. It has accordingly, with studied care, vested the question of war to the legislature.”

This proposal is about cost. It is about saying we have spent $2.5 trillion in the Middle East. The Harvard study says 6 trillion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore.

The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for all these different reasons, we need to stop the war, not adding troops home, but, as has been suggested by others, to force a debate on Congress’ role. This is something Republicans and Democrats ought to equally care about; Do we or don’t we have proper lanes in the channel? Is the executive exceeding its authority or not?

This is something Republicans absolutely ought to care about. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, again, I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts for bringing this bill which is so important for, simply, Congress’ authorization of war effort.

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

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I first would like to insert in the RECORD a letter of support from the Constitution Project, which is signed by our colleague, Republican Mickey Edwards of Oklahoma; a letter in support of this resolution from the Council for a Livable War; a letter of support from Win Without War; and a letter of support from the Friends Committee on National Legislation.

THE CONSTITUTION PROJECT,

Washington, DC, June 17, 2015.

Hon. Jim McGOVERN,

House of Representatives.

Hon. Walter Jones,

House of Representatives.

Hon. Barbara Lee,

House of Representatives.

Dear Representatives McGOVERN, Jones and Lee: We write to applaud you for your efforts to compel Congress to exercise its constitutional responsibility to decide on war. For ten months President Obama has prosecuted the war against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) under a special legal claim that Congress authorized it four years ago. None of this is legal. It is high time that Members weighed in.

We take no position on grave policy choices about whether to continue to use military force against ISIL, and if so how. But Congress must. The Framers vested the war power in the legislative branch precisely because they believed that young Americans should only be put in harm’s way when the people, through their representatives’ collective judgment, approved it.

We know this is the most difficult issue that Members face. It is also your most important responsibility. If Congress agrees that the service men and woman should be engaged in battle, it is Members’ constitutional duty to say so. If Congress disagrees,
those men and women should come home. What Congress cannot do is continue to avoid the question. We support H. Con. Res. 55 because it would force this long-overdue debate and vote.

Please do not hesitate to contact us, via Scott Roehm at The Constitution Project, with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

MICKEY EDWARDS,
Vice President, Aspen Institute; former Member of Congress (D-OK) and Chairman of the House Republican Policy Committee; co-chair The Constitution Project War Powers Committee.

LOUIS FISHER,

VIRGINIA SLOAN,
President, The Constitution Project.

COUNCIL FOR A LIVABLE WORLD,
Washington, DC, June 16, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCGOVERN, Later this week, Congress has the opportunity to take action it has conspicuously avoided: debate and vote on the war in Iraq and Syria.

While America has dropped thousands of bombs, deployed 3,500 troops—with plans to send 450 more and spend billions of dollars in our latest war, Congress has failed to perform its most basic constitutional responsibility: to debate and vote on war.

But this week, Reps. Jim McGovern (D-MA), Walter Jones (R-NC), and Barbara Lee (D-CA), are demanding that Congress do its job.

They have introduced a bipartisan resolution, H. Con. Res. 55, which could force the House of Representatives to debate and vote on the war.

If adopted, the legislation would direct the President to withdraw all American military personnel from Iraq by December 31, 2015 unless Congress votes to authorize the use of force.

The right of Congress to declare war is fundamental to our Constitution, yet Congress has avoided taking a stand on our most recent war in the Middle East. In addition, Congress holds the power of the purse, and yet the war is costing at least $10 million per day without congressional approval. Congress owes it to the thousands of Americans we have put into harm’s way to ensure it is for the right reasons.

The President should not be permitted to wage war without Congressional approval; he should not be able to claim outdated authorizations for the use of military force dating to 2001 and 2002 as his cover for war.

We urge you to support H. Con. Res. 55, the McGovern-Jones-Lee resolution. It is time for Congress to take a stand.

Sincerely,

ANGELA CANTERBURY,
Executive Director.

WIN WITHOUT WAR,
Washington, DC, June 16, 2015.


This bipartisan resolution, introduced by Reps. McGovern (D-MA), Jones (R-NC), and Lee (D-CA), would force Congress to debate the use of military force in Iraq and Syria. We expect the resolution to be on the floor tomorrow, June 17.

While America has dropped thousands of bombs, deployed 3,500 troops, and spent billions of dollars in our latest war, Congress has failed to perform its most basic responsibility to debate and authorization on the war in Iraq and Syria. After ten months of bombing Iraq and Syria, it is past time for Congress to do its job and debate and vote on this war. It is simply unconscionable that we are asking our men and women in uniform to risk their lives in a war that Congress has not voted on.

The McGovern-Jones-Lee Resolution would force Congress to vote on the war in Iraq and Syria, and, importantly, if Congress continues to shirk its constitutional duty, it would bring our troops home. In the words of Rep. McGovern, “if this House doesn’t have the stomach to carry out its constitutional duty to debate and authorize this latest war, then we should bring our troops home. If the cowardly Congress can go home each night to their families and loved ones, then our brave troops should receive that same privilege.”

However one feels about this latest war in the Middle East, we can all agree that it is long past time for Congress to do its job and finally debate and vote on the war in Iraq and Syria.

Congress needs to fulfill its constitutional duty to debate and vote on this war. We hope you will SUPPORT H.Con.Res.55.

As always, if we can be of any additional assistance as your office considers this important resolution, please let us know.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN MILES,
Advocacy Director, Win Without War.

FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2015.

Today your boss will take an important vote on war authority. The House is expected to consider H.Con.Res.55, a privileged resolution led by Reps. Jim McGovern, Walter Jones, and Barbara Lee. By exercising Congress’ ability under the War Powers Resolution to urge cessation of hostilities absent a congressional authorization of force, the resolution would serve as a forcing mechanism for Congress to finally debate the war against ISIS that has lasted more than ten months without specific congressional debate and authorization.

Nearly ten months ago, the Obama administration sidestepped its constitutional mandate to seek authority from Congress before engaging in new military hostilities. This greatly expanded the scope of the 2001 AUMF and the scope of executive war powers. Further, it deprived the American people and their elected representatives of an opportunity to express their opinion, or to ask important questions about the overall strategy, and why more war will solve the region’s problems, when it has failed to do so any other time.

The Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL) urges your boss to take this opportunity to debate the war, to vote for the re-establishment of congressional war power, and to vote in favor of H.Con.Res.55. It’s time for Congress to weigh in on this issue.

Please do not hesitate to reach out to us at Elizabeth@fcnl.org if you have any further questions or concerns.

Thanks,

MAGGIE O’DONNELL,
Program Assistant, Militarism and Civil Liberties, Friends Committee on National Legislation.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to close.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the gentleman from California and the gentleman from New York. I know that if we were left up to him, they could fashion an AUMF that could get 218 votes here. Quite frankly, we wouldn’t be here today if we had done our job, because the only reason why you can bring up a privileged resolution under the War Powers Resolution is if our troops are in harm’s way and we haven’t acted. This could end right now if the Speaker of the House or the majority leader would give us a date certain by which we would debate and vote on an AUMF.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled by our policy in Iraq and Syria. I do not believe it is a clearly defined mission, and I fear that it might be just more of the same.
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I am not convinced that by enlarging our military footprint, we will end the violence in the region, defeat the Islamic State or address the underlying causes of unrest.

Regardless of whether you support the war or oppose the war, believe we should escalate our involvement or place restrictions on it, the bottom line is that Congress needs to debate an AUMF and vote on it. That is our duty. That is our job. If we don’t have the guts to do so, then we should at least have the decency to bring our troops homes to their families and to their loved ones.

I hope that each Member of this House, before they come down to this floor to vote on this resolution, takes a minute to look in the mirror. Ask yourself: Why do we get to go home to our families when our troops don’t have that privilege?

They have been sent to Iraq and Syria to fight in our name, but we don’t have the courage to stand up for them and to authorize the war, and we don’t have the guts to bring them home.

Take a minute and ask: We are willing to send our troops into danger; we are willing to spend billions upon billions upon billions of borrowed money for this war, but we are not willing to carry out our constitutional duty, the same Constitution we keep asking our troops to put their lives on the line to protect? How can we keep asking them to sacrifice for us when we are not willing to put anything on the line for them?

I have had colleagues come up against this resolution and say: We share your frustration over the fact that we have not debated and voted on an AUMF.
I appreciate that, but I would ask them: What in the world can we do in a bipartisan way to force this question to come to the floor? What is it going to take to get the leadership of this House to say, I am going to schedule an AUMF; and are we going to debate it and vote on it?

We have been involved in this latest war for over 10 months. Our resolution would give them another 6 months to come up with an AUMF, and if they didn’t, they would be leaving our troops home.

This resolution before us, I admit, is a bit of a blunt instrument; but if Congress had lived up to its responsibilities, we wouldn’t need to be so blunt. Congress needs a clear deadline for a debate on an AUMF for Iraq and Syria.

That deadline is the withdrawal of our troops by the end of this year. It gives this House, it gives this Republican leadership 6 entire months to get an AUMF enacted. It gives this House and this leadership 6 more months in which to simply do their job.

A vote for this resolution is not a vote to pull out, as some have asserted; it is not even, I got to say, House Republican leadership a deadline that they cannot ignore, to force them to do their duty as leaders of this House by finally bringing an AUMF to the floor for a vote.

I heard some of my colleagues complain that they don’t like the President’s policy in Iraq and Syria; yet rather than trying to bring an AUMF to the floor to define that policy better, they are simply content to sit back and criticize from the sidelines. That is not what we are here to do. That is not our job.

This is important stuff. War is a big deal. We ought to treat it like it is a big deal. War has become too easy for this House. It is too easy for us to go to war and pass a responsible policy for degrading and defeating ISIS. Voting for such a withdrawal is not the right way forward. I believe that with all my heart.

Let’s vote down this resolution and go back to the drawing board. Chairman ROYCE and I will work together in a bipartisan way, as we have so many times in the past, and let’s put before this Congress the right policy to get this job done.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I very much appreciate Mr. McGovern for his consistency. Even when we may disagree on substance, I have always respected his dedication with respect to human rights in Africa and, frankly, across the world on many, many issues. I agree that an AUMF would be good, but only the right AUMF.

I would make this point: the White House hasn’t helped the case to move an AUMF. Indeed, as soon as the President sent up his draft AUMF text to the Congress in February, the White House said he has all the legal authority he needs for those operations, regardless of what the Congress does, undercutting our effort to build a consensus, but we should not give up in terms of our effort to build this consensus.

To that end, I intend to continue to work with Mr. ENGEL and others and craft a bipartisan and successful AUMF that sends a message of unity, that sends a message of resolve.

To that end, I would point out that the committee has held seven full committee hearings and two subcommittee oversight hearings on the ISIS threat. We have discussed the AUMF; we have discussed the U.S. and coalition response, but given the wide range of views, including the view that we have no military business in Iraq, reaching an agreement on a bipartisan AUMF that authorizes the actions needed to defeat ISIS may not be possible, but it may be possible. For that reason, we are going to redouble our effort.

There would, though, be a price paid for failure on this floor, signaling disunity. As we work towards the effort to build a consensus, we have passed legislation directly and indirectly helping Kurdish Peshmerga forces who are fighting ISIS on the ground.

We have worked to strengthen U.S. defense cooperation with our regional ally Jordan, to help prevent Americans who join and fight for ISIS from returning home to the homeland—we passed that legislation—and to combat the cultural genocide being perpetrated by ISIS forces.

As I say, we will continue to work with our colleagues to try to find a way forward on a revised and updated authorization focused on the vicious and growing threat posed by ISIS, but acting without a credible way forward would be foolhardy, not brave. A divided and unsuccessful process would be perceived by our allies, our partners, and our enemies as a no-confidence vote in the fight against ISIS, resulting in a significant blow to the national security of this country.

For that reason, I would ask Members to contemplate for a moment what the world would look like should ISIS, should our forces, our airstrikes against ISIS, be pulled out of that region because I remember what it looked like when we did not have airstrikes on ISIS before they went into Mosul, and members of our committee, in a bipartisan sense, called for airpower to be used against ISIS on that desert path as they were headed to Mosul.

Here is what we saw when they took that city: mass killings, beheadings, abductions, forced conversions, torture, rape, sexual assault, using women and children as human shields, people being burned alive and buried alive, women and girls the age of 13 being taken as captives to be sold as sex slaves and put into forced marriages with ISIS fighters. That is what we witnessed after the fall of that great city.

The question I would ask is: If we are to abandon our airstrikes in support of these Kurdish units on that 600-mile front—50,000 of those troops are women fighting against ISIS, and they no longer have U.S. air support to support their effort to turn back ISIS—what will become of them? What will become of others?

Because this is no longer simply a terrorist organization—it is now a full-blown army seeking to establish a self-governing state through the Tigris and Euphrates valley in what is now Syria and Iraq and Lebanon and seek to expand that further.
We know a lot now about its leader, Abu al-Baghdadi, in Syria. He is a designated global terrorist under U.S. law. His mission, he clearly states, if you want to go online and see the blueprint of ISIS.

Part of that is to gain resources and recruits and create a safe haven to attack the United States. Yes, this certainly goes to the direct security interest of the United States if we were to pull off and give a breather to Abu al-Baghdadi and to ISIS. In Iraq, we are taking less than half of what we need to gain resources and recruits and create a safe haven to attack the United States. Yes, this certainly goes to the direct security interest of the United States if we were to pull off and give a breather to Abu al-Baghdadi and to ISIS.

In order to do so, we are taking less than half measures to assist the ISF, the forces that are fighting ISIS, with insufficient trainers and advisers, as I said, with no air force, controllers, with insufficient plans to train the Sunni tribes, and insufficient arms to the Kurds and Sunnis, something we are trying to do something with our legislation.

The power balance in the Middle East is shifting against the U.S. regional interest and certainly against U.S. security.

As stated, there are no simple answers or solutions; we discussed this in this debate, but without our involvement—without our involvement—our adversities will continue to be emboldened, and our friends out of fear are susceptible to poor decisions, while the Middle East region and the world become a more dangerous place.

This organization ISIS is simultaneously a strategic threat at the regional and to the world and a genocidal terror movement. I recall saying on the floor of this House, never again with respect to genocide and terror, and we are watching genocidal terror.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 16, 2015, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution. The question is on adoption of the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas and nays were ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution will be followed by 5-minute debates on the previous question on House Resolution 319, and adopting House Resolution 319, if ordered.
because I was absent for personal reasons.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous resolution (H. Res. 319) providing for consideration of the bill (H. R. 160) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices, and for providing for consideration of the bill (H. R. 1190) to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 186, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 371]

AYE—241

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Nanomaki
Boyle, Brendan F.
Buck
Buck
Bueno
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clay (FL)
Cooper
Craig (FL)
Crenshaw
Crawford
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DelBianco
Dansky
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Nunes
Olson
Palmaz
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Pitman
PoiteVIN
Poconos
Pompeo
Posey
Proof
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfuss
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Santorum
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (SC)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stevens
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thomson
Tiberi
Tipton

NEAY—186

Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O’Brien
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Price
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rolle-

AYE—241

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Babin
Barletta
Barrett
Barton
Beukenesch
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blair
Bonos
day
Boulter
Bowers
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Buena
t
Buck
Buchanan
Burge
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Crautters
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davalos
Dent
DelBianco
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Doll
Drew
Duckworth
Eberhardt
Edward
Ehrenreich
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Farr
Frankel (FL)

Trep
Turner
Udall
Wagner
Walberg
Walsh
Walker
Walters
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (NC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—6

Byrne
Curbelo (FL)
Drury
Drury
Drew
Drew

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

[Divide]

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. CURBelo of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rolcall No. 371, I was in a meeting. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS, Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-

[Roll No. 372]