Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—4

Amash
Gohmert
Huelskamp
Salmon

NOT VOTING—15

Brady (PA)
Broun (GA)
Clark (MA)
Cleaver
Cole
Deutch
Doyle
Johnson (GA)
Labrador
Marchant
McCollum
Miller, Gary
Rush
Schwartz
Thompson (MS)

□ 1401

Mr. HUELSKAMP changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. BARR changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, due to an oversight, I missed the vote on Conference Report on H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act on May 20th, 2014. I had intended to vote "aye" on rollcall vote 220, Agreeing to the Conference Report on H.R. 3080.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3717

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove myself from H.R. 3717.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4660, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4435, HOWARD P. ''BUCK'' MCKEON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 585 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 585

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4660) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4435) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-44 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. After disposition of the further amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, the reason it is hard to get order down here on the floor of the House is it is kind of a celebratory atmosphere down here. We just saw the Water Resources Development Act pass by a big bipartisan vote.

It has been not a year, not 2 years—it has been years since we have been able to come together and pass this very important bill that deals with waterways and water supply all across this district. We do things together on a regular basis, but the big things are hard, and we have gotten to do the big things today.

I will brag on my friend from Massachusetts just for a moment, Madam Speaker. I was at Crews Middle School in my district last Friday, and Crews Middle School, their eighth grade class, Megan Mendez runs that class, but they were talking about how it is that they could be effective, how they could make a difference.

The students came upon Mr. MCGOVERN's bill, I think it is H.R. 1692, dealing with Sudan and genocide, what we can do to come together to make a difference in other parts of the world.

Now, I represent Georgia, Madam Speaker. It is a rock-solid hardcore Republican constituency. Folks can surmise where Mr. MCGOVERN, out of the great State of Massachusetts, what kind of constituency he represents there.

His ideas about how we could come together to make a difference for people resonated all the way down the eastern seaboard into that class at Crews Middle School, such that Nathan, Madeleine, Keegan, Georgia, Lauren all put pen to paper and invited me to come and talk about it to see how it was that we could come together.

Now, we didn't have the entire cosponsorship discussion there in the classroom on that day. We were trying to talk about making a difference.

That is what I get to come down and do today, Madam Speaker, with this rule that the Clerk just read. This is a differencemaking rule. It covers two bills today.

One is the Commerce-Justice-Science and related agencies bill. It is H.R. 4660, and the rule provides for an open rule, so that every single Member, no matter what their political stripe, no matter what their ideas, no matter where their constituency is located, any Member of this body can come to the House floor and offer their ideas to make that deal better.

It is a wonderful part of our process. It is a part of the process that gets used all too frequently, and I am very fortunate to be able to come and bring a rule today that does that.

Almost more fascinating, Madam Speaker, is that this rule makes in order the debate for the National Defense Authorization Act of 2015. It is H.R. 4435, and that bill—I am just going to consult my notes because it is almost unbelievable. That bill came out of committee 61–0, 61–0.

Here we are, the bill that is going to authorize our entire national defense infrastructure, in what constituents back home believe is a hyperpartisan U.S. House of Representatives, made that way by incredibly divergent views held by American voters; and when it comes to national security, we came together at the committee level and passed out a bill 61–0.

This bill is made in order for debate by the rule that is before us today. I hope I will be able to get my colleagues' support for that.

It is, again, an open rule for the Commerce-Justice-Science bill and a rule for debate on a bill that came out of committee 61–0.

Now, what is fascinating about this institution, Madam Speaker, it never ceases to amaze me. You hear about the arrogance of power in D.C., that somehow you get elected to Congress and you get inside the Beltway, suddenly, you think you are the smartest guy in the room and only your ideas are the good ideas.

This bill that came out of committee 61–0 isn't done with the legislative process there. This rule that we are debating today makes in order seven more amendments to that bill, so that we can all have a voice on that here on the floor of the House.

My great expectation is the Rules Committee is going to continue to meet this afternoon, making even more amendments in order. Hundreds of amendments filed to this bill, and the Rules Committee is working through trying to get through each one of those amendments to determine what we can make in order.

It is just a—I call it a festival of democracy, Madam Speaker. It is a festival of democracy that we are having right here on the House floor, where you not only have open rules, where every Member's voice is able to be heard, where every constituent back home is able to give that advice and counsel to their Member, and they bring those ideas to the floor, but it is on issues as difficult as national security, issues that do bring us together, but that have components that pull us apart, and we are able to work through that.

Over 300 amendments have been filed for this National Defense Authorization Act, and the committee is working through them even as we speak.

□ 1415

I know that every Member of this body has a contribution that their constituency has asked them to make, a voice that their constituency has asked them to come and bring. Madam Speaker, there are times where all of those voices, whether it be because of a clock, whether it be because of timing, whatever the reason may be, where folks don't feel like those voices have been able to be heard. This day is not that day. This is a day where we have an opportunity to make sure that each and every idea is heard and heard fully. And I am proud that the Rules Committee has produced this product today.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, this is not a normal rule, but it is a fair one. It is unusual because it combines two bills into one rule and makes in order several amendments for one of the bills. What might be unusual for my Republican friends is that I will support it.

The rule makes in order the fiscal year 2015 Commerce-Justice-Science appropriations bill under an open rule. And although I wish the funding levels were higher, I believe it is a good thing to bring this bill to the floor under an open rule.

This rule also makes in order general debate on the annual defense authorization bill along with seven amendments. That is a little unusual. Normally, the Rules Committee reports two rules: one for general debate and one for consideration of amendments. Now, I don't have any problem with these amendments being made in order, but I will voice my strong concerns tomorrow if the Rules Committee fails to make in order many of the amendments submitted for consideration.

I would like to thank my distinguished colleagues, the chairman, Mr. MCKEON, and the ranking member, Mr. SMITH, of the Armed Services Committee for their leadership and their hard work in crafting this bill each year and for coming to a bipartisan agreement on so many of the serious matters contained in this bill.

This is a massive undertaking that touches on so many aspects of our defense and national security priorities and the health and the well-being of our military personnel and their families. But there are serious and substantive matters in this bill that we must debate over the next few days because they merit the attention of every single Member of this House.

First and foremost, H.R. 4435 fails to make many of the difficult choices required by our current budgetary constraints and fiscal reality. This is a half-trillion-dollar bill. That is trillion, with a t, Madam Speaker. It provides $513.4 billion in discretionary budget authority. $495.8 billion of that is for the Department of Defense base budget; another $17.6 billion for defense-related activities, mainly nuclear, within the Department of Energy; and another whopping $79.4 billion for the so-called

overseas contingency operations, or OCO.

But according to the Congressional Budget Office, H.R. 4435 decreases direct spending by just $1 million in FY 2015. In a $500 billion bill, we can only find savings of $1 million? There is probably $1 million in the couch cushions at the Pentagon.

Madam Speaker, this Congress just cut $8 billion in the farm bill for the SNAP program. That is an $8 billion cut to help hungry families put food on their table. But we couldn't find more than $1 million next year from the Pentagon budget? Give me a break.

And if sequestration remains the law of the land, these funding levels simply will not stand, and another round of arbitrary reductions will harm our troops, our military civilian workforce, their families, and our military readiness. That is also unacceptable.

So I oppose, and I have always opposed, sequestration for both defense and nondefense programs. But putting forward a bill that fails to make any hard decisions on reducing spending authority is not a solution. In fact, it compounds the problem.

This brings me to Afghanistan, Madam Speaker, where we continue to squander lives and waste money. Since 2001, over 2,300 U.S. troops have been killed in Afghanistan. Nearly 20,000 have been wounded. We lost 127 brave soldiers just last year alone. Estimates are that around 30,000 Afghan civilians have been killed since 2001. And the VA estimates that approximately 22 veterans will die by suicide every day.

Since 2001, we have spent over $700 billion on this war. In this current year, fiscal year 2014, we are spending $7.1 billion every month in Afghanistan.

The President is committed to bringing most of our troops home by the end of the year, and I trust him to keep his word to America's families. But he has also said that he wants to keep some level of forces remaining there, 5,000, maybe 10,000. And he wants to keep them in Afghanistan for an extended period of time.

Whether you support keeping U.S. troops in Afghanistan after 2014 or whether you oppose it, as I do, I would hope that we can all agree that Congress should have a say in whether or not the longest war in American history continues. At a minimum, we owe the thousands of U.S. servicemen and -women who will be called upon to serve for years to come in Afghanistan a vote, and we owe it to their families, and we owe it to the American people.

Now, Congressmen WALTER JONES and ADAM SMITH and I have an amendment pending before the Rules Committee that would call for such a vote, and I hope the Rules Committee makes it in order so that one of the most important matters facing the American people can be debated and voted on.

Last year, 305 Members of this House voted in support of an amendment that we three offered, calling for just such a vote on any post-2014 deployment of U.S. troops in Afghanistan. If that vote is to have any meaning whatsoever, then those same Members and this House must support the McGovern-Jones-Smith amendment once again this year.

And this brings me to the overseas contingency operations, the OCO account. Madam Speaker, this bill authorized $79.4 billion for the OCO account for fiscal year 2015. Now, the last time I looked, the war in Iraq was over; the war in Afghanistan is winding down, with nearly all our troops heading home by the end of the year; and only a much smaller residual force for training operations and some special operations might remain deployed in Afghanistan, depending on what the President asks for. But the OCO funds don't ever seem to go down. The OCO is just $5 billion less than the current fiscal year. It certainly doesn't reflect the changing circumstances on the ground in Afghanistan.

Where is all the money going? A February 28th Pentagon report concludes that the United States Government and its money ''created an environment that fostered corruption'' in Afghanistan. Maybe there are some lessons we need to learn here.

Many assert that the OCO account is nothing more than a slush fund for the Pentagon. If we want to save some money, one of the first places we should look is getting rid of the OCO, putting everything back into the Pentagon base budget, and then taking a long and clear-eyed look at where spending needs to be reduced.

Madam Speaker, there are many other problems with H.R. 4435: it continues to place restrictions on the transfer of inmates in Guantanamo; it undermines our nuclear security cooperation with Russia; it attempts to derail the multiparty negotiations with Iran; and it coddles the nuclear weapons budget. Foolish choices, wasteful spending, and wars without end.

I urge my colleagues to vote to change course, to end the war in Afghanistan, to cut the nuclear arsenal, face reality, and make the tough choices in overall defense spending.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, at this time, it is my great pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT), a member of both the Rules Committee and the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL). We came in to this Congress together a couple of years back, and I have had the great opportunity to serve with him on the Rules Committee. And being placed on Armed Services last year was a great opportunity for me to be in the process of crafting how our military establishment moves forward.

Madam Speaker, in addition to providing an open rule for the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, H. Res. 585 provides for 1 hour of general debate on this year's National Defense Authorization Act. It also makes in order the first of many amendments that are going to be coming forward in the debate over the next couple of days.

Because the Rules Committee traditionally does two rules, one for the underlying legislation and the second for the amendments, which I am going to bring forward tomorrow—as we have heard, we have had over 300 amendments come forward on the NDAA this year. My understanding is that is a record. Typically, it is around 200-andsome. This year, it was over 300.

So we are going to have the opportunity to hear arguments on both sides as to why an amendment should pass or why an amendment should fail, and that is a good thing. That is what this body is designed to do, to have a dialogue and a discussion back and forth about the merits of a particular issue.

I have three sons who currently serve this Nation. One is in the National Guard, and two are in the Active Duty Army. So when we craft an NDAA, it is extremely important to me to make sure that our men and women have all the resources they need if they are called to go into harm's way. It is not their call to go. It is the President's call, the Commander in Chief's call in regards to whether or not our servicemen and -women go off to fight.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) mentioned earlier about all the partisanship in this place. The NDAA, when it passed through committee, had over 100 amendments within committee that passed and were attached to the NDAA, amendments from both sides of the aisle, Democrat and Republican alike, because there was great discussion within the committee about those amendments. Some didn't pass, but the vast majority, over 100, did pass, and you see it in the body of the National Defense Authorization Act today. That says an awful lot.

The National Defense Authorization Act has passed 52 times, 52 consecutive times, and we are hoping that this is the 53rd consecutive time that it passes in this body. Mr. WOODALL was correct. It passed out of committee 61–0. I would suggest to you, I don't think I have heard that number before in other committees.

While there are disagreements on how things should work in the NDAA, disagreements about priorities and how things should be moved around and where our money should be spent, at the end of the day, we came together as Democrats and Republicans and put forward a piece of legislation that we can be proud of, that was actually named after the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Chairman BUCK MCKEON.

Madam Speaker, I have had the opportunity to help craft the NDAA. I believe that it is a good step in the right direction. We have heard a lot of things

about sequestration in the coming year, and we need to be very cognizant of what that will do to our military, our readiness, and our ability to meet the demands that this country could call upon our military to meet.

This legislation takes care of that 1 percent of Americans who step forward and raise their hand and say: If you need me, I am there; if you need me to fight your fight, I am there. That is why this legislation is so important. It protects the members of our military, the 1 percent of America, Americans who stand up and say: I am there to protect you. That is why this legislation is so important.

The benefit of this is that we have a strong, well-run military, that we have a military that is trained and equipped for the battles to come. And I will suggest to you that we have not done a very good job of figuring out what our next battle will be. As a matter of fact, we have had members of the military, flag officers, high-ranking folks that have been involved in the military for 30-plus years say we have never gotten it right once; not one time have we gotten it right in regards to what our future conflicts are going to look like. So I would suggest to you that we need to make sure that we are on top of it now.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, Sheriff Nugent is the expert on these issues on the Rules Committee. I am proud to yield him an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. NUGENT. Well, I appreciate that. I don't know that I am expert, but I certainly have the heart. I have the heart to make sure that America is safe.

□ 1430

It is a constitutional responsibility that this body make sure that we have a strong defense for our homeland. It is a huge responsibility, and it is not one that is taken lightly. As you can see in the vote that was taken in the House Armed Services Committee—61–0—it is one that is shared by all Members.

We have seen the threats. Unfortunately, not everybody knows what the threats are. But if you look at and read the news, whether it is Russia today resurging its influence within Europe, whether it is China, or whether it is Iran or North Korea, there are so many players out there that have ill intentions to our people, to this Nation.

We have Africa, a continent that has seen a huge increase in violence that is associated with al Qaeda. We have threats around this world. To those who would say this world is safer than it was before, I would suggest to you it is not. So I will do anything that I can do to lend credence to our military fighting force to make sure we have the strongest, most-equipped, and best-trained force. It is what gave my wife and me solace when our older son was deployed to Afghanistan. It gave us solace when our two sons were deployed to Iraq, that we knew they were the best fighting force out there. That gave them the greatest opportunity to come home safe to us.

Last night in the Rules Committee, we had a young man, a double amputee, who is a proud, proud member of the 82nd Airborne's 4th Combat Brigade. Specialist Stefan LeRoy was in our midst last night as we talked about the NDAA in the Rules Committee. There is not a more powerful statement than that young man sitting right in front of me at the dais looking at us to make sure that we provide for them, for that 1 percent I talked about earlier. That is what makes this all worthwhile, in my estimation, that we do the right thing.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his leadership and as well the manager, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, both distinguished members of the Rules Committee.

This is always a tough bill because many of us are aware of the extensive amendment process that occurred during the markup. But let me speak to one or two points that I think are very important. Our men and women in the United States military deserve our keenest support.

This is, in fact, Military Appreciation Month, and we want them to know that we truly appreciate them. We also know that they are fact-finders, and they are sometimes the front-line support on behalf of the United States without weapons to be helpful to countries that are in need.

I am introducing an amendment cosponsored by Congresswoman FREDERICA WILSON and Congresswoman BARBARA LEE to ask for a report on the status of the Boko Haram and the resources that our defense persons are using to help with respect to the girls that have been kidnapped, and as well report to the extent of the crimes against humanity with respect to Boko Haram in Nigeria. I just got through meeting with African ambassadors, and they have mentioned that this is a regional issue.

We have also introduced an amendment to make sure that the contractors that are utilized for intelligence gathering have oversight, to avoid some of the catastrophes that we saw in recent years of contractors not appropriately, for some, handling important information that they had and doing this through contractors.

As we support our military, every day we see soldiers coming home from places far away and the need for posttraumatic stress disorder treatment. And my amendment, as I have done, asked for an increase of $5 million to be able to help those individuals. It is not throwing any bad money after good. It is recognizing that these symptoms and psychological problems may cause difficulty in providing provider-patient communication.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlelady an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. They may appear later in time and not mostly at the time that these individuals will come home. So I think it is important that we have the opportunity for diagnosing at a later period of time. These numbers are going to grow. There are over 200,000 veterans of military service who live and work in Houston, more than 13,000 of whom are veterans of Operation Enduring Freedom.

Let me finally say that we must stand with the repair of the Veterans Administration health system. I know that it tracks this bill, but it is not this bill per se, but we want to support our troops. And then I want to make sure that we heighten again the Iran negotiations and that we have no gap in the time that Iran is to report on what they are doing to not have war nuclear weapons as opposed to civilian use.

Let us also get re-engaged in the discussions on the Palestinian peace discussions, with the discussions going forward with Israel and Palestine, in spite of the fact that there are some very difficult things that we have to overcome. I believe it is important that we stand ready and are ready, that our negotiations are going forward to secure this Nation.

Finally, Madam Speaker, if I might just indicate that we hope to keep at Ellington Field—keep our helicopter units in Texas, and we hope that the legislation provides that opportunity without closing out the National Guard without a further review. I think that is extremely important.

Madam Speaker, I rise to speak during House consideration of the rule for the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

I thank Chairman MCKEON, and want to express my appreciation for his years of service to our nation as chair of the House Committee on Armed Services. This year's appropriation bill's title reflects the dedication you have shown to our men and women in uniform in defense of our nation.

I also thank Ranking Member SMITH of the Armed Services Committee for his work on this bill.

Thank you, Chairman WOODALL and Ranking Member MCGOVERN I appreciate for allowing me the opportunity to speak on the Rule for H.R. 4435.

This is the 53rd consecutive National Defense Authorization Act, which speaks to the long-term commitment of the Congress and successive Administrations to provide for National Defense. This bill encompasses a number of initiatives designed to modernize our nation's military to combat threats defined by the last decade of war in Afghanistan and Iraq, while dealing with dramatic cuts in funding; along with sequestration; and the federal government shutdown last year.

The National Defense Authorization Act's purpose is to address the threats our nation

must deal with not just today, but in the future. This makes our work vital to our national interest and it should reflect our strong commitment to ensure that the men and women of our Armed Services receive the benefits and support that they deserve for their faithful service.

Our men and women in uniform are ending the longest military conflict in the history of our nation. The lessons learned are hard, but solutions to improve our ability to provide the tools our troops will need to protect themselves were developed based on their experiences. Now it is our obligation to be sure that these new tools for the defense of our troops are available for their use when and where they are needed.

The bill will provide for resources to address the threats posed by improvised explosive devices, chemical agents, drug interdiction and dangerous drugs entering our nation.

The military needs the funding in the bill that would address munitions destruction, support the Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund and support our work with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to make more efficient the work of protecting America and our interest.

We do live in a dangerous world, where threats are not always easily identifiable, and our enemies are not bound by borders. The Boston Terrorist Attack last year reminds us of how fragile our nation's security could be without a well-trained and -equipped military.

The definition of war has changed and with it our understanding about what is needed to combat a unique type of enemy that fights under no flag or for any nation.

U.S. Special Operations Command, a vital part of our military, provides much of the special skills needed to defend our nation. This legislation continues to build on previous efforts to support their important work.

There are several Jackson Lee amendments before the Rules Committee for consideration. These amendments are simple, straightforward, and are intended to improve the underlying bill. I believe they would command the support of a majority of the House, and I urge the Rules Committee to make them in order.

JACKSON LEE-WILSON-LEE AMENDMENT (#65)

This amendment (#65), co-sponsored jointly by Congresswoman BARBARA LEE of California and Congresswoman FREDERICA WILSON of Florida, and Congresswoman KELLY of Illinois have joined efforts to make three important contributions to the bill): strongly condemns the ongoing violence and the systemic gross human rights violations against the people of Nigeria carried out by the militant organization Boko Haram, includes the cowardly kidnapping of the more than 200 young schoolgirls; expresses support for the people of Nigeria; and the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress on the nature and extent of the crimes against humanity committed by Boko Haram in Nigeria.

Since 2013, more than 4,400 men, women, and children have been slaughtered by Boko Haram.

JACKSON LEE-WILSON-LEE AMENDMENT (#186)

The second Jackson Lee Amendment (#186) directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study to ascertain the extent to which civilian contractors are used in the conduct of intelligence activities and the type of information to which such contractors are exposed or have access.

The amendment also requires the Secretary to submit to Congress a plan for reducing by 25 percent the number of civilian contractors with top secret security clearances that are engaged in intelligence gathering and analysis activities.

The disclosure of leaked and highly sensitive classified information to the Washington Post and the Guardian by a contract worker with a security clearance raises several very important and disturbing issues.

Something went very wrong in the conduct of this individual's security clearance background investigation, which is troubling enough in itself but particularly alarming given that more than 3.5 million persons hold a Confidential or Secret clearance.

The cost of government security classification in 2005 was $7.66 billion and in 2011 the total was $11.36 billion.

According to the Office of the Director of National Intelligence 2012 Report on Security Clearance Determinations there were 483,263 contractors with Top Secret security clearances.

In the previous year 133,493 contractors receive approval for Top Secret security clearances. At the time of the report over 1.4 million Federal government employees and private sector contractors held Top Secret security clearances.

These costs are not all encompassing, but were generated by 41 executive branch agencies including the Department of Defense.

Another consequence of contracting out national security work is the power it may extent to a private company over the most sensitive information our nation may hold.

For example, only the person with the Top Secret classification authority may classify information. Only original classifiers are authorized to decide what information if made public could cause harm to national security.

Between 2003 and 2004 original classification authorities increased the number of classified documents from 234,052 to 351,150. In 2011, the Department of Defense original classification activity generated 62,753 classifications.

The consequences for making more and more information Top Secret could lead to the government's need for more persons working for contactors receiving classifications to do this type of work. At some point the ability to manage the work absent contractors can become very difficult.

My amendment simply directs the Secretary of Defense to study the feasibility of implementing a modest reduction in that number consistent without jeopardizing the nation's security.

JACKSON LEE-WILSON-LEE AMENDMENT (#68)

The third and final Jackson Lee Amendment (#68) increases post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) funding by $5,000,000.

Last year, the Rules Committee made in order the identical amendment to the FY14 NDAA, which was approved by the full House. I ask the Committee to make this amendment in order again this year.

Post traumatic stress disorder is one of the most prevalent and devastating psychological wounds suffered by the brave men and women fighting in far off lands to defend the values and freedom we hold dear.

PTSD symptoms and other psychosocial problems may cause difficulty in provider-patient communication, reduce patients' active collaboration in evaluation and treatment, increase the likelihood of somatization, and reduce patient adherence to medical regimens.

As with other anxiety disorders and depression, most patients with PTSD are not properly identified and are not offered education, counseling, or referrals for mental-health evaluation.

A suicide bomber, an IED, or an insurgent can obliterate their close friend instantaneously and right in front of their face.

Yet, as American soldiers, they are trained to suppress the agonizing grief associated with those horrible experiences and are expected to continue with their mission. And carry on they do, with courage and with patriotism.

According to surveys conducted of troops in Iraq, 15–20% of Army soldiers suffer PTSD symptoms, including nightmares, flashbacks, emotional detachment, dissociation, insomnia, loss of appetite, memory loss, clinical depression, and anxiety.

Approximately 35% of soldiers seeking some kind of mental health treatment within a year of returning from combat.

I am reminded of the continuing need to treat PTSD every time I return to my district because Houston is home to one of the largest populations of military service members and their families in the nation.

There are over 200,000 veterans of military service who live and work in Houston; more than 13,000 of whom are veterans of Operation Enduring Freedom (Afghanistan); and Operation Iraqi Freedom (Iraq).

Although some of a soldier's wounds are invisible to the naked eye they are still wounds that should be properly treated. One of the best ways to increase access to treatment is to increase the number of medical facilities and mental health professionals who are available to serve the needs of men and women currently serving and those who have become veterans.

We must continue to direct our efforts as a body to ensure that our troops remain the best equipped and prepared military force in the world. They are not just soldiers they are sons and daughters, husbands and wives, brothers and sisters—they are some of the people we represent as members of Congress. Support of them is a sacred obligation of Congress both to those who are at risk on battle fields and serving as the guard against threats around the world, but they are also those who have returned home from war.

I thank Chairman WOODALL and Ranking Member MCGOVERN for their work; to manage the debate on the rule for the NDAA Fiscal Year 2015 bill.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I would advise you and my friend from Massachusetts that I do not have any further speakers remaining, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Madam Speaker, as I indicated at the beginning of this debate, we have no objection to this rule. We are glad that the 2015 Commerce-Justice-Science appropriations bill is coming to the floor under an open rule. We have no problem with moving ahead on general debate or the amendments made in order on the Department of Defense authorization bill, and so we support this rule.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1445

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2014

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3530

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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