

SEC. 1217. COMPLETION OF ACCELERATED TRANSITION OF UNITED STATES COMBAT AND MILITARY AND SECURITY OPERATIONS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF AFGHANISTAN; REQUIREMENTS TO CONTINUE DEPLOYMENT OF ARMED FORCES IN AFGHANISTAN TO CARRY OUT MISSIONS AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2014.

(a) COMPLETION OF ACCELERATED TRANSITION OF UNITED STATES COMBAT AND MILITARY AND SECURITY OPERATIONS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF AFGHANISTAN.—In coordination with the Government of Afghanistan, North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) member countries, and other allies in Afghanistan, the President shall—

(1) complete the accelerated transition of United States combat operations to the Government of Afghanistan by not later than December 31, 2014;

(2) complete the accelerated transition of United States military and security operations to the Government of Afghanistan and redeploy United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan (including operations involving military and security-related contractors) by not later than December 31, 2014; and

(3) pursue robust negotiations leading to a political settlement and reconciliation of the internal conflict in Afghanistan, to include the Government of Afghanistan, all interested parties within Afghanistan and with the observance and support of representatives of donor nations active in Afghanistan and regional governments and partners in order to secure a secure and independent Afghanistan and regional security and stability.

(b) REQUIREMENTS OF PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION AND CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORIZATION TO CONTINUE DEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN AFGHANISTAN TO CARRY OUT MISSIONS AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2014.—

(1) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION.—In the event that United States Armed Forces remain deployed in Afghanistan after December 31, 2014, then no later than March 31, 2015, the President shall send to Congress a determination describing the purpose and expected duration of such deployment, and the projected number of troops to be deployed.

(2) CONGRESSIONAL ACTION.—No later than 30 days following the receipt of the President's determination, Congress shall enact a joint resolution to approve the content of the President's determination. Should Congress vote against the President's determination, the President is directed to remove all troops not required to protect United States diplomatic facilities and personnel in a safe, orderly and expeditious redeployment from Afghanistan.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to include my amendment calling for a vote on keeping troops in Afghanistan after 2014, and that this amendment receive 10 minutes total debate like every other germane amendment made in order under the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has been yielded for the purpose of debate by the gentleman from Florida. Does the gentleman from Florida yield for this unanimous consent request?

Mr. NUGENT. I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 23, nays 361, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

YEAS—23

Castor (FL)	Israel	Moore
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Nadler
Clarke (NY)	Jones	O'Rourke
Dingell	Kelly (IL)	Pallone
Fudge	Lee (CA)	Pingree (ME)
Hastings (FL)	McGovern	Pocan
Hinojosa	Meeeks	Velázquez
Honda	Miller, George	

NAYS—361

Aderholt	Cotton	Graves (GA)
Amash	Courtney	Graves (MO)
Amodei	Cramer	Grayson
Bachus	Crawford	Green, Al
Barber	Crenshaw	Green, Gene
Barletta	Crowley	Griffin (AR)
Barr	Cuellar	Griffith (VA)
Barrow (GA)	Culberson	Grijalva
Barton	Cummings	Grimm
Beatty	Daines	Guthrie
Benishek	Davis (CA)	Gutiérrez
Bentivolio	Davis, Danny	Hahn
Bera (CA)	Davis, Rodney	Hall
Bilirakis	DeFazio	Hanabusa
Bishop (NY)	DeGette	Harper
Bishop (UT)	Delaney	Harris
Black	DeLauro	Hartzler
Blackburn	Dent	Hastings (WA)
Blumenauer	DeSantis	Heck (NV)
Bonamici	DesJarlais	Hensarling
Boustany	Deutch	Higgins
Brady (PA)	Diaz-Balart	Himes
Braley (IA)	Doggett	Holding
Bridenstine	Doyle	Horsford
Brooks (AL)	Duckworth	Huffman
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Huizenga (MI)
Broun (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Hultgren
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Hunter
Brownley (CA)	Ellison	Hurt
Buchanan	Ellmers	Issa
Bucshon	Enyart	Jackson Lee
Burgess	Eshoo	Jeffries
Bustos	Esty	Jenkins
Butterfield	Farenthold	Johnson (OH)
Byrne	Farr	Johnson, Sam
Calvert	Fattah	Jolly
Campbell	Fincher	Jordan
Capito	Fitzpatrick	Kaptur
Capps	Fleischmann	Keating
Capuano	Fleming	Kelly (PA)
Cárdenas	Flores	Kennedy
Carney	Forbes	Kildee
Carson (IN)	Fortenberry	Kilmer
Cartwright	Foster	Kind
Castro (TX)	Fox	King (IA)
Chabot	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Chaffetz	Frelinghuysen	Kinzinger (IL)
Cicilline	Gabbard	Kirkpatrick
Clark (MA)	Gallego	Kline
Cleaver	Garamendi	Kuster
Clyburn	Garcia	Labrador
Coble	Gardner	LaMalfa
Coffman	Garrett	Lamborn
Cohen	Gerlach	Lance
Cole	Gibbs	Langevin
Collins (NY)	Gibson	Larson (CT)
Connolly	Gohmert	Latham
Conyers	Goodlatte	Latta
Cook	Gosar	Levin
Cooper	Gowdy	Lewis
Costa	Granger	Lipinski

LoBiondo	Pearce	Sessions
Loeb sack	Pelosi	Sewell (AL)
Lofgren	Perlmutter	Shea-Porter
Long	Perry	Sherman
Lowenthal	Peters (CA)	Shimkus
Lowey	Peters (MI)	Shuster
Lucas	Peterson	Sinema
Luetkemeyer	Petri	Sires
Luján, Ben Ray	Pittenger	Smith (MO)
(NM)	Pitts	Smith (NE)
Lummis	Poe (TX)	Smith (NJ)
Lynch	Polis	Smith (TX)
Maffei	Pompeo	Smith (WA)
Maloney,	Posey	Southerland
Carolyn	Price (GA)	Speier
Maloney, Sean	Price (NC)	Stewart
Marchant	Quigley	Stivers
Marino	Rahall	Stockman
Massie	Rangel	Stutzman
Matheson	Reed	Swalwell (CA)
Matsui	Reichert	Takano
McAllister	Renacci	Terry
McCarthy (CA)	Ribble	Thompson (CA)
McCarthy (NY)	Rice (SC)	Thompson (MS)
McCaul	Richmond	Thompson (PA)
McClintock	Rigell	Thornberry
McCollum	Roby	Tiberi
McHenry	Roe (TN)	Tierney
McIntyre	Rogers (AL)	Tipton
McKeon	Rogers (KY)	Titus
McKinley	Rogers (MI)	Tonko
McMorris	Rohrabacher	Tsongas
Rodgers	Rokita	Turner
McNerney	Rooney	Upton
Meadows	Ros-Lehtinen	Valadao
Meehan	Roskam	Van Hollen
Mica	Ross	Veasey
Michaud	Rothfus	Vela
Miller (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
Miller (MI)	Royce	Wagner
Moran	Ruiz	Walberg
Mullin	Runyan	Walden
Mulvaney	Ruppersberger	Walorski
Murphy (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Walz
Murphy (PA)	Salmon	Wasserman
Napolitano	Sánchez, Linda	Schultz
Neal	T.	Weber (TX)
Negrete McLeod	Sanchez, Loretta	Webster (FL)
Neugebauer	Sanford	Welch
Noem	Sarbanes	Wenstrup
Nolan	Scalise	Westmoreland
Nugent	Schiff	Whitfield
Nunes	Schneider	Williams
Nunnelee	Schock	Wilson (SC)
Olson	Schrader	Wittman
Owens	Schweikert	Wolf
Palazzo	Scott (VA)	Womack
Pascarell	Scott, Austin	Yarmuth
Pastor (AZ)	Scott, David	Yoder
Paulsen	Sensenbrenner	Yoho
Payne	Serrano	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—47

Bachmann	Frankel (FL)	McDermott
Bass	Gingrey (GA)	Meng
Becerra	Hanna	Messer
Bishop (GA)	Heck (WA)	Miller, Gary
Brady (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Camp	Holt	Ryan (OH)
Cantor	Hoyer	Schakowsky
Carter	Hudson	Schwartz
Cassidy	Huelskamp	Simpson
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Slaughter
Collins (GA)	Joyce	Vargas
Conaway	Kingston	Waters
DelBene	Lankford	Waxman
Denham	Larsen (WA)	Wilson (FL)
Duffy	Lujan Grisham	Woodall
Engel	(NM)	Young (AK)

□ 1511

Mses. MCCOLLUM, BROWN of Florida, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Messrs. BARTON, STIVERS, GARCIA, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. CHU and Mr. PALLONE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 224, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4435, HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3361, USA FREEDOM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT) has 21½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) has 16 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me time to address the subject of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, this House is considering a combined rule. It is a rule that addresses the NDAA and it is a rule that addresses the USA FREEDOM Act wrapped up together.

Mr. Speaker, I would reiterate the point that we are addressing a combined rule between the National Defense Authorization Act and the USA FREEDOM Act.

The first component that I would like to address with the time that I have is an expression of appreciation to the Rules Committee for going through all the amendments of the NDAA, taking a look at that and coming down with a rule that recognizes that the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee is immigration policy, not Armed Services.

□ 1515

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Rules Committee for the decision that they made on the NDAA. Even though there were dozens and dozens, actually scores of amendments to consider last year, there was an amendment that addressed the immigration issue that was made in order on the bill. That brought about a debate and a discussion here on the floor.

Instead, that debate took place this time in the Rules Committee and the Rules Committee declined to approve essentially amendment number 58 that dealt with the immigration issue. It is the proper jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. Additionally, it was bad policy.

So I rise to thank the Rules Committee for that decision and transition into a discussion about the USA FREEDOM Act, which I am troubled by; and that is the process of regular order in this Congress, and the idea that, as the Congress put together a bill that blocked the Federal Government from collecting metadata on telephone bills, there was a negotiation that took place over the weekend, a substitute amendment was delivered, announced at 12:35 p.m. on a Monday, we took up the bill

I believe the next day quickly, no amendments were accepted, we didn't have an opportunity to have a serious discussion about the national defense, national security implications of a bill that addressed the civil liberties.

I support the underlying bill, I support the effort to protect the civil liberties of the American people.

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

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

The amendment that I offered, even though it was voted on, the debate really didn't consider this proposal that the head of an element of the intelligence community may enter into an agreement to compensate for retaining call detail records for a period of time.

What the underlying bill does in section 215 is it limits the amount of time that we can get a FISA warrant to do a query of existing records in the private hands of the telecommunications companies to the 18 months that is required by the FCC. We need to have the opportunity for this Commander in Chief, the intelligence community, or a subsequent Commander in Chief to be able to expand that period of time while still protecting that data within the possession of the private sector companies, which we have confidence in.

That is an issue that I would like to see before this Congress. It is not going to be voted on in this bill. I am troubled by the national security implications of it, which brings me to the floor. I will support this rule. I do thank the Rules Committee. But I wanted to make that point that when national security issues come up, somebody has got to put the marker down.

I urge all to consider the point I have made here today.

Mr. POLIS. Once again, Mr. Speaker, this rule does not even allow a discussion of the war that we are currently engaged in in Afghanistan. How can we have a discussion about our national defense when being prohibited from any amendments relating to the war in Afghanistan?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule.

First, the underlying National Defense Authorization Act continues wasteful spending at the Pentagon and won't allow, as Congressman POLIS said, a full debate on the longest war in American history.

This bill continues the overseas contingency operations slush fund, and it is a slush fund at a time when the administration still hasn't decided on how much the Afghanistan war is going to cost or how many troops will be there.

Yet the Republican leadership of this House has failed to allow the American people to have a say in the future of America's longest war, while maybe, quite frankly, some of these amendments probably would pass.

Finally, we would be reflecting the views of the majority of the American people.

For many years, we have known that there is simply no military solution in Afghanistan, and our constituents are sick and tired of war. This bill simply ignores 82 percent of the Americans who oppose the war and 74 percent favoring all U.S. troops out by 2014.

I want to just read the authorization that we are talking about today. The Authorization for Use of Military Force was passed sorrowfully. Let me tell you, after the horrific events of 9/11—some were not here during that period—it was passed September 14, and we had probably about maybe 1 hour of debate, maybe 1 hour of debate.

That resolution said—which is what we are talking about today, which is what we are insisting on a debate on—it said:

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

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Ms. LEE of California. We are 13 years into this war without end.

So, Mr. Speaker, I authored H.R. 4608. I had an amendment to come here on this bill that would really get us back to the drawing board so that we could have this full debate to determine whether or not this resolution, the one of 9/14/2001, should still hold. Minimally, we should have a full debate on this.

I am really pleased though to see that the administration finally agreed to release a secret drones memo. That is a good thing. That is happening I think today. But we need to have a debate on this resolution, and we need to have it today.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), whom I have the honor of serving not only on the Rules Committee with, but also in Armed Services.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida.

The underlying defense authorization bill is a good bill. This is a good rule with maybe one caveat that there are too many amendments that are in here.

Henry Clay, as the first Speaker of the House who went from the Senate over here and was elected Speaker on the first day and served as Speaker every day he served in the House, he is