



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2015

No. 143

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Almighty God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We pray for the gift of wisdom to all with great responsibility in this people's House for the leadership of our Nation.

Along with millions of men and women around the world, we join in praying for those in leadership in our world. Those You have entrusted to lead in local and national governments in this Nation and all the nations of the world, guide them, Lord, with wisdom and truth.

May they seek You in the decisions they make and in the way they live. In praying for them, we are also reminded to pray this morning for those on life's margins who are affected by extreme poverty, poor health care, polluted and diseased water, unjust societies, division and terror, and those who do not have the opportunity to receive a quality education.

Lord, the suffering of our world is all around us. Stimulate our hearts and minds so that everything we may do this day would be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE)

come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

GHIDOTTI HIGH NATIONAL BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate William and Mary Ghidotti High School in Grass Valley for being one of the 335 schools to be recognized as a National Blue Ribbon School this year.

First established by President Reagan in 1982, the Blue Ribbon Schools program recognizes excellence in K-12 public and private schools who demonstrate a commitment to closing achievement gaps among student subgroups.

This award is certainly fitting for Ghidotti. As a small school in Nevada County in northern California, with an emphasis on personalized learning, students are challenged daily to excel in leadership, technology, and critical thinking, helping them prepare to be college and career ready.

To the students, teachers, and administrators: Congratulations on this distinct honor and thank you for your work in setting the standard of excellence in education for our students in northern California.

END THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON BENGHAZI

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, in a FOX News interview yesterday, the Republican speaker-in-waiting admitted to something that we have all known all along, and that is that the real motive of the Select Committee on Benghazi was simply to politically attack and drive down the poll numbers for Hillary Clinton, spending millions of taxpayer dollars for a political mission.

And, unbelievably, the speaker-in-waiting mentioned this in response to a question as to what were the accomplishments of the Republican Congress, the accomplishments of this Congress. The number one accomplishment that he came up with was to use taxpayer dollars to create a committee for the specific purpose of affecting the Presidential campaign and driving down the polling numbers of a Democratic candidate.

Is that your job when it took until yesterday to get a budget for just 2 months to the floor of this House, but you spend millions of dollars, thousands of hours, specifically for the purposes of driving down the polling numbers of a Presidential candidate in the Democratic Party?

Give me a break. This has gone too far. Something needs to change in this House of Representatives.

CONGRATULATING COLONEL DAVE "CHEESE" BURG

(Mr. BRIDENSTINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Colonel Dave "Cheese" Burg on his outstanding

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6751

leadership as commander of the Oklahoma Air National Guard's 138th Fighter Wing located at the Tulsa Air National Guard Base. He relinquishes command this Saturday.

Colonel Burgy received his Air Force ROTC commission at Arizona State University. He transitioned to the Oklahoma National Guard as a C-26 inspector pilot before retraining in the F-16. Colonel Burgy has logged over 3,800 military flight hours and deployed five times to fight our Nation's wars.

As the 138th commander since December 2012, Colonel Burgy led the Air National Guard's best fighter wing of over 1,200 airmen. He exemplifies the self-sacrifice and patriotism of the citizen warriors in the National Guard.

Colonel Burgy, thank you for your outstanding service to the 138th, the National Guard, and our country.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON BENGHAZI

(Mr. ELLISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, we always knew that KEVIN MCCARTHY and the Republican Caucus had gotten together to set up this Benghazi task force in order to do a political stunt, but I never thought they would admit it. I was shocked.

I mean, could you imagine me or any Member of this House setting up a \$4.5 million task force for the sole purpose of electioneering? Everyone in that task force, every staffer, was essentially a campaign staffer and, yet, paid for with government money to impact a Presidential election.

This is a scandal, people. I cannot believe what I heard. We all knew it was going on, but we couldn't prove it. Now it is documentary proof in front of literally millions of Americans, bragged about and set out as: Yeah. We did it, and it is an achievement we are proud of.

Now, if one Member were to use their Congressional office to campaign, that would be an ethics complaint. What if a whole caucus does it?

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE JAMES A. LOVELL FEDERAL HEALTH CARE CENTER

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations to the Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center on its 5-year anniversary.

The Lovell Federal Health Center is the Nation's first and only integrated Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense medical center. In just 5 years, the Center has demonstrated the merits of combining two different healthcare systems.

Through hard work and dedication, the Lovell staff has shown that one

healthcare facility can annually provide excellent care to over 90,000 military personnel, their families, military retirees, and veterans.

I would like to personally congratulate Director Stephan Holt and Deputy Director Navy Captain Bob Buckley. Their vision and enthusiasm facilitated the integration tremendously.

I look forward to celebrating many more anniversaries of the Lovell Federal Health Care Center, and I would like to again congratulate and thank them for their hard work on behalf of our veterans and military personnel.

HANFORD LAND TRANSFER

(Mr. NEWHOUSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a significant milestone in Richland, Kennewick, and Pasco, Washington.

While the Tri-Cities led the way in ending World War II and the cold war and was very proud to do so, the Federal Government has a legal and moral obligation to clean up the legacy nuclear waste at Hanford. This week we celebrate a cleanup milestone and the transfer of more than 1,600 acres of land back to these communities.

This transfer represents the culmination of years of local efforts as well as bipartisan, bicameral cooperation. I commend the work of Doc Hastings and Senators MURRAY and CANTWELL that laid the groundwork for this achievement.

As Hanford's cleanup mission is completed, this unneeded Federal land should continue to be returned to the local community for the goals of conservation, preservation, public access, and economic development to be achieved.

This long anticipated land transfer will be used for industrial and energy production and creates jobs and boosts economic development in the mid-Columbia region. This week's transfer is an exciting step for the post-Hanford future. I will continue to work with all parties to have more land returned to the community.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD). Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bill was signed by the Speaker on Wednesday, September 30, 2015:

H.R. 719, to require the Transportation Security Administration to conform to existing Federal law and regulations regarding criminal investigator positions, and for other purposes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3457, JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF IRANIAN TERRORISM ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1735, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 449 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 449

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3457) to prohibit the lifting of sanctions on Iran until the Government of Iran pays the judgments against it for acts of terrorism, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to its adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate; and (2) one motion to recommit if applicable.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of October 1, 2015, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), 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.

□ 0915

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 449 provides a rule for the consideration of H.R. 3457, the Justice for Victims of Iranian Terrorism Act, and the conference report to accompany H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

Mr. Speaker, these two bills are directly related to one of the most important functions of Congress, which is to provide for the national security of our country. For 53 straight years, Congress has come together in a bipartisan fashion to pass a National Defense Authorization Act to ensure that our military men and women have the resources and the policies they need to do their job. Even in an era of deep partisanship in Congress, we have still been able to keep the tradition alive and pass an NDAA each year. This rule would allow us to keep that tradition alive.

The NDAA process has been a great example of following regular order and doing congressional business the way it is supposed to be done. In both the House and the Senate, the respective Armed Services Committees held multiple hearings and markups that allowed all Members to have a role in the process.

Here in the House, the NDAA came up for a vote on the floor with a record number of amendments—135, to be exact. It passed with bipartisan support by a vote of 269–151. The Senate followed a very similar process and was able to approve their version of the bill by a vote of 71–125, a veto-proof majority.

Since our bills were different, the last few months have been spent in a conference committee to iron out the differences. The bill doesn't include everything I would like, but it is the true definition of a bipartisan collaborative work product. This NDAA is a textbook example of how Congress should work.

Despite all of that, I am shocked to learn that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not supporting this critical legislation. Even worse, the President has threatened to veto this bill.

Mr. Speaker, let's take a quick look at what is going on in the world today. North Korea is trying to develop an ability to deliver a nuclear warhead to our allies in South Korea and to other places. China is building new islands in the western Pacific and daring America to come into what they now claim is their new sea space and airspace. Russia has pushed into Crimea, is consolidating its gains in the Donbass; Iran has just now been given the ability to get a nuclear weapon; ISIS and other terrorist groups are running wild in the area that used to be Syria, Iraq, Yemen, and Libya. Now we have Russia coming into that same area in Syria and using their jets for military purposes and daring us to get in those skies with them.

In the middle of all of this, we should be having a bipartisan, unified front to tell the world, to tell our adversaries, to tell our allies, and to tell our service men and women that we are united. There is no Republican, there is no Democrat when it comes to the defense policy of this country.

Instead, we are going to have a debate not about the defense policy of our country, but about whether we are going to fund other functions of government, whether we are going to fund the IRS at a high level that the President wants, whether we are going to fund the Environmental Protection Agency that is attacking businesses across this country. We are going to talk about all those domestic issues and not talk about the defense of the country at this critical juncture.

If there ever was a time when we should continue that tradition of standing together, it would be today. And for our President, our Commander in Chief, to threaten to veto this bipartisan bill is simply beyond belief.

Now, I expect my friend from Colorado will argue that they oppose this bill because we should be spending more money on nondefense programs, and that is a debate worth having, but this is not the time for that debate. There is nothing more important for us to do today than to make sure that we are standing tall and standing unified for the defense of our country, and we should never ever use the military as a pawn in some political game to increase controversial nondefense spending.

Today's debate should be about providing for our Nation's military men and women and their families, and I hope my colleagues and the President will reconsider their objections.

This rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 3457, the Justice for Victims of Iranian Terrorism Act.

A lot has been said on this floor recently about the threat and dangers posed to the United States and our allies by the Islamic Republic of Iran. I don't want to rehash that debate, but I do think it is important to remember that Iran is the top state sponsor of terrorism on the globe.

Over the past 15 years, more than 80 judgments have been handed down against Iran under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act exception for state sponsors of terrorism. These judgments add up to over \$43.5 billion in unpaid damages. This straightforward bill would simply require Iran to pay each of these Federal court judgments before the President can lift, waive, or suspend any sanctions currently in place against Iran. Let me briefly highlight a few examples of these judgments.

In 1985, a Navy petty officer named Robert Stethem was killed during the hijacking of TWA flight 847. Hezbollah, an Iran-financed terrorist organization, was found responsible for the hijacking and his family is now owed \$329 million, and that is in a Federal court judgment.

My friend from Colorado might be particularly interested in this one. Thomas Sutherland, a teacher at Colorado State University for 26 years, was the former dean of agriculture at the American University of Beirut. He was kidnapped on June 9, 1985, after Iran directed terrorists to kidnap Americans in Lebanon. He was held in prison until November 18, 1991. His judgment is for \$323.5 million.

There is the story of Alan Beer, an American living in Israel who was tragically killed after the Iranian-backed terrorist organization Hamas blew up a bus in Jerusalem. There is a \$300 million judgment against Iran for Alan's death.

These are just a few stories of Americans who have been tragically injured, killed, tortured, and kidnapped by Iranian-sponsored terrorist organizations.

I simply can't understand why some of my colleagues and the President won't support this bill. This shouldn't be a partisan debate. American courts have already ruled that Iran owes money to these individuals and their families, citizens of the United States. So why is it controversial to require that these payments are made before rewarding Iran with billions of dollars in sanctions relief?

This bill is really pretty simple to me. You can either stand with American citizens or you can stand with the Islamic Republic of Iran. You can stand with the Ayatollah or the families of servicemembers who were killed by Iran-backed terrorists. To me, this is an obvious choice.

Mr. Speaker, both of these bills are more than deserving of broad, bipartisan support, and I hope that they receive just that. So I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding me 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition today to this rule and to both of the underlying bills.

Both of these bills, the conference report to accompany the annual National Defense Authorization Act and the so-called Justice for Victims of Iranian Terrorism Act, are simply partisan political charades. They are not a serious effort at the lawmaking process. They are not a serious effort at improving our national defense, nor do they even attempt to solve the problems that the American people want this Congress to take up.

I would first like to acknowledge that at least these two bills are somewhat related under this rule. In the past, we have had bills in vastly disparate areas.

A couple of points about these bills:

The National Defense Authorization bill is not a version of the bill that is going anywhere. It contorts the budget

process in a way that doesn't make sense to anybody. It doesn't make sense to budget hawks or defense hawks, and it is a way that many Members of the majority party don't even seem to understand.

Neither bill will be signed into law. The President has indicated he will veto them, nor will consideration of them today here on the floor of the House advance national security one iota.

Even after knowing the budget plans on National Defense Authorization for months, here we have a convoluted bill that won't make us any safer or financially secure. What it does is it takes the emergency account, the overseas contingency operations fund, and turns it into a slush fund to temporarily fund all kinds of other programs. So effectively, it is a deficit spending bill by fudging the different pots of money that we have for defense.

Now, I should point out this doesn't even appeal to the Pentagon or to the military. The Pentagon strongly dislikes this plan of using overseas contingency money to fund items in the base budget.

So the question I pose, Mr. Speaker, is, if it is not being done to satisfy defense hawks and the Pentagon and it is not being done to satisfy budget hawks because it is an increased spending proposal, who is the constituency for this and why are people even proposing this?

Now, it is completely fiscally irresponsible to disregard budget caps in a way that anybody who cares about our deficit should find maddening, and it is why so many of our colleagues on the majority, from what we have heard, had to be pushed to even go along with this highly flawed plan.

As I mentioned, it doesn't make sense to the defense hawk contingency in this body either. The Pentagon does not like the plan. Using short-term money for base funding and long-term problems makes planning and procurement nearly impossible on the ground. This budget plan hurts national security, and it damages our fiscal responsibility in our country.

Like many bills, it is simply not going anywhere. The President said he opposes a version of the NDAA with this budget gimmick in it.

Congress, of course, needs to pass a National Defense Authorization bill. Unfortunately, the time that we are spending on this today gets us no closer.

Passing a National Defense Authorization Act is very important, and it seems like an obvious and routine thing to do; but with this Congress, nothing is surprising. Even routine matters are made infinitely more difficult as we jump through these self-created hoops to appeal to whoever is yelling loudest at the time, and that seems to be what we are doing today on the floor of this body is turning our national defense into a political football and missing yet another opportunity to

provide the stability that our national defense needs to defend our country.

Now, this could have been an opportunity to address what voters want us to address. We could have talked about an Authorization for Use of Military Force. I have heard from so many of my constituents regarding that.

We could be talking about the fact that just yesterday Russia is supposedly bombing targets in Syria in support of Assad, and we have been conducting military operations in that part of the world for over a year without a specific Authorization for Use of Military Force.

We could have talked about Guantánamo Bay and how we can approach finally leaving that chapter behind and closing down our extra-legal detention facility there.

We could have debated how we can save money by right-sizing our massive nuclear arsenal that would allow us to blow up the world several times over to meet our needs here in the 21st century. Perhaps being able to blow up the world once might be enough for our nuclear arsenal, and that would save a lot of money that we could reduce the deficit with.

Instead, this bill would have us spend billions upon billions of dollars, reassign money to a slush fund, blow through budget caps that we put in place to reduce the deficit in support of a war we have never debated, never voted on, and in support of a failed policy in continuing to fight wars that we have not approved and the military arsenal that was meant to fight a cold war which ended decades ago.

This is simply a charade that does not advance our national security, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

The other bill under consideration is another charade. It is another symbol of the failure of this body to take up the issues that matter to the American people. It is a bill, as we talked about in our Rules Committee, that had zero hearings, no markup, no amendments, and was rushed to the floor for unknown reasons. This bill serves as nothing more than another attempt to undermine the agreement that prevents Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

Now, Members on my side of the aisle were on varied sides of that Iran agreement. Some felt that the agreement was the best way to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons. Others felt that there were other ways. But nearly everybody on my side agrees that this bill is simply a terrible idea.

□ 0930

Now we are in the stage of implementing the Iran Nuclear Review Act, consistent with the agreement that was reached to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons. If we want to advance national security, let's have a discussion about how to enforce the agreement to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

If there is a problem with the compensation of victims of state terrorism,

we should have a broad bipartisan bill that addresses that. Iran is one of the countries, but there are certainly other sponsors of state terrorism; and if there is a problem collecting court judgments, let's add some teeth to that in a bipartisan proposal to do that rather than attach it to sanctions that were put in place for the specific purpose of deterring Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

Congress said that was the purpose of those sanctions. They were part of that discussion for Iran to open themselves up to inspections and agree not to develop nuclear weapons. This is a separate and legitimate issue that there are judgments against Iran that are not being enforced.

There are probably judgments against a number of other nation-states that are not being enforced. That is a perfectly fine issue and one that there is no reason in the world for it to be partisan. We should have a thoughtful, deliberative process with hearings and markup in committee with the opportunity to take good ideas from both sides and simply address that problem to make sure that we add some teeth to the ability to make sure that payments are made to victims of terrorism, a concept that this bill wouldn't even come close to accomplishing.

This bill adds no teeth to making sure that terrorist victims actually get their money. It merely tries to reinstate sanctions that are tied to the development of Iran's nuclear problem. It makes it no more likely that a single victim of terrorism will ever see any kind of restitution.

Now, if we are serious about national defense, what in the world have we been doing the last few days? Because of this body's inaction in maintaining government funding, you know what the Pentagon has been doing the last few days? They have been focused on planning for a shutdown, because we were just hours away from a shutdown when finally this body figured out how to continue funding national defense. We should have done that weeks ago.

Why did we put the Pentagon through the exercise these last few days of figuring out who had to go home and what missions had to be grounded? Do you think ISIS or Moscow or the Assad regime spent yesterday wondering if they would have the money when they showed up for work today? Well, that is what this Congress has done to our military and risks doing again in December when we face another government shutdown. We might as well be telling our generals: "Okay, keep doing what you are doing, but don't make any plans to combat ISIS on December 12."

Well done, Congress. I am sure America and the rest of the world is impressed with your work.

It is completely incongruous to be discussing a budget trick for defense authorization just a day after we risked closing down many parts of our

military. Just yesterday, 151 Republicans voted to shut down the Pentagon and the military. They voted to shut down the Department of Homeland Security. They voted to shut down the State Department just because they couldn't get their way on an unrelated healthcare provision for low-income women. Now, suddenly, the Republicans support national security? I don't think so.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and both of the underlying bills.

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

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

The gentleman from Colorado made some interesting points. He said this is not serious, that the President is going to veto it. If we go back over the vote total in the Senate, this bill was passed in the Senate by a veto-proof majority. It passed in this House by a near veto-proof majority. If a couple more people from the other side will join with us, we can override that veto, and we would stand united behind our servicemen and -women. So it is, indeed, serious. If the President were serious, he wouldn't be threatening a veto. He would understand the importance at this point in time for the Congress and the President to stand together across party lines.

We also heard about what is happening in Syria. I am a member of the House Armed Services Committee. I served on the conference committee that brought this report to us. Let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, this bill contains things that are critical to what we are doing in Syria.

He talked about Guantanamo Bay. One of the main items that I was appointed to the conference committee for was for the provision that regards Guantanamo Bay and what we are going to do and not do with the prisoners there. He talked about the military's view of this. I have talked to dozens of generals and admirals about this very issue, and they would like for us to find a different way, but they understand and agree that this way gets us where we need to go. What is important to them is really not which way we get there but the fact that we get there. This gets us there.

He talks about the fact that there is a failed policy here. There is a failed policy here. It is a failed policy of this administration in the Middle East. If we had done what we should have done in the Middle East, we wouldn't have Iran nuclearized. We wouldn't have Russia there flying sorties with their jets and daring the United States. The failure of policy here is the failure of the policy of the President of the United States.

The House Armed Services Committee, the Senate Armed Services Committee, Democrats and Republicans from both sides here have tried to work together to give the President the authorization he needed to do the right thing, to make sure we don't

have the instability we have today in the Middle East. Instead, we have seen a President that seems to be inert, doing nothing. Russia comes in, makes this big play. What is the President doing? Nothing.

We were asked this time last year to authorize the training of certain Syrian troops to combat ISIS. Well, they trained 50-some-odd. We have about six left. After all that, a year, all this time, all this money, that is what the failed policy is. The whole idea was not going to work, but we gave him the authorization because we are trying to stand behind our President. We are trying to push him to do the right thing. Still, nothing happens, except he threatens to veto this bill.

If he wants to be the Commander in Chief that we need, he needs to stand with us. He needs to stand with the Congress. We need to stand together as Republicans and Democrats—we support our men and women in uniform—and do what needs to be done.

Now, my friend from Colorado referenced the Iran bill and called it a charade. Let me assure him, this is not a charade to the people who have these judgments. To the people who are victims or the families of victims, this is far from a charade. This will get them real compensation.

He says that there are no teeth here. Well, guess what. The sanctions don't get lifted unless Iran pays this money. I call that real teeth, because Iran wants that money more than anything else in the world right now because, with that money, they will go out and fund terrorism throughout the Middle East.

What we will do here is not only get money to American people who have been victimized, but we will deny that money to Iran that will use it to fund Hamas and Hezbollah and the Houthis in Yemen. That is what this is all about. This is dead serious. This is as serious as you can possibly get. I wish my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would come together with us so we can do right by the American military and the men and women that wear our uniform and do right by American citizens who have been victimized by the largest sponsor of state terrorism.

I have said this before, and I am going to say it again, that Iran bill is real clear. You stand with the Ayatollah or you stand with the United States citizens. It is one or the other. If you stand with the Ayatollah, you stand with the Ayatollah. I am going to stand with the citizens of the United States that have these judgments. They deserve to be paid.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation that would protect jobs in America to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amend-

ment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) to discuss our proposal to save American jobs.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me in defeating the previous question so that this body can immediately take up reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank and, in fact, immediately take up legislation offered by Mr. FINCHER, a Republican who, like many Republicans in this House and every Democrat, supports the reauthorization of an institution that has been reauthorized by this body for eight decades, routinely, that is essential to supporting small American manufacturers that I represent back home in Michigan.

During the recess, I spent some time with my local manufacturers. I did a couple manufacturing roundtables; one in Flint, my hometown, and one up in the Tri-Cities. These are small manufacturers. They are not big companies. No one would recognize their names. They are small manufacturers that have found that they have products that the world wants, but they didn't feel comfortable entering into that kind of global trade without some help, without some support, without their own government standing behind them where they can. That was what the Export-Import Bank provided for them. They told me, without exception, that the failure of this Congress to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank puts that kind of trade in jeopardy, puts the company itself in jeopardy, and puts the workers who build great American products that we can sell to the world in a position of some jeopardy as well.

We don't agree on a lot of things in this body, and that is the way it is supposed to be; but when we do agree, the American people expect us to do something about it. We agree in this body on the Export-Import Bank, Democrats and Republicans. Why can't we see a bill come to the floor to simply reauthorize something that is essential to supporting American manufacturers, supporting American exports, supporting American workers?

Sadly, almost ironically, there are more Republicans in this Congress that support the Export-Import Bank than supported keeping the government open itself. You would think—you would think—that somehow we would figure out a way.

There is all this talk of bipartisanship. It is just a word unless we do something about it. It doesn't mean anything unless it translates to something that helps the American worker. Here is a chance to do that. We should bring up the Export-Import Bank reauthorization, a Republican bill, which I

will vote for, and we should do it today.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I just observed that the gentleman from Michigan talked about something that had nothing to do with the defense of this country or getting these judgments paid for American citizens who were victims at the hands of Iran. What he is talking about may be important at a time down the road, but it is not relevant to what we are talking about today.

The bipartisanship we need today is to stand up for the American people and defend the American people and to provide for our servicemen and -women, to make the victims of Iranian tyranny, make them whole. Let's get together and be bipartisan about that, and maybe there will be more opportunities to be bipartisan about these other issues. Let's not confuse what is on the floor today with what people want to talk about down the road. Let's have a bipartisan majority, a big bipartisan majority, a veto-proof majority, pass both of these bills.

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

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

Just to be clear, what we are offering as a previous question, if we win the previous question vote, this bill will then be amended and sent back to include a reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank, so the Democrats are choosing to focus on protecting American jobs rather than partisan games.

Unfortunately, I wish either of these two bills under this rule had something to do with national defense. They don't. One of them diverts money from the overseas contingency fund to a slush fund, which the military says will weaken their ability to prepare for conflict around the world. The other one is another attempt to undermine a deal that prevents Iran from developing nuclear weapons and won't lead to American victims seeing money.

If they were serious about making sure American victims were compensated, we would be talking about putting teeth in the ability of American courts to impound assets and make sure that judgments are paid for victims of state terrorism. Why, instead, are we seeing a deal that relates only to one particular sponsor of state terrorism and deals with a set of tariffs that were put in place to prevent them from developing nuclear weapons? The tariffs that are in place with regard to Iranian sponsorship of state terrorism are still in place and weren't even on the table during the discussions around the nuclear agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), who wants to discuss our amendment that will protect and save American jobs.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, one of the previous speakers, the gentleman and my friend from Alabama, said today is not the time, it is

not now. I want to remind him that in my effort here to defeat the previous question so that we may take up reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank, the charter for the Bank expired 3 months ago yesterday. You are right, the time isn't now; it was 3 months ago. The fact is, in the ensuing 90 days, there has begun a drumbeat of job loss, concrete and measurable. It is real.

□ 0945

But I want to start over. Today is the first day of the new fiscal year for the Federal Government. We can all give at least some thanks that we avoided a government shutdown. So let's take a fresh start to this thing. Take a step back.

The truth is, when I am home in the district talking with people, an amazing number have a consciousness, an awareness, about the termination of the charter of the Export-Import Bank and its impact. The most frequently asked question I get is, "How can anybody do that?"

How can anybody do away with an institution that, as my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman KILDEE, so eloquently said, has in 81 years been almost unanimously reauthorized 16 times by 13 different Presidents and has a track record of reducing the deficit and creating jobs? How can anybody do that?

That is a very challenging question for me to answer. Adherence to ideological purity is just not something somebody can compete with when it stands up against the real-life job loss that we have begun to experience.

So, in my effort—which I just digressed from—of taking a fresh start, I want to say that this Chamber will take up later today the National Defense Authorization Act. It is not unrelated to our effort to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Some people actually support what we call the NDAA because it creates jobs. I frankly don't think that that is a good reason to support the NDAA. One should support or oppose it because of how it reinforces us and helps us fulfill our national security objectives and goals and missions. That is why you support or don't support the NDAA. But some people do support it because of the jobs it helps create.

Well, the truth of the matter is, as we have said so often, the Export-Import Bank also creates jobs. In fact, for the last year for which we have data, it supported 164,000 jobs.

We have an existential threat to those jobs. The fact is, as you all have heard, both General Electric and The Boeing Company have announced layoffs directly attributable to the demise of the Export-Import Bank. People are not concluding negotiations for foreign sales as a consequence of us not having that arrow in our quiver.

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

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

Mr. HECK of Washington. Because the fact of the matter is the Chinese are developing a wide-body aircraft to compete in the international market, code name C919. They think it will be online in 2 years. I think it is more like 10 years.

They will take business away from us. When they do, they will take jobs away from us. And I remind you that China has not one, but four, export credit authorities.

It is also a relevant issue to the subject we take up later today—the NDAA—because the truth of the matter is the Export-Import Bank helps protect the homeland very directly.

There is a lot of talk about rebalancing the Pacific and Asia and the pivot. But the fact of the matter is, in order for us to compete with China, we have to retain the heart of our manufacturing base.

And, frankly, the production of aircraft, in the aggregate, constitutes the largest concentration of engineers and manufacturing capacity within that base.

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

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

Mr. HECK of Washington. This is vital to our national security. Imagine a world 20, 30, 40 years from now in which The Boeing Company no longer exists. I don't want to imagine that future, but think of what it would do to our national security circumstance. It would be devastating to our national security. And we are ceding this territory. We are literally ceding this territory.

The irony of this debate and why, again, I find it so challenging to answer the question of why would anybody do this is, truly, if we had never had an Export-Import Bank, we would all be sitting around asking ourselves, "How do we compete with those other countries, all of whom have export credit authorities?"

We would be devising and standing up an Export-Import Bank and we would say, "What do we want that to look like?" First of all, we want it to support American jobs. Secondly, we would say we want it to protect American taxpayers and not have them on the hook. Well, guess what, my friends. We already have—or had—that institution.

The Export-Import Bank in the last generation has transferred billions of dollars to the Treasury and reduced the deficit. The Export-Import Bank has helped create and support millions of jobs.

If you want to compete in the global economy, you need an export credit authority that creates jobs. Please defeat the previous question and take up the issue of reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

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

I appreciate the words of my good friend from the State of Washington,

my co-chair for the Singapore Caucus. I know that he feels those words deeply. I agree with him that manufacturing is very important to this country.

Manufacturing aircraft is very important to my district. We just opened up 3 weeks ago an Airbus facility that will make competing aircraft against Boeing. It is good for America to have competition. So I certainly agree with him about that.

It has nothing to do with these two bills. We are here today again, amazingly, talking about the most important thing we do in our government, and we get off on a side issue. It is a side issue today. It may be a big issue tomorrow. But today we are here to talk about these two bills.

My friend from Colorado for the second time has referred to the overseas contingency fund as a slush fund. The President of the United States, President Obama, has asked for that fund every year that he has been President, and we, the Congress, have given him that fund every year that he has been President.

I don't think when the President asked for it or when the Congress gave it to him either side thought we were giving a slush fund. It has been used to protect the people of the United States. Everyone has agreed on that. It only became a slush fund when they didn't want it to be used for a particular purpose. It is not a slush fund.

The purposes for which it will be used are spelled out in detail in the National Defense Authorization Act, an act, as I said, we have gone through in both Houses, through committees and floor debate and this very lengthy process of trying to get to this conference report. This is not a slush fund. This is something that is necessary to defending the country.

So I hope, instead of using terms like that, which, quite frankly, does not reflect very well on President Obama, who asked for it, I think we should use other terms.

And let's get back to the heart of this argument: Are we going to stand together for the defense of this country or are we not? Are we going to stand with Ayatollah or are we going to stand with the people who have been harmed by the Ayatollah.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We haven't even passed an Authorization for Use of Military Force to establish the legal way for who we are supposed to be fighting against. We are still operating under the post-9/11 Authorization for Use of Military Force that names al Qaeda. But if you talk to most military experts, al Qaeda is not the preeminent threat today.

There are a lot of threats in the world, including ISIS, including threats in the Syrian civil war, including threats of the resurgence of the Taliban in Afghanistan, and this body needs to take up an Authorization for

Use of Military Force to ensure that funds that we appropriate for defense are used in a way that Congress is aware of and has oversight of.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank my good friend from Colorado for managing this bill.

Let me also thank the majority manager as well for coming to the floor and doing the people's bidding.

Although we disagree in both the purpose of the underlying bill and its effectiveness, there is no doubt that this bill has a good cause. None of us take a backseat to protecting the American people, to seeking compensation, to bringing those who are missing or those who have been captured on false terms back home to American soil. And I stand here to make that commitment.

As well, I recognize that we are going down the trail, Mr. Speaker, that we have done for the Affordable Care Act, one more attempt to undermine a legitimately debated initiative—the Iran nonnuclear proliferation—where Members made a conscious decision, personal decision, on reflecting on the best direction for the American people.

In both the Senate and the procedures set out for this Congress to determine whether this bill, this initiative, will be turned back, it did not work. So it is the law of the land. It is an effort to ensure peace, to reconcile in the area, to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons by Iran. It does not in any way diminish the United States' stance on Iran's terrorist activities. It does none of that.

But this legislation, under the pretense of not allowing the sanctions to be relieved, has a very key component and a number of measures in that initiative. It has a number of measures, another roadblock, before those sanctions will be removed. It is under the pretense of dealing with the individuals who we all want to be brought home.

I don't know how this Congress does not know of the negotiations and the engagement that is going on, but they know that this is legislation that will be vetoed by the President.

I say this in the backdrop of the Madison Papers, No. 51, that says, "Justice is the end of government." It means that we on this floor must do things that really get us in the direction of justice, the end result for the American people.

The reason why I am so disappointed is I listened to my two colleagues speak eloquently about the Export-Import Bank. I can tell them that I was in Africa with the President, and an American stood up and pleaded that he was going to lose 400 jobs if we could not get that Export-Import Bank. I hesitate to think that his contract and his engagement—what we asked him to do—has collapsed.

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat again, "Justice is the end of government." So

here we are on a bill that is going to be a copycat of what we are doing with the Affordable Care Act.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I am so disappointed, Mr. Speaker, because here I am on the floor discussing justice and we have yet another disappointing representation of this Congress when a leader of the Congress can speak and say that the Benghazi Committee is only a farce, it was only used to be-smirch a public servant.

That is not what Madison wanted for this Nation. They didn't want us to stop the economic engine for the Export-Import Bank. They didn't want us to over and over attack the Affordable Care Act that has been passed and upheld by the Supreme Court. They didn't want us to pass a bill like the underlying deal blocking the Iran sanctions process of the bill that we passed to stop nuclear proliferation.

They didn't want us to do that, Mr. Speaker. They wanted us to have justice established, and they wanted us to do what is right for the American people.

I ask for a vote against the rule and the underlying bill. Justice should be the end of government, not what we are doing here today.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just note that the gentlewoman from Texas talked about justice. One of the bills that is in this rule is the Justice for Victims of Iranian Terrorism Act.

It is about justice for the victims and for the families, victims of state-sponsored terrorism by Iran. This doesn't undo the Iranian deal. If Iran pays the judgments, the deal goes forward. That is the law.

So I would disagree with the gentlewoman with regard to the whole concept of justice. This rule contains a bill that is directly about justice.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

It is remarkable the gentleman from Alabama hasn't been able to find any other Republicans to support these bills and come down and help him argue. I think that that speaks volumes about how these bills are simply not consistent with promoting our national defense and are fiscally irresponsible. They don't please the defense hawks or the budget hawks. So my poor colleague, Mr. BYRNE, is left alone to fend for himself.

Here we are, trying to use the contingency funding as base funding and use it to somehow form the base from which our military must fund its everyday operations. The commanders and generals all agree this is a bad idea, and the gentleman from Alabama has even acknowledged that.

Here we are, discussing a bill that won't result in any of the victims of

state-sponsored terrorism actually seeing their settlement, when there is another path and we certainly could have a deliberative process around a bill that empowers the impoundment and collection of assets from state sponsors of terrorism States here in our country to ensure that victims see their judgments.

□ 1000

What this bill does is it ties it to an unrelated set of sanctions that were put in place to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons to settlement of these claims when, actually, we should be giving our courts, or if we are concerned about this issue with regard to settlements against sponsors of state terrorism, we should give courts the increased ability to make sure that they can see that restitution and impound assets from sponsors of state terrorism.

Now, Democrats have come down and offered something, if we defeat the previous question, that actually will improve our national defense. It will ensure that we have a strong aerospace industry here in our country.

The gentleman from Alabama has mentioned that Airbus is in his district. Well, Airbus is a company that will do very well if we fail to authorize the Export-Import Bank because it will put American competitors like Boeing and Lockheed at a significant disadvantage.

Now, I hope that we are fighting to ensure that America maintains its aerospace capacity and leadership and we don't cede all of that to European companies like Airbus that are welcome to compete on a level playing field. It is critical for our national security that we have the ability to lead the world as we have in the aerospace industry.

I also want to bring up that we should be discussing an Authorization for Use of Military Force. The National Defense Authorization Act does contain some parameters about how money is used, but it is not a substitute for an Authorization for Use of Military Force, and we should be having that debate.

Who are we even fighting? Who are we even fighting? I don't think that most people believe that it is still al Qaeda from the post-9/11 Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Now, I don't know what to call what we are doing in Iraq and Syria. Maybe it is a war. Maybe it is a security operation. Maybe it is occasional support to some Syrian rebels or support to the Iraqi Government or on-and-off commitment to the Kurds. But whatever it is, I don't think it is what Congress voted for in 2001 or 2003, before I was here, before Mr. BYRNE was here, before the vast majority of this body that currently serves was even here.

Those authorizations should be in the history books, not being invoked as legal justification for conducting operations in a world, in 2015, which is vastly different than the world of 2001 and

2003. And who knows how much longer or how many different wars or security operations will continue to be administered if Congress doesn't finally specify and do our job with regard to an Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Now, that is a hard debate. It is a hard issue. It is not a partisan debate. There are Democrats and Republicans on all sides; and many Members, when we have that debate, will make sure that we have the very best information to act on.

But since we authorized military force against al Qaeda and "affiliated" groups in 2001, there have been over 300 new Members of Congress elected, so the vast majority of this body, including myself and Mr. BYRNE, including Mr. HECK, including Mr. KILDEE—I believe, of all of us. I believe Ms. JACKSON LEE was the only one who was actually here when we even had that discussion. The rest of us talking about defense and NDAA didn't even play any role in choosing what the target and what our focus of our national security operations are.

The American people deserve and demand this debate. They don't want yet another fight with Congresspeople playing budget tricks around defense. They want to know what our Nation's plan is for the operations that have been ongoing. They want to see Congress take its constitutional responsibilities for actions in the world.

And whether any one of us ultimately votes in favor or against an Authorization for Use of Military Force, we all, I hope, are for the debate, and we should join in demanding one.

On the conference report, Madam Speaker, this plan will not work, will not become law. The President will veto it. The generals oppose it. The budget hawks oppose it. No one even came down to join Mr. BYRNE in arguing for it. It is a terrible plan. It will hurt our national defense. We need to defeat it.

The Iran bill tries to get at a legitimate issue in completely the wrong way. It is not a partisan issue that we want to see restitution for victims of state terrorism. Let's get into that act and look at the enforcement mechanisms rather than try to use these victims as yet another attempt to go after the deal that prevents Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

I think it is clear from our Rules Committee debate that everyone supports efforts for American victims of terrorism to pursue compensation. The Iran nuclear agreement has nothing to do with that, and it certainly doesn't prevent that from happening.

No matter what country, whether it is Iran or other sponsors of state terrorism, we all remain committed to this process of seeing justice. Undermining the ability to enforce a nuclear agreement is not the proper way or even a relevant way to achieve this goal.

The reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank is ready to go. If we de-

feat the previous question, we will bring it to the floor. We have the votes in the House. I hope my colleague, Mr. BYRNE from Alabama, will join us in that vote if we can defeat the previous question. We have the votes in the Senate, the President. We can stop this unnecessary loss of jobs every single day in districts across our country solely due to our inability to act.

Hopefully, we can move to take up highway authorization, ESEA, immigration reform, raising the minimum wage. These are some of the issues that I hear from my constituents about every day that we need to act on. So rather than waste time, waste money, hurt our national defense, let's get to work and accomplish something.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and defeat the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate Mr. POLIS being concerned that I am here by myself. I think it has been a good debate, and I know I have the full support of my colleagues behind me, and there will be a number of them here to debate the bill when it comes up after we adopt this rule.

It is extremely important that we understand what we are about in these two bills. It is not about the Export-Import Bank. It is not about immigration. It is not about any of the other issues that he brought up. It is about defending the American people and making victims of Iran terrorism whole. That is what it is about.

Now, I have seen the public opinion polls on national security. National security has rocketed up to be the number one issue for the people of America. I didn't need to see those polls. I have done 18 townhall meetings in the last several weeks in my district, and I have looked my constituents in the eyes and heard their concerns.

They don't bring up the Export-Import Bank to me. They bring up the fact that they are worried about what is happening to our country's standing abroad. They are worried about what is going on with these brutal terrorists in the Middle East. They are worried about the fact that we have just given Iran a nuclear weapon. They are worried about whether we are going to have an adequate defense to continue to protect them, as we have for decades now, in a bipartisan fashion. That is what they are worried about, and that is what they expect us to come here and do something about.

These two bills do something very important. The National Defense Authorization Act, for 53 years, has been passed in a bipartisan fashion, which has said to the world, which has said to our allies, which has said to our enemies, which has said to the men and women in uniform in the United States of America, we stand as one.

Now this President and some—not all of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—some of my colleagues on

the other side of the aisle are going to break that, after five decades, at this critical time. I find that hard to believe, but I accept the fact that it is nonetheless true.

I would plead with them to reconsider that. I would plead with the President, who is our Commander in Chief, not to veto this bill. This is critically important at a critically important time.

On the Justice for Victims of Iranian Terrorism Act, you know, we don't get very many opportunities where we in this body can do something that will directly bring some measure of compensation to people, citizens of the United States, who have been victimized by the largest state sponsor of terrorism in the world. We don't get very many opportunities like that, and we have it right now this with this bill. We have the opportunity to make them whole, or come close to making them whole.

They have got judgments from courts, valid judgments; and with the passage of this bill, which should truly be a bipartisan thing, and if the President signs it, with passage of this bill, we could give it to them. What a wonderful thing we could give to them after all the suffering they have been through. We would deny them that because we want to stand with the Ayatollah, because we think Iran is more important than they are?

If we think for one second that Iran is going to take this money that is going to be released and use it for good and peaceful purposes, we are excessively naive. They are going to take this money, based upon what they have done in the past and what they are doing today, and they will use it to fund Hezbollah, Hamas, the Houthis, and other terrorist groups around the Middle East and perhaps around the world not just against other people outside the United States, against people in the United States. So by passing that bill, we deny them tens of billions of dollars. They won't be able to use it for that.

I wish that, for once, we could come into this room, on something of this magnitude and stand shoulder to shoulder, not as Democrats, not as Republicans, but as Americans, which we have done for decades. It saddens me that the President and some of the members of his own party in this House would not do that.

So I beg my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to reconsider, and I beg the President of the United States to reconsider. There has never been a more important time for us to stand together for the defense of this country and for the men and women in uniform.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 449 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, 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. 3611) to reauthorize and reform the Export-Import Bank of the United States, 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 Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. 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. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3611.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the pre-

vious question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 180, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 529]

YEAS—237

Abraham	Comstock	Goodlatte
Aderholt	Conaway	Gosar
Allen	Cook	Gowdy
Amash	Costello (PA)	Granger
Amodei	Cramer	Graves (GA)
Babin	Crawford	Graves (LA)
Barletta	Crenshaw	Graves (MO)
Barr	Curbelo (FL)	Griffith
Barton	Davis, Rodney	Grothman
Benishek	Denham	Guinta
Bilirakis	Dent	Guthrie
Bishop (MI)	DeSantis	Hanna
Bishop (UT)	DesJarlais	Hardy
Black	Diaz-Balart	Harper
Blackburn	Dold	Harris
Blum	Donovan	Hartzler
Bost	Duffy	Heck (NV)
Boustany	Duncan (SC)	Hensarling
Brat	Duncan (TN)	Herrera Beutler
Bridenstine	Ellmers (NC)	Hice, Jody B.
Brooks (IN)	Emmer (MN)	Hill
Buchanan	Farenthold	Holding
Buck	Fincher	Huelskamp
Bucshon	Fitzpatrick	Huizenga (MI)
Burgess	Fleischmann	Hultgren
Byrne	Fleming	Hunter
Calvert	Flores	Hurd (TX)
Carter (GA)	Forbes	Hurt (VA)
Carter (TX)	Fortenberry	Issa
Chabot	Fox	Jenkins (KS)
Chaffetz	Franks (AZ)	Jenkins (WV)
Clawson (FL)	Frelinghuysen	Johnson (OH)
Coffman	Garrett	Johnson, Sam
Cole	Gibbs	Jolly
Collins (GA)	Gibson	Jones
Collins (NY)	Gohmert	Jordan

Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney

Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner

Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky

Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica

Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise

Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—17

Bishop (GA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Conyers
Culberson

Gutiérrez
Hudson
Kelly (IL)
Neal
Nunes
Payne

Perlmutter
Pompeo
Reichert
Whitfield
Yoho

□ 1039

Messrs. CONNOLLY and HOYER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. YODER changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 529, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Stated against:

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, earlier today, I was unavoidably detained and was not able to vote on the Motion Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule for H.R. 3457, rollcall vote 529. Had I been able to vote, I would have voted “nay.”

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. Madam 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 device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 181, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 530]

AYES—241

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth

Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey

Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)

Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry

Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren

NOES—181

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier

Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallo
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Clyburn
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence

Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarelli
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Ruppersberger	Sherman	Van Hollen
Rush	Sires	Vargas
Ryan (OH)	Slaughter	Veasey
Sánchez, Linda	Smith (WA)	Velázquez
T.	Speier	Visclosky
Sanchez, Loretta	Swalwell (CA)	Walz
Sarbantes	Takai	Wasserman
Schakowsky	Takano	Schultz
Schiff	Thompson (CA)	Waters, Maxine
Schrader	Thompson (MS)	Watson Coleman
Scott (VA)	Titus	Welch
Scott, David	Tonko	Wilson (FL)
Serrano	Torres	Yarmuth
Sewell (AL)	Tsongas	

NOT VOTING—12

Brady (TX)	Hudson	Pompeo
Brown (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Reichert
Culberson	Neal	Whitfield
Gutiérrez	Perlmutter	Yoho

□ 1049

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2617. An act to amend the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 to postpone a scheduled increase in the minimum wage applicable to American Samoa.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2078. An act to reauthorize the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and for other purposes.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF IRANIAN TERRORISM ACT

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 449, I call up the bill (H.R. 3457) to prohibit the lifting of sanctions on Iran until the Government of Iran pays the judgments against it for acts of terrorism, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 449, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 114-273, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3457

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 Iranian Terrorism Act”.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON LIFTING OF SANCTIONS ON IRAN PENDING PAYMENT OF CERTAIN JUDGMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may not take any of the actions described in subsection (b) until the President has certified to the Congress that the Government of Iran

has paid each judgment against Iran that is described in subsection (c).

(b) ACTIONS DESCRIBED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The actions described in this subsection are the following:

(A) To waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions described in paragraph (2) or refrain from applying any such sanctions.

(B) To remove a foreign person listed in Attachment 3 or Attachment 4 to Annex II of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action from the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Asset Control of the Department of the Treasury.

(2) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this paragraph are—

(A) the sanctions described in sections 4 through 7.9 of Annex II of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action; and

(B) the sanctions described in any other agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran that includes the United States, commits the United States to take action, or pursuant to which the United States commits or otherwise agrees to take action, regardless of the form it takes, whether a political commitment or otherwise, and regardless of whether it is legally binding or not.

(c) JUDGMENTS.—A judgment is a judgment described in this subsection if it is a final judgment entered by the courts of the United States or of the States—

(1) that relates to a claim—

(A) that was brought against Iran or its political subdivisions, agencies, or instrumentalities (regardless of whether the claim was also brought, or the resulting judgment was also entered, against another defendant); and

(B) for which the court determined that Iran (or its political subdivisions, agencies, or instrumentalities, as the case may be) was not immune from the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States or of the States under section 1605A, or section 1605(a)(7) (as such section was in effect on January 27, 2008), of title 28, United States Code; and

(2) that was entered during the period beginning on April 24, 1996, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION DESCRIBED.—In this section, the term “Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action” means the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, agreed to at Vienna on July 14, 2015, by Iran and by the People’s Republic of China, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States, with the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, and all implementing materials and agreements related to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to submit extraneous materials on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in strong support of this bill. This is the Justice for Victims of Iranian Terrorism Act.

I appreciate the work of the bill’s author, Mr. MEEHAN of Pennsylvania. He has worked very hard on this. There are about 100 cosponsors in this House.

On the Foreign Affairs Committee, we have made Iran the central focus of our work. As a matter of fact, we have had over 30 hearings and briefings so far on Iran and on the dangerous nuclear agreement that was struck with this state sponsor of terrorism.

Madam Speaker, since coming to power in the late 1970s—well, 1979—the Iranian regime has funded terrorist groups such as Hezbollah and Hamas and directed their operations.

Now, the way they do that is they have a special force. It is called the Quds Force. It is headed up by General Soleimani. He is in charge of assassinations outside the country, assassinations of U.S. targets, by the way, besides other targets.

Recently you will have heard of General Soleimani because—by the way, European sanctions are going to be lifted on him under this agreement, but you will have read or heard that he traveled—he traveled—to Moscow to meet with Putin. As a result of those meetings, you will notice the discussions about weapons coming from Russia into Syria into the hands of the Quds Forces.

So we look at what he has done and what U.S. courts have done as a result. There have been 80 separate attacks on U.S. installations and U.S. individuals. We remember the 1983 bombing of the U.S. marine barracks in Beirut, the 1996 bombing of the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia. Those two attacks killed 260 American servicemen and left their widows and left children to be raised by one parent.

There are judgments that have been rendered that direct payment from Iran to these families, to the victims’ families. Unfortunately, under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, even though this reward has been given, even though U.S. victims of state-sponsored terrorism got their day in court, and even though they have brought the suits in U.S. courts and had the right to collect these damages, Iran has not as of yet paid.

U.S. courts have held Iran liable for the attacks carried out by its terrorist proxies when those attacks were orchestrated and paid for by the Iranian regime. The judgments that remain outstanding are \$43.5 billion in unpaid damages for those 80 cases over the last decade and a half.

In one case, \$9 billion was awarded to the victims of the bombing of the marine barracks in 1983. Again, the Government of Iran was found responsible through lawful proceedings in a U.S. court. That judgment remains unpaid.

Madam Speaker, the Obama administration during its negotiations with Iran did not seek for Iran to compensate the families of those whose

lives were taken by Iranian terrorism despite these U.S. court judgments. That is very much in contrast with our past procedure.

In the case of Libya, for example, a decade ago, when we reached that agreement with Libya, the U.S. secured the right or the demand that the Qadhafi regime compensate the victims of the attacks, such as the bombing of Pan Am 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland. That was \$2.5 billion. That was done. That is our procedure.

Iran will soon obtain \$100 billion, approximately, in unfrozen assets as well as immeasurable economic and financial benefits by escaping the sanctions regime and reintegrating into the global economy. Iran will get sanctions lifted and American victims will still be out in the cold. That is not right.

This legislation would address that injustice. It is straightforward. It would say that, of the \$100 billion and some in sanctions relief, those judgments will be paid out of that. That \$43 billion will be paid to the survivors of those families of those 80 attacks orchestrated, paid for, by Iran.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, September 30, 2015.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing with respect to H.R. 3457, the "Justice for Victims of Iranian Terrorism Act," which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 3457 involves issues that fall within Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite the House's consideration of H.R. 3457, the Committee on Ways and Means will not assert its jurisdictional claim over this bill by seeking a sequential referral. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding and agreement that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 3457, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of H.R. 3457.

Sincerely,

PAUL D. RYAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, September 30, 2015.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 3457, the Justice for Victims of Iranian Terrorism Act, which involves issues within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and for agreeing to forgo a sequential referral request so that it may proceed expeditiously to the Floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or

similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 3457 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with the Committee on Ways and Means as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, September 28, 2015.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing with respect to H.R. 3457, the "Justice for Victims of Iranian Terrorism Act," which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 3457 involves issues that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite the House's consideration of H.R. 3457, the Committee on the Judiciary will not assert its jurisdictional claim over this bill by seeking a sequential referral. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding and agreement that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 3457, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of H.R. 3457.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, September 28, 2015.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 3457, the Justice for Victims of Iranian Terrorism Act, which involves issues within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, and for agreeing to forgo a sequential referral request so that it may proceed expeditiously to the Floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 3457 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with the Committee on the Judiciary as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

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

I rise in opposition to the bill.

Let me start by acknowledging my friend, Chairman ROYCE. The Committee on Foreign Affairs is the most bipartisan committee in Congress. We are collaborative, we are productive, and we have built a record advancing bipartisan legislation that promotes American interests abroad and keeps the American people safe. I want to state that Chairman ROYCE's leadership is to thank for much of our committee's good work.

So I am disappointed that the House Republican leadership decided to ignore regular order on this bill. They have rushed it to the floor without any consideration by the Foreign Affairs Committee. As has been pointed out, we have had 30 hearings. We know a little bit about Iran on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

So rushing it to the floor without any consideration by the Foreign Affairs Committee is wrong. I think it is a shame. Because I think, left to our own volition, we could have sent forward a bill that could make a difference for the victims of Iranian-sponsored terrorism. Iranian-sponsored terrorism is there, it is palpable, and we should do something to try to help the victims.

But this bill, on the other hand, would not do that. Let me explain why. American courts have awarded roughly \$46 billion to about 1,300 victims and their families. We all want justice for these families. We all want to hold Iran accountable for its act of terrorism against Americans. Iran should pay these claims. But this bill does nothing for the victims of Iranian terror.

Here is the problem. Let's assume for argument that Iran's leaders did change course and decide to pay the claims. This bill would actually make it more difficult for Iran to pay these judgments.

Iran owes American claimants \$46 billion, but Iran has access to \$20 billion of its cash reserves, not \$46 billion. The rest—\$95 billion—is frozen in bank accounts in Europe and Asia.

On top of that, Iran's oil revenues are frozen. When Iran sells oil, the payments are kept frozen under the threat of American sanctions, which I support. Iran can access these funds only for certain purposes. Paying court judgments is not one of them. Current U.S. sanctions don't allow it.

□ 1100

And under this bill, all U.S. sanctions are kept in effect, absolutely no changes allowed, until Iran pays the full \$46 billion.

So where would Iran get the money to pay the American claims?

The bill says: Iran, pay the claims, but you can't have any of the funds to pay them. So it is a catch-22. And who does it hurt? Not Iran. It hurts the victims. Not a single claim would be paid under this bill. So, in my opinion, this bill offers nothing but false hope.

Now, I have heard some Members say, well, we can pay the claims by

seizing Iran's frozen assets, but that is really not the case. Virtually all of Iran's funds frozen under our sanctions are overseas, not in the U.S. Though they are frozen by U.S. sanctions, they are beyond the jurisdiction of our courts to seize them.

Another false promise: virtually all of Iran's assets will stay overseas. Under this bill, they would be required to be kept overseas because all U.S. sanctions would be kept in effect by law with no change allowed.

So let's be honest. This bill is not really about helping these victims. It is about exploiting their plight and their tragedy to make a political splash.

Look, everyone here knows I am no fan of the Iran nuclear agreement. I voted against it, but the other side won. Whether you are for or against the deal, it is time to be realistic about what happens next.

In my opinion, there were two potential courses. The first is to do everything we can to strengthen enforcement of the agreement and hold Iran to its commitments. We should double down on our support for friends and allies in the region. We should crack down on Iran's support for terrorist organizations. We should push leaders in Tehran to release detained Americans and improve its abysmal record on human rights. That is the course I hope we will take. I will soon introduce legislation to pursue those aims, and I will work with members of both parties to get these measures to the President's desk.

The other course would be doing to the Iran agreement what leaders on the other side have tried to do to the Affordable Care Act, and that is what I am afraid of here: vote after vote after vote after vote, whether we like it or not, on an issue that has already been voted on by this Chamber many, many times. I don't want the dispute on Iran to turn into the Affordable Care Act where we try to kill it 60 different ways.

We should not be using this for political purposes. We should be passing legislation, which I know we can get out of the Foreign Affairs Committee in a collaborative way, that would really do something to help these victims, that would really do something to hold Iran accountable for all its reprehensible acts. So I hope that what we are doing today is not the path we are going down not only now, but in the future with other things.

There was a measure in the Senate that was very similar to this, which tried to hold Iran to certain things and say that the funds couldn't be released unless Iran did this or did that. We could do this another 60 times; it would be counterproductive. Let's put our heads together. Let's figure out a way that we can continue to hold Iran accountable, and let's move on that way.

So I hope we can move past this bill and start working on measures to ensure that the Iran agreement is implemented as strongly and stringently as

possible. I hope we can get back to our regular practice in the Foreign Affairs Committee of which we have been so proud and focus on making policy that leaves politics at the water's edge.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. The administration is arguing, Mr. Speaker, that although the Iranian regime has access to over \$20 billion and that this judgment is \$43 billion, there isn't enough money there to make payment. In addition to the 20-some billion, Iran is in the process right now of negotiation and paying and supporting in transfers to other regimes.

For example, a report out this week says Iran is purchasing \$21 billion of airplanes and satellites from Russia. That is \$21 billion. Iran somehow has the money to do that, but it doesn't have the money for this claim.

A report out about a month ago says that Iran's annual support for Hezbollah is over \$100 million per year. Somehow they have got the spending cash for that.

It is providing the Syrian regime, one estimate of one of the think tanks here in town is that they have provided them a little over \$10 billion a year.

So Iran somehow has the discretionary money for these other purposes, but not for the purpose of the judgments won in U.S. court for over 1,000 victims or family members of the victims of their attacks.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MEEHAN for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Iranian ayatollah has preached and practiced "Death to America" since the 1970s.

Iran is a state sponsor of terrorism. Iran has been sued in Federal courts by the families of the murdered victims. Iran is guilty of the murder of 421 Americans in Beirut, Lebanon, in 1983. Iran is guilty of the murder of 19 servicemembers and injuring 372 others in Saudi Arabia in 1996. Iran is guilty of murdering a thousand other Americans, including some in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Federal courts have awarded the victim and families over \$40 billion for these crimes, but Iran will not pay. It laughs at the death of the innocent it has murdered. It laughs at American justice.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is about time for the long arm of American justice to hold Iran accountable for its sins—make them pay.

I don't understand why some appeasers are more concerned about the murderous Iranian regime than they are about justice, justice for the victims that were murdered by this regime.

Let the ayatollah know he cannot get a diplomatic pass or sanctions relief until he pays for his crimes. The ayatollah has sown the seeds of murder, and now it is time for Iran to reap the consequences of their crimes.

It seems to me that the voices of the murdered cry out for us to do something for justice, justice for them that has been too long waiting. This bill, in my opinion, will do it.

It is about time we have justice because justice is what we are supposed to do in this country.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote "no" on this particular bill.

You know, once we were able to secure this negotiation and once the deal was put in place, the focus of our attention should shift to making sure that Iran lives up to its commitments, and we should use this prior negotiation as a template for negotiating other issues, including the captives, including the interests of these victims talked about here today.

What this bill does is it handcuffs the President and says that the President doesn't have any discretion to do his end of this bargain, to exercise his discretion to forward and help America and the P5+1 live up to our end of the bargain. That is the wrong way to go.

So I can credit the authors of this bill with having good intentions, but I think that the method that they are going about it is just wrong.

Let's use the template that has been developed through the negotiation process to go back and say, "Okay, now we got other things we want to talk to you about," rather than pass legislation on this floor that will do nothing other than hamstringing the President. It is the wrong way to do it. It is a mistake, and it should be voted down.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in 1983, 241 American servicemen in Beirut were killed and another 60 injured by a car bomb.

One of the Marines murdered was my constituent, Paul Innocenzi III, who lived with his young family in my hometown of Hamilton. In my second term as Congressman, I joined mourners at his funeral. I will never forget the agony and the sorrow of his family. Iranian terrorism killed Paul Innocenzi and, over the decades, has killed or maimed thousands of other Americans.

A Federal court, Mr. Speaker, found that the 1983 bombing was "beyond question" perpetrated by "Hezbollah and its agent who received massive material and technical support from the Iranian Government." Later a three-judge Federal appeals court panel approved \$1.75 billion in judgment against Iran for the 1983 bombing and some other Iranian acts of terror.

Today Iran is poised to get billions of dollars through so-called sanctions relief for an egregiously flawed comprehensive plan of action, money that will procure for Iran a significantly larger arsenal of sophisticated weapons

and an enhanced capability to terrorize, murder, and destabilize.

The chairman talked about Iran's \$21 billion weapons purchase from Russia. Billions more to Iran will exponentially increase weapons buys. The Justice for Victims of Iranian Terrorism Act authored by PAT MEEHAN says not so fast.

The President has said he will veto this bill. That is wrong, Mr. Speaker. That is uncaring, it is unacceptable, it is unconscionable. And does a grave disservice to American victims of Iranian terrorism.

Support court-ordered victim payments by the terrorist State of Iran. Fundamental justice demands that this bill become law.

Mr. Speaker, what was previously unacceptable—an Iranian nuclear state—is now inevitable under the terms and conditions of what is officially known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Tragically, the deal is riddled with serious flaws, gaps, and huge concessions to Iran. Taken as a whole, this egregiously flawed deal poses an existential threat to Israel, our allies in the region—and poses significant risks to the United States.

Today Iran is poised to get billions of dollars through so-called sanctions relief—money that will procure for Iran a significantly larger arsenal of sophisticated weapons and an enhanced capability to terrorize, murder and destabilize.

The Justice for Victims of Iranian Terrorism Act (H.R. 3457) authored by Pat Meehan says not so fast.

The bill prohibits the President from waiving sanctions until Iran pays its more than \$44.5 billion in court ordered damages to thousands of victims and survivors of Iranian terror attacks.

To date, the U.S. Department of State has refused to release funds ordered by the courts to victims and surviving families in more than 80 cases despite clear authority to do so under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA).

In 1983, 241 American servicemen in Beirut were killed and another 60 injured by a car bomb. One of the Marines murdered was my constituent WO1 Paul Innocenzi III who lived with his young family in my hometown of Hamilton. In my second term as congressman, I joined mourners at his funeral. I will never forget the agony and sorrow of his family. Iranian terrorism killed Paul Innocenzi and over the decades, has killed or maimed thousands of other Americans.

A federal district court found that the 1983 bombing was “beyond question” perpetrated by “Hezbollah and its agents (who) received massive material and technical support from the Iranian government”. Later a three judge federal appeals court panel approved a \$1.75 billion judgement against Iran for the 1983 bombing and other Iranian acts of terror.

The President has said he will veto this bill. That's wrong. That's uncaring, unacceptable, and unconscionable. Support court-ordered victim payments by the terror state of Iran. Fundamental justice demands that this bill becomes law.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), our colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for his leadership on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

This bill prohibits any waivers, reductions, or other relief from U.S. sanctions on Iran until Iran pays all court-ordered damage claims to U.S. victims. Those claims total about \$46 billion.

This bill would prevent the U.S. from implementing its commitments under the Iran deal, which is really what my friends on the other side are trying to do. Not being able to win directly, let's get at it indirectly and let's cover it with the patina of respectability. But the real issue is, cynically, how we use the plight of U.S. victims for another partisan shot.

We all want to help American victims of Iran's terrorism and lack of justice, but this is not the way to help them. It would have the opposite effect by reducing the chance that any claims, in fact, would be paid because, by freezing assets, Iran wouldn't have the wherewithal to do what this bill says it should do before sanctions are lifted.

Think about this: Iran owes \$46 billion in U.S. claims, but it doesn't have the money right now, even if it wanted to pay. Iran only has access to about \$20 billion of its own reserves.

Realistically, the only funds that could be used are the frozen funds under U.S. sanctions held in banks around the world. Under this bill, the frozen funds couldn't be used to pay the claims, and all the money remains frozen until Iran pays the claims. It is a catch-22 if there ever was one. It couldn't sell any oil to use to free up cash because those funds, too, would be frozen.

Another clue about what is really behind this bill is that all of the 76 sponsors are my friends on the other side of the aisle, not a single Democrat.

Regardless of one's position on the Iran deal, a deal I probably supported because it keeps Iran from becoming a nuclear state, opposing this cynical bill is, in fact, the right vote if you care about the victims of Iranian injustice and terrorism.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and author of this bill.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, \$21 billion for Russian jets, but not a penny for the victims of their own acts of terror. That is what my colleagues are trying to say? In fact, the President can negotiate it. Let him reach an installment plan, but let's make sure that these dollars are paid.

Look, this is a fundamental question: Should Iran receive relief from the U.S. sanctions before it pays the victims of terrorism the \$43 billion that U.S. courts say these victims are owed?

When we say “terrorism,” what are we talking about? We are talking about Iranian-backed assassinations, bomb-

ings, and attacks across time zones, from Paris to Jerusalem, to New York, to Beirut, to East Africa, to Buenos Aires.

I say not one cent.

These victims are United States citizens. They are wives, brothers and sisters, children who hail from all across the Nation, and they were killed in hijackings and suicide attacks and bombings of buses and planes and buildings and embassies and shopping malls and pizza parlors.

□ 1115

In fact, I met with one of those victims this morning and yesterday, the widow of Kenneth Welch and his child. They are here in Washington today. They have been waiting 30 years for the opportunity to see this issue addressed.

My friends, by voting against this legislation, you are saying that Iran and the perpetrators of these atrocities deserve U.S. sanctions relief before the victims deserve the court-ordered compensation. Let me say it again. By voting “no,” you are putting the interests of Iran's terror machine before the American victims of that terror. I say not 1 cent.

To those who say Iran can't afford to pay these damages, let me remind you of a few facts. Iran has a yearly gross domestic product in excess of \$1.3 trillion, and they just spent \$21 billion on Russian jets. The facts show that Iran has the money and will have much more if the sanctions are lifted, money that our own administration freely admits will go to finance even more terror.

I sat yesterday with Ken Stethem, the brother of Robert Stethem, the United States Navy diver who was executed on Beirut Flight 847. His brother Ken, himself a retired Navy SEAL, said to me yesterday, “If the President doesn't take this opportunity and Congress doesn't take the opportunity to hold Iran accountable for their terrorist acts now, I have to ask them when will they. Thirty years for one family, more than 15 for another. When will they?”

He is talking to us. Let's answer him. Let's today stand up for the standards of U.S. Navy Petty Officer Robert Stethem. Let's today vote as one House to say we will put Robert Stethem and the many victims of Iran's terrorism before—before—the criminals who conspired to kill them.

Until they pay these victims what they are owed, let's say no to Iran, not 1 cent.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this issue. I listened to the impassioned pleas from my friends on the other side of the aisle about horrific acts of the thugs who run Iran. Nobody disputes that, and nothing before us would take away the sanctions that we have against their terrorist activity.

We are all committed to justice for those victims, but bear in mind what this legislation seeks to do is to unwind another critical objective of the United States, of our allies, to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran.

That agreement was a signal achievement of diplomacy not just of the Obama administration, but of Russia, China, Germany, France, Great Britain, working with us to secure the strongest agreement that we have seen to contain these thugs' nuclear ambitions. The world is united with us to restrain a nuclear Iran.

Now, we have had testimony from our partners that, if the United States walks away from that agreement, we are on our own. They are not going to continue to enforce nuclear sanctions against Iran, and, ultimately, Iran will get its money and a free hand to develop nuclear weapons unencumbered by the allies that we have assembled and the pressure that we have put on them.

Now, my friends, Mr. ENGEL and Mr. CONNOLLY, are correct. The construct here is very difficult, even if this were to be approved, to actually work out on paper. But take it a step further. These elements have been in place for years and have not resulted in any movement for the victims.

We have had what the rest of the world thinks is a significant breakthrough with Iran. We have got an area of cooperation, and the world is united with us to keep the pressure on them. I would suggest, rather than throwing this agreement in the trash can and allow Iran to develop nuclear weapons and make them stronger—and, ultimately, they will get their money because India and China are going to go ahead and start buying oil from Iran again as the sanctions collapse. It will be the United States against the world again.

We couldn't even sanction itty-bitty Cuba to change their regime. It takes multinational efforts to be able to make changes. This agreement is an important first step, and I would suggest it gives us an opportunity to continue putting pressure on Iran to be able to obtain the justice that we all want for those victims.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. ROYCE for their leadership. I oppose the Iranian deal for many reasons. Among the reasons is the over \$100 billion windfall Iran will receive in unfrozen assets and sanctions relief.

The administration has acknowledged that some of this money will be certainly distributed to the Iranian military, its global terrorist network, and to the Quds Force, an organization with American blood on its hands.

We remember the marines and sailors killed in the bombing of the barracks in Beirut in 1983 and civilians in that

embassy in Beirut, the airmen who died in Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia in 1995. And what about the victims of the Iranian-financed attacks, like Alisa Flatow of West Orange, New Jersey, who died in a bus bombing in Gaza in 1995 and Sara Duker of Teaneck, New Jersey, who was murdered on a bus in Jerusalem in 1996? Who speaks for them, for those innocents and their families? This bill does.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD), a member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. Justice is a powerful word. For those who have been wronged, justice can bring peace and closure. For those guilty of harming the innocent, justice is absolutely necessary to ensure the authority of our laws. Without justice, truth becomes irrelevant.

If America is going to continue to be the greatest nation in the world, it is imperative that we pursue justice. But the Iran nuclear deal does the exact opposite. It rewards lawlessness and corruption. It tells Iran that they can be unjust to our own citizens and the current administration will allow them to get away with it.

Iran is responsible for sponsoring terrorism that has led to the death of thousands of Americans. When the families of these Americans sought justice in the court, Iran was found guilty and ordered to make reparations. The family of Cyrus Elahi from Dallas, Texas, was awarded more than \$300 million after Cyrus was assassinated for criticizing the Iranian Government.

Judgments like this have added up to billions of dollars that Iran owes the families of American victims. But is this administration forcing Iran to pay? Are they demanding justice for Americans like Cyrus? No. Instead, this administration is handing over an estimated \$100 billion to Iran. That is not justice. That is outrageous.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, this bill would respond to one of many significant problems with President Obama's disastrous Iran deal, which gives Iran sanctions relief without requiring it to make reparations for the crimes it has committed against Americans.

Anne Dammerell, who was born in Cincinnati near my district, was working at the U.S. Embassy in Beirut in 1983. A bomb exploded while she was in the embassy cafeteria, breaking 19 of her bones. She received a judgment against Iran for \$6.8 million because of the physical and mental suffering she endured. Anne is one tragic story among many.

Over the past 15 years, U.S. courts have handed down 80 judgments against Iran, adding up to more than

\$43.5 billion in unpaid damages. Iran refuses to pay. Yet, the President's nuclear agreement provides Iran with \$150 billion in sanctions relief. Those that have destroyed innocent American lives, Iranian terrorists, are being chosen over the American victims themselves.

This bill would prohibit the President from removing any sanctions in place against Iran until the President has certified to Congress that Iran has paid each Federal court judgment.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN) for introducing this good bill. It is a compassionate bill. It is a bill that tells victims of terrorism that they are not forgotten.

I chair the task force in the House Committee on Financial Services to investigate terrorism finance, and we had a hearing specifically on the joint plan of action, the so-called P5+1. That was back in July.

There was an attorney who testified at the hearing about the \$43 billion in judgments and how this deal, then not approved yet, was likely going to sidestep the ability of victims who did all the right things through the legal process, who hired lawyers, who went to court, who got the judgments, legitimate judgments, how these judgments would not be paid.

On July 29, I wrote a letter to Secretary Lew—Secretary of the Treasury—and Secretary Kerry of the State Department asking whether or not they had addressed the issue as part of the negotiations. That was July 29. I have yet to receive a response from the Treasury Department, from the Department of State, in any way.

Mr. Speaker, the deafening silence of this administration has led me to believe that they completely overlooked the victims of terrorism.

What we are going to do is we are going to give the money to the Islamic Republic of Iran and not to American victims, and that is wrong. This bill is right. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, as the chair of the bipartisan Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing, I analyzed the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) put forward by this Administration at length.

After numerous hearings and research, I opposed the deal for a number of reasons—not the least of which is because of its potential impact on terrorism financing by Iran. At hearing after hearing, members heard directly from foreign policy experts about this threat and the danger of the influx of cash provided by this agreement finding its way to terrorist organizations threatening Iran's neighboring states as well as those planning strikes in the United States.

At a hearing specifically on this deal and its impact on Tehran's state sponsorship of terror, one witness, a practicing attorney, testified to

the fact that American citizens and families who were victims of Iranian sponsored terrorist attacks—including families in my district in Pennsylvania—are owed over \$43 billion in compensation as awarded by United States.

Following the Task Force's fourth hearing I wrote this letter to both Secretaries John Kerry and Jack Lew asking if this nuclear deal would strip victims of Iranian terrorism the right to this compensation.

That was July 29. I have yet to receive any sort of response from either the Treasury or State departments. The deafening silence from the Administration has led me to believe they completely overlooked these families when they rushed to finalize this bad deal with Iran.

Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable to think that—as a nation—we would allow the world's largest state sponsor of terror access to billions of dollars in sanctions relief and unfreezing of held assets while victims of Iranian terrorism are left with nothing.

These victims are Americans from all around the country—from my home and yours. They've lost loved ones and suffered irreparable damages because of Iran's long, sordid history with terrorism. By failing to take this situation into account throughout the negotiation process, the administration has failed these victims and their families.

The Justice for Victims of Iranian Terrorism Act we are considering today rights that wrong. It says simply: Not one cent in sanctions relief for Iran until these families are paid. That's not a partisan demand—that's common sense.

I strongly support this legislation and ask for my colleagues to join me in standing up for our constituents impacted by Iranian terror and pass this bill in the bipartisan fashion it deserves.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, Iran is shortly set to receive over \$100 billion when President Obama uses his pen to lift our sanctions against the world's largest sponsor of terrorism. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, Iran owes U.S. victims of terror it sponsored and supported \$43.5 billion.

One of these victims was Petty Officer 1st Class Michael Wagner of Columbia, North Carolina. He was serving in the American Embassy in Beirut in 1984 when a car bomb filled with explosives paid for by Iran detonated outside his office, killing him and 23 other people. In the case of Petty Officer Wagner and Tehran's other victims, our courts have found Iran guilty and ordered Iran to pay restitution, but Iran has not paid a penny.

Mr. Speaker, we should require Iran to pay every penny it owes to the victims of terrorism before sanctions are lifted, period.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I am and will remain opposed to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action on Iran. It represents Iran's ability to build a nu-

clear weapon at a future date while reaping the financial benefits of immediate relief from international sanctions. By removing sanctions, the agreement injects almost \$100 billion into the Iranian regime.

Iran is the single largest state sponsor of terrorism in the world, funding—even with sanctions in place—Hezbollah in Lebanon and Hamas in Gaza. Over \$43 billion in judgments have been awarded to Americans who have been the victims of Iranian terrorism. The agreement fails to clear those judgments.

The agreement, at best, delays Iran's ability to build nuclear weapons. At worst, it gives the regime more money to engage in more terrorism while providing no justice to Americans already harmed by the regime.

The Justice for Victims of Iranian Terrorism Act is timely. It is appropriate, and it should be supported by every member of this body who believe in the validity of U.S. courts and the Federal Sovereign Immunities Act.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

□ 1130

Mr. HILL. I thank Mr. MEEHAN for his leadership on this, and I thank the ranking member and the chairman for their opposition to the Iranian agreement, which I believe was ill-conceived and not enough time given for those negotiations to bear true fruit. In fact, that is the whole point of our debate today. The maximum amount of negotiating clout that the United States had over these sanctions was during these negotiations, before we released sanctions, before Iran gets access to their monthly oil flow and their \$100 billion.

We have \$44 billion and 85 judgments. The number of intelligence agents that have worked day and night to adjudicate these claims in court, the number of FBI agents involved, the Federal Government's obligation to generate awards for these victims, and yet this administration has never raised it in public in regard to the Iranian agreement.

Under the 1996 and 2008 Federal Sovereign Immunities Act, the President of the United States is obligated to seek resolution for these claims.

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

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

Mr. HILL. He is obligated to adjudicate these claims and seek restitution for these victims under the Federal Sovereign Immunities Act. President Bush did his duty. When he had leverage over Libya, he got the claims paid for the victims of terror in Libya.

For every day we come to work in this House and we ask, "What can we do to help this country? How can we do to help this country? How can we right a wrong?" today is that day.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support Mr. MEEHAN's outstanding bill. Let's right the wrong. Let's adjudicate these claims. Let's get this money back for the victims of terrorism.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. A majority of this House thinks this deal is bad, a majority of the Senate thinks this deal is bad, and a majority of the American people think this deal is bad. We have not had any input, and the effort here today is to simply make a bad deal a little less bad.

The idea behind Mr. MEEHAN's bill is to provide restitution to American victims. It is not just any American victims. It is the victims of Iranian terror. \$150 billion is going to flow to Iran. It seems to be common sense that the first \$43 billion should instead be paid to the victims of Iranian terror.

Joseph Cicippio was one of those victims. He lived right outside my congressional district. He spent 5 years in brutal captivity before being released in 1991.

A vote for this bill today is a vote for the victims of Iranian terror.

I also want to say Congressman MEEHAN's congressional district is right next to mine. I want to thank him for his thoughtful, creative approach and his leadership in this country and in this House on this bill.

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

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1982, I was with the United States Marine Corps off the coast of Beirut, Lebanon, waiting on orders to do evacuations of the U.S. Embassy and U.S. citizens and their families. Our assignment was done in August of 1982. We returned to the United States. I finished my 2 years with the battalion.

The battalion went back out. This time, they took positions in the airport in Beirut, Lebanon. On October 23, 1983, a suicide bomber drove a truck laden with explosives into the marine barracks; 241 marines were killed that day.

To my friends who died there—First Lieutenant Bill Zimmerman, Captain Bill Winter, Captain Joe Boccia, Master Sergeant Roy Edwards, Captain Mike Haskell—today is your day. Today is your day for justice. God bless you. God remember all of you.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. COFFMAN. Today is the day for justice for these marines—and their families—who were lost on that day by the Iranian-backed Hezbollah bomber.

So I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for bringing this measure forward. I urge my colleagues not to forget those who have died and

to remember this: when the Iranians say “death to Americans,” they mean death to Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues to support this legislation. I want to thank the gentleman for his sponsorship. I am proud to be a cosponsor.

Thirty-one years ago, one Michigan family's sleepless worry became a heartbreaking reality. Their son, brother, and father, U.S. Army Warrant Officer Kenneth Welch, was one of two U.S. servicemen to lose his life in the bombing in Beirut, Lebanon.

U.S. judgments later found that the act of terrorism was sponsored by the Iranian regime. For its crimes, that regime was ordered to pay damages to the family of Kenneth Welch. Not surprisingly, however, not one dime has been paid to the family. Yet today, in this country, we find ourselves dealing with an administration that wants to lift sanctions.

Mr. Speaker, I am beside myself to think that this is the Nation that we have become. America is built on bravery and freedom, and that is because of the unwavering strength and sacrifice of men and women in the military. I am forever proud of our soldiers, and I know my colleagues here today are, too. That is why we cannot let the Iran terror continue. We need to do whatever we can to address the victims like Ken Welch.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD).

Mr. DOLD. I thank my good friend from California, the chairman, for yielding me the time. I also want to thank my good friend from Pennsylvania for bringing this piece of legislation.

Supporting victims of Iranian terrorism is a cause that every single Member of this body should be able to support, regardless of where they stand on the Iranian nuclear agreement. Under no circumstances should we be ignoring the victims of Iran's terrorism while simultaneously rewarding the greatest state sponsor of terror the world has seen.

Make no mistake, under this administration's agreement with Iran, Iran will be receiving approximately \$150 billion in sanctions relief—in new funding—almost immediately, while American victims of Iranian terrorism, whether it be bombings, kidnappings, murder, and the like, are basically going without resources.

Where are our priorities? Where are our priorities in this Chamber when the victims of Iranian terror are being ignored while Iran is being rewarded with new funds that will inevitably be used to fund new terror—Hezbollah, Hamas, and those around the globe?

Iran's terror proxies have killed Americans and continue to do so to

this day. This is a fact that cannot be ignored. I certainly hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support this piece of legislation.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank my colleague, Mr. MEEHAN from Pennsylvania, for introducing this very important piece of legislation.

The President's nuclear agreement with Iran provides them with billions in frozen assets and sanctions relief. One needs only to look at recent history to know exactly what Iran will do with this financial windfall.

While pursuing a nuclear bomb, Iran has been engaged in a decades-long campaign of terror that resulted in the deaths of many, many Americans. They continue to bankroll proxies like Hezbollah, Hamas, and the Houthi rebels.

Atrocities like the Beirut marine barracks bombing, the murder of Bobby Stethem on TWA flight 847, Khobar Towers, and the kidnapping of CIA Agent William Buckley, are just a small taste of what Iranian state-sponsored terrorism has wrought.

This bill is about everyday Americans getting justice. Americans like the family of Beaver County native Major John Macrogrou, the highest ranking officer killed in the attack on the Beirut marine barracks.

Victims of Iranian terrorism have successfully brought suit in U.S. courts, yet billions in judgments remain unpaid. The Obama administration failed to secure restitution for the victims of Iran in its negotiations with this country, but this legislation can rectify this wrong.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 17½ minutes remaining.

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

In closing, let me say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, and they know this, no one has been more of an adversary of the Iranian regime than I have, but a number of us found the deal with Iran wanting. We voted “no,” but it didn't prevail, and now we have to figure out the best way forward. The best way forward, I sincerely believe, is not to keep trotting out these bills.

No one is condoning anything that Iran has done, particularly with terrorism. It is a matter of how we combat it. The way I see it is that we have two paths forward: we can choose to mirror what we did with the Affordable Care Act, voting and revoting on an issue that has been settled to some degree, or we can choose the path that suits our Nation's interests the best. This path includes doing everything we can to strengthen the enforcement mechanisms of this agreement.

The path also includes holding Iran accountable for its nefarious activities that destabilize the region, as well as pushing Tehran to release detained Americans and improve their human rights records in the interim, and, of course, taking care of the victims of terrorism and their families. This path requires the strengthening of bilateral partnerships and supporting our allies in the region, both of which help us in the long term.

This is the course I hope we take. We cannot let this opportunity go to waste. So that is why I won't be supporting H.R. 3457. After that, we need to work together on measures that strengthen implementation of the agreement as much as possible.

I hope we can do that in a bipartisan way, as we have for the past 3 years in the Foreign Affairs Committee. This path promises to bring us back to making foreign policy rather than using political bills that deflect from the important issues at hand.

I do not doubt the sincerity of anyone who spoke today. We all are sincere and we all feel the same way: Iran is a bad actor and must be held accountable. But this bill is not the correct mechanism to do so, so I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, consider the case of Anne Dammarell, a USAID worker who was posted in the U.S. Embassy in Beirut in 1983. At 1 p.m. on April 18, a suicide bomber in a delivery van drove 2,000 pounds of explosives into the front door of our U.S. Embassy and the blast demolished the front of the building and caused the upper floors to collapse on top of each other.

When that went off, she was eating lunch in the Embassy cafeteria until suddenly she awoke outside, covered in cement, with 19 bones broken. Sixty-three people were killed in that blast.

Now we have a moral obligation to ensure that these judgments for these victims, which represent Iran's legal debt to the victims of its official policy of terrorism, are paid. There have been 90 such attacks on Americans, and this legislation helps us fulfill that moral obligation we have to our constituents and to all Americans.

What I will share with you is that it is not going to work to release the \$100 billion first, because that \$100 billion goes into the hands of the IRGC. They are the ones who have taken over the companies in Iran as of 1979, and the Iranian Revolutionary Guard forces and the Quds forces are the ones that carried out these attacks.

So the only leverage we are going to have in this negotiation is if we pass legislation that says, first, you have got \$20 billion in reserves. Start the process of paying the victims of that attack.

□ 1145

If we don't get them paid now, if we don't get the survivors and the family

members of those who were killed paid now, it will never happen later.

But more importantly, at least we would do this. If we are going to give \$100 billion out of escrow into the hands of the IRGC, what do you think they are going to do with it?

They have already announced \$20 billion in sales to Russia for fighter planes. They have already announced the money, \$100 million, that they are going to give to Hezbollah.

Why not at least get our own civilians paid the judgments that they earned up front?

That is exactly what we did with the Lockerbie agreement. We were going to lift the sanctions or allow the return of the escrowed money to Libya. Right?

\$2.5 billion had to go to the victims and the family members killed in the Pan Am 103 bombing because of the judgment in U.S. courts.

This needs to be done under that procedure. That is why this legislation is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 3457, the "Justice for Victims of Iranian Terrorism Act."

If enacted into law, H.R. 3457 would prevent the United States from implementing its sanctions relief commitments under the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) reached between the P5+1 countries, the European Union (EU), and Iran by tying the Administration's ability to fulfill its commitments to non-nuclear issues that are outside the scope of the JCPOA.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has absolutely no chance of becoming law because President Obama has already announced he will veto it if presented to him for signature.

And that is as it should be since this ill-considered and unwise bill comes to floor without being vetted by any of the committees of jurisdiction.

The bill was not considered by the Judiciary Committee or its Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, of which I serve as Ranking Member and which has jurisdiction over issues federal lawsuits and compensation involving victims of terrorist acts.

Nor was the bill considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, even though that committee has held several hearings relating to violent extremism and terrorists acts.

In the month of September alone, the Committee on Foreign Affairs held six hearings that addressed some aspect of terrorism and violent extremism, not one of which involved H.R. 3457 or the subject matter raised in the legislation.

Given its adverse impact on the JCPOA, one would have thought that this legislation would have been fully vetted before being rushed to the floor, and this lack of careful scrutiny is sufficient in itself to vote against this bill.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear: I am, and long have been, a strong supporter and advocate for adequate compensation for victims of terrorism sponsored or supported by foreign states.

For example, I have fought for compensation for the victims of Boko Haram, the Lord's

Resistance Army, ISIL and Al-Shabaab from Nigeria, to Syria, to Kenya, to name just a few.

I have requested the Attorney General of the United States to take action to secure relief for thousands of victims of terror from different regions of the world.

But I have never advocated or supported actions to achieve this result that puts the national security at risk.

And that is why I cannot support H.R. 3457.

By obstructing implementation of the JCPOA, H.R. 3457 would greatly undermine our national security interests and likely would result in the collapse of the comprehensive diplomatic arrangement that peacefully and verifiably prevents Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

This would in turn allow for the resumption of a significantly less constrained Iranian nuclear program, lead to the unraveling of the international sanctions regime against Iran, and deal a devastating blow to America's credibility as a leader of international diplomacy.

This would have the collateral effect of jeopardizing both the hard work of sustaining a unified coalition to combat Iran's destabilizing activities in the region and America's ability to lead the world on nuclear non-proliferation.

Mr. Speaker, the Administration supports efforts by U.S. terrorism victims to pursue compensation, consistent with our national security.

It bears pointing out that nothing in the JCPOA prohibits or impedes those efforts.

Mr. Speaker, we have called Iran untrustworthy because it has not always lived up to its commitments.

What would it say about the United States and its reputation of being an honest broker and trustworthy partner if we reneged on a carefully and painstakingly negotiated agreement before the ink barely had time to dry?

The single and overriding purpose of the JCPOA was to address the international community's concern over Iran's nuclear program and the need to verifiably prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

This goal is achieved by the JCPOA this objective is undermined by H.R. 3457.

After all our hearings and thoughtful deliberations on the JCPOA, it defies reason to collapse the historic and landmark diplomatic success that created the framework for a peaceful and verifiable methodology to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose H.R. 3457 and urge all Members to join me in voting against this unwise measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 449, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1735, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 449, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 449, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 29, 2015, at page H6337.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1735.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the first and most important thing I can say today is that this conference report is good for the troops and it is good for the country, and nothing that I or anybody else is going to say in this next hour is going to be more important than that one basic proposition.

Now, we may hear a variety of excuses, ifs, ands and buts about this, that or the other thing, and I certainly don't agree with every provision in this conference report.

But in pulling this bill together, I had to put aside personal preferences and party considerations and other things because getting a bill passed and enacted that is good for the troops and good for the country is more important than anything else.

The second point I want to make is that this bill is the product of work from Members from both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol. About half of the amendments that were adopted in committee and on the floor were from Democratic Members.

Democratic conferees played a substantial role in shaping this final conference report. And if you look at the

substance of what is in the bill, you can see major contributions from both sides.

As a matter of fact, we hear a lot these days about regular order. Well, this bill went through regular order through the committee, with 211 amendments that were adopted on the floor, when 131 amendments were adopted through a regular conference, with a Senate-passed bill for the first time in years, and now it is back here for approval.

So after going through regular order and all that that entails, if there is still partisan opposition, it leads some to ask why. Why bother?

The third point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is just a reminder to Members that this is a dangerous world, and it is getting more dangerous by the minute. Just look at the headlines that are in today's papers.

Russia has conducted airstrikes in Syria not against ISIS, but against the moderate opposition forces, and Russia is telling us, the United States, when and where we can fly our airplanes in Syria.

Meanwhile, the Palestinians have decided they are going to back away from all the agreements that they have with Israel.

Meanwhile, the Taliban is on the move in Afghanistan, and U.S. American troops are sent in to help turn the tide. That doesn't even count the things that are happening in Ukraine, North Korea, Iran, China building islands out in the Pacific.

So the point of that is that this is no time for political games. This is the time to come together and pass a bill that helps provide for the country's security. I think that is exactly what this bill does.

Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the exact amount of money that the President requested for national defense. Now, we did not agree with every single program request.

We made some different judgments, like preserving the A-10, and it is being used today in the Middle East. We thought we needed not to retire some of the ships that the President wanted to retire. So there were some adjustments. But at the end of the day, the total is exactly the amount the President asked for.

Now, some of those programs are under different labels. But, frankly, whether you call it base funding, OCO funding, or pumpnickel—it doesn't matter—it is money that goes to the troops.

If you are a U.S. soldier today on the ground in Iraq or Afghanistan or if you are a soldier, sailor, airman, or marine who are supporting them from the United States or anywhere else, do you really care what the label on the money is? What you care about is that the money to help for provide your operation and maintenance is provided.

Of course, there are many other parts of this bill, Mr. Speaker: acquisition reform, which is a significant first step

to make sure the taxpayers get more value for the money they spend; personnel reform, including a new retirement system.

Today 83 percent of the people who serve in the military walk away with no retirement at all. That changes under this bill.

So Members who are going to vote against this bill are going to tell 83 percent of the people who serve in the military: You are going to continue to walk away with nothing.

This bill requires the DOD and VA to have a joint formulary for sleep disorders, pain management, and mental health issues. We have been told those are some of the most important steps we can take.

It takes additional steps to combat sexual assault. It authorizes defensive weapons for Ukraine. It gives the President more tools to battle ISIS in Iraq, to provide weapons directly to the Kurds and Sunni forces.

We take steps to help defend this country against missiles.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

We take steps in this bill to help defend our country against missile attacks, which is particularly important now that Iran is going to have a bunch more money to put into their missiles. But what we also do is support the Israeli missile defense program with more money than was asked for by the President.

So, Mr. Speaker, my point is this bill is good for the troops and it is good for the country, and that ought to override everything else. It should be passed today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

First of all, let me agree on two points with the chairman. There is a lot that is good in this bill. There is no question about that. And I want to thank the chairman for his leadership in making that happen.

I think the conference committee process was a model for how the conference committee is supposed to go. The minority was included. There was robust debate about a large number of issues. There were points when we thought we couldn't resolve them and we did. And I think there is a lot that is good in this bill.

I also think, without question, without debate, that this is a very, very dangerous time for our country. No doubt about it. The chairman laid out some of the challenges—there are many, many more—with what is going on in the Middle East, certainly with Russia, with how we deal with China. It is a very challenging time for national security, and we need to be as strong as we possibly can.

But the one area where I disagree—and I think the chairman also correctly states the fundamental question: Is this good for our country? Is it good for our troops?

I don't believe that it is. It is not good for our country, and it is not good for our troops. It does, in fact, matter where the money comes from for a couple of reasons.

First of all, by the budget gimmick that the Budget Committee in the House and the Senate put together, by using overseas contingency operations funds for things that are not overseas contingency operations funds—and this was all done as a dodge to get around doing what we need to do, which is to lift the budget caps. Because, you see, the OCO funding, for some reason is not counted as real money. It is money. It is \$38 billion.

But it enables the conservatives in the Republican Party to say that they have maintained the budget caps while still spending \$38 billion more dollars, which is incredibly hypocritical and a terrible way to budget.

But here are two reasons why that is bad for our country and bad for our troops. Number one, it does not lift the budget caps. These budget caps are in place, I believe, for another 9 or 8 years. Unless we lift those budget caps, we are harming our troops and we are harming our country.

This bill dodging that issue is precisely a national security issue because, until we lift those caps, the Department of Defense has no idea how much money they are going to have. All right?

OCO is one-time money. That is why it is not as good as lifting the budget caps and giving the ability to do the 5- and 10-year planning that they do, to do multi-year projects so that they can actually have a plan going forward. That hurts national security.

The inability to raise the budget caps in this bill and appropriations process is a critical blow to our troops and to our national security.

The second reason this is important is because the OCO funding that is in this bill is not going to happen; all right?

Part of it is because the President is going to veto it. But the larger part of it is the Senate, as they have been unable to do for a number of years, has not passed any appropriations bills because they have rejected their own budget resolution.

So this \$38 billion in OCO funding that we are going to hear about, all this great money, is not going to happen because the appropriators have said it is not going to happen.

So to have a national defense authorizing bill with \$38 billion in imaginary money is not good for our troops and it is not good for our country. We need to lift the budget caps. We need to spend the money that we need to spend on national security.

I will also say that there are other pieces of national security, because the budget caps remain in place for the Department of Homeland Security. They remain in place for the Department of Justice. They remain in place for the Department of the Treasury, three

agencies that play a critical role in national security for this country, in tracking the money of terrorists, in protecting the homeland, in making sure that we can try and convict terrorists when we catch them.

So it is not good for the country to maintain those budget caps, and that is what this bill does. It also relies on money that simply isn't going to be there by having this imaginary OCO funding.

The second way I think this bill is not good for the troops and not good for the country is something that the chairman alluded to, and that is there are restrictions on what the Pentagon can do by way of saving money.

The chairman mentioned the A-10, but there are a whole host of other things the Pentagon has proposed as a way to save money and spend it more efficiently, which, over the course of the last 2 or 3 years, we have blocked almost every attempt, not every attempt.

On personnel savings, we have made changes in the retirement system. We have made changes in the healthcare system. We saved no money for 10 years. For 10 years we saved no money in personnel costs while the Pentagon tells us that, to be able to properly train our troops to get them ready to go to battle, they need personnel cost savings.

If we don't give them that savings, last year, next year, this year, in the future, they will not have the money for readiness that they need to train and equip our troops. So that is not good for the country.

There are a number of other provision areas—well, BRAC would be a big one. We have seen our Army and Marine Corps shrink substantially. We have seen our entire military shrink substantially. We haven't closed any bases. That is not good for the country, to not find savings there so that we can spend it on training our troops.

□ 1200

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

Over the course of the last 2 or 3 years, we have wound up authorizing and appropriating here in Congress substantially less money for readiness than the President, now, not this year, assuming you imagine that this OCO money is actually going to appear.

The bulk of the OCO money makes up for the readiness gap. But, again, that OCO money isn't going to be there. So I don't think this bill is good for our country or good for our troops.

I do agree with the chairman that that is the criteria on which it should be judged. But I urge a "no" vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES), the chair of the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces.

Mr. FORBES. I thank the chairman for his hard work on this bill and bringing it to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, as we listen today, one of the things that you really won't hear outside of this room is anybody challenging the substance of this bill. In fact, the opponents of this bill time and time again say what a really good bill it is.

You won't hear anyone challenging the partisanship of this bill because they will praise Chairman THORNBERRY for the bipartisan product he has brought to the floor.

You won't hear them saying it is not the right amount of money in here, that it is too much or too little, because it is almost exactly the dollar amount that the President requested.

And you won't hear them say that they took this money from another priority because they agree this is the amount of money that should be spent on national defense.

The sole reason this bill is being opposed today and the sole reason the President is going to veto it is because he wants to use national defense as a bartering chip to get everything he wants for the IRS, the EPA, and all of the other political agendas that he has.

Can you imagine, as Chairman THORNBERRY mentioned, how strong he looks around the globe when he says America is going to be strong, yet he vetoes the bill that authorizes the national defense of this country and gives him almost everything he wants.

The President and the opponents of this bill also need to realize that, if they defeat this bill, they will also defeat the construction of three destroyers, two attack subs, three small surface combatants, an amphibious ship, and they will delay the Air Force bomber and tanker programs.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we stop using national defense as some kind of political poker chip that can be gambled away. It is time we pass this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

First of all, I very specifically challenge the substance of this bill. The OCO funding and the way it is funding is not good for national security and not good for our troops. The substance of the bill is precisely the issue and what it does for defense or does not do for defense. That is why using the OCO funding is the exact wrong way to go.

The other thing I will say is I am quite confident that we will get a bill. Because that is the interesting thing about this argument.

As I have pointed out, the appropriators in the Senate have already rejected the OCO funding. So this \$38 billion that we have in here is gone, done, poof, not going to happen. All right?

We are going to have to have a further debate about that in the Appropriations Committee to actually fund any of the stuff that we are talking about in this bill. I am confident that we will have that debate. I wish I could be more confident that it will come out in a positive way.

We need to lift the budget caps. We actually need to pass appropriations bills and not shut the government down. We will see what happens on December 11.

But when that happens, we can pass this bill. We are not going to not pass the NDAA. We just need to pass it the right way so it actually helps our country and actually funds the programs that we are talking about.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Washington really makes the case when he talks about appropriations, OCO will not happen that way.

This is not an appropriations bill. He is exactly right. There is more to do to figure all of that out. But that is not a reason to vote against this bill. This bill can't fix what he is complaining about. But it does do something. My point is why not do what it can.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to support the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 and also thank Chairman MAC THORNBERRY for his leadership and hard work in bringing this important bill and conference report to the floor with bipartisan support.

I appreciate serving as the chairman of the Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee to oversee some of the most important aspects of the Department of Defense. The subcommittee's portion of the bill represents a comprehensive and bipartisan product. For this reason, it is sad that some of our Democratic colleagues may vote against this bill and, worse, that the President is threatening a veto.

Mr. Speaker, a veto or a vote against this bipartisan bill is a vote against security for American families and a vote against every member of the armed services and its military families.

It would be a vote against authorizations that would strengthen our cyber defense capabilities. It would be a vote against counterterrorism programs and resources for our special operations forces currently fighting overseas. It would be a vote against reform efforts and programs that would ensure America maintains superiority in all areas of science and technology.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues across the aisle to support this bipartisan National Defense Authorization Act and for the President to sign this important piece of legislation that will soon cross his desk.

A vote or veto against this measure is, simply put, a vote endangering American families and a vote against the American-dedicated servicemembers who mean so much to our country.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield myself 1 minute just to make two quick points.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, we will have a motion to recommit that takes the money out of OCO and puts it into the base budget. So this is a problem that our bill could fix.

We didn't have to buy into the OCO dodge and put money in there that we knew wasn't going to exist. Our motion to recommit will make that obvious. We will simply take it out of OCO. We will put it in the base budget so that you can do long-term planning with it and so that we actually get out from under the budget caps.

The second point that I will make is that the previous speaker said that voting against the Defense bill was all of those bad things. Well, people have voted against the Defense bill.

In 2009 and 2010, all but seven or eight Members of the Republican Party voted against the Defense bill. They voted against the defense bill because they didn't like Don't Ask, Don't Tell in one instance and because they didn't like adding LGBT people to hate crimes in the other instance.

So they all were perfectly willing to vote against the troops and do all of the awful things that the previous speaker said for social policy reasons that had nothing to do with defense.

So voting against the defense bill does not mean that you don't support the troops, and that is proof because most of the people who are now saying that it does have voted against the bill in the past.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is my 35th year in the Congress of the United States. I don't know that I voted against, prior to this year, either a Defense Appropriation bill or a Defense Authorization bill.

I will vote against this bill. I regret that I will vote against this bill because I regret that we have not gotten ourselves on a fiscally sound path in a bipartisan way that makes this country more secure not only on the national defense side, but secure on the domestic side as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report, which I believe does a disservice to our men and women in uniform and undermines our national security.

I do not believe this is the chairman's fault. I want to make that very clear. The chairman has been dealt a hand, and he is trying to play the best hand he can. I understand that.

I agree fully, however, with the ranking member, with his concerns and opposition to this bill not because of most of its substance, but because of the adverse impact it has on so much else.

This continues the Republican sequester sneak-around strategy. What do I mean by that? My Republican colleagues historically—since I have been here—talk about spending money. What they don't like to do is pay for

things. That is, of course, what we do with taxes.

It is not for free: national security, education, health care, law enforcement. You have to pay for it. And if you want to put a level of doing something, you need to pay for that or you pass it along to the next generation.

This bill continues the sequester sneak-around strategy of blowing through their own defense spending cap by misusing emergency overseas contingency operations funding for non-emergency base defense spending. That is why the Pentagon is opposed to this. That is why the Joint Chiefs believe this is bad policy fiscal policy for the military.

As our military planners and Secretary Carter have made clear, such an approach to funding undermines the Pentagon's long-term planning process, which is based on multi-year budgets and predictable funding streams.

Unfortunately, the fiscal policies of the leadership of this House over the last 6 years have been anything but predictable.

We avoided a shutdown of government yesterday, notwithstanding the fact that 151 of my Republican colleagues voted not to fund government today. Only Democrats ensured the fact that we kept the government open. Ninety-one Republicans voted with us, but that was far less than half of their caucus.

This proposal undermines the chances for a bipartisan budget agreement to replace the sequester before the CR we passed yesterday expires on December 11. Mr. Speaker, 151 Republicans voted even against keeping government open for a short period of time, approximately 2 months.

This approach included in this bill also harms fundamental national security priorities by characterizing core defense items as part of contingency operations. That is not true. It is not fiscally helpful.

This includes the Iron Dome missile defense program and all other U.S.-Israel joint missile defense programs that help Israel protect civilians from Hamas and Hezbollah rockets.

Additionally, this report continues to prevent the administration from closing the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay, which remains a recruiting tool for terrorists and undermines America's role as a beacon of constitutional rights and freedoms around the world. Meanwhile, we are spending \$2.4 million per detainee every year for those we hold in Guantanamo.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. The ranking member of the Armed Services Committee opposes this bill strongly, as do members of that committee. The President has made it clear he is going to veto this bill not because he is against national security.

Ironically, Republicans have come to the number that the President pro-

posed. There is a difference. The President paid for his number. He didn't pass it along to our children.

We must recognize this conference report for what it is: a vehicle for partisan messaging and an instrument for breaking with the Murray-Ryan principle of parity in defense and non-defense sequester relief. It is not a bill that makes America safer and a stronger force for justice around the world. Therefore, I will oppose it.

I thank my friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) once again for his work in trying to improve this bill in committee, on this floor and in conference, and for his untiring work in support of the men and women of our Nation's armed services.

I thank the chairman of the committee for the same thing. He was dealt a bad hand. I understand the hand he has to play. It is not good for our country.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."
Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would just make three brief points.

Number one, as this debate goes on, it is increasingly clear that the real debate is about budget and appropriations, not about this bill.

Secondly, I am one of those who voted to continue to fund the government because I think it is essential that we pay our troops and that there be no lapse in that. Unfortunately, we have today the White House playing politics with national security, and I think that is what makes an ultimate agreement harder.

□ 1215

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the President was short in funding Israeli missile defense. We fully fund Israeli missile defense in this bill, and it should be supported.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), the distinguished chairman of the Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1735, what would be the 54th consecutive National Defense Authorization Act.

What we have here today is, unfortunately, partisan politics at its worst. You have people who are coming down to the House floor condemning a bill that they voted for, and now they are going to vote against it because the President has decided that he is going to veto it. He is not going to veto it because of what is in this bill. He is going to veto it because there is not enough spending on the bureaucracies of the IRS and the EPA. We know this because not only has the President said it, even Defense Secretary Ash Carter has said it in front of the Armed Services Committee.

Now, if this were such a bad bill, you would think that it would not have come out of our committee with full, almost unanimous, support by both sides of the aisle, bipartisan, unbelievable support for this bill in virtually

its same structure that is coming to this floor. Only when President Obama stepped forward and said, I am going to veto it because you are not funding the IRS and the EPA, did it suddenly lose its bipartisan support.

This is not an issue about Republicans and Democrats. This is an issue about this administration. This administration, the author of sequestration, President Obama, set forth a plan that has been dismantling our military and needs to be set aside. Now, what we have in this bill is a bill that fully funds national defense, even as Minority Leader STENY HOYER said, that fully funds it at the level that is requested by the President.

Now, you can say there are gimmicks, you can say there are tricks, but you can also say what is important; and as you go to the experts to determine whether or not this bill works, Chairman Dempsey of the Joint Chiefs of Staff stood in front of our committee, and when asked the question of does the structure of this bill fully fund national defense, he said, absolutely, that he could spend it and that it would be the number that is necessary. He also said it was the lower jagged edge of what is necessary for national security.

Mr. Speaker, if Chairman Dempsey says in front of our committee—and he certainly is the expert—that this works, it works. I urge everyone to support this bill. Set aside sequestration, set aside partisan politics, and support our men and women in uniform.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), the distinguished chair of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for your leadership in getting us here today. I would like to ask the chairman a question if I might.

Does the legislation provide the President the exact amount of money he requested in his budget request?

Mr. THORNBERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. The gentleman is correct. The total is exactly the amount that the President asked for.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Thank you. That is what I thought.

Does the chairman recall who it was that testified that the amount requested for fiscal year 2016 for the national defense is “at the ragged edge of manageable risk?”

Mr. THORNBERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. As the gentleman from Ohio just said, it was the

Chairman of the Joint Chiefs that said that this is the lower ragged edge of what it takes to defend the country.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. And that individual is the President’s senior military adviser, isn’t he?

Mr. THORNBERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. That is what I thought.

Thank you, Chairman.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have an easy choice here today: we can vote for a conference report that sends a bill to the President that provides him authorized funding at exactly the level he requested, or we can send the Nation below the “ragged edge of manageable risk” in its security.

It is a bill that provides over a \$320 million increase for our Israeli allies on top of the \$155 million in the President’s request for missile defense cooperation.

I would ask Members, especially those who supported the President’s Iran deal, to recall it is exactly this funding that the administration said was vital to Israel’s security because of that deal and its termination of multilateral sanctions on ballistic missile proliferation.

This is a bill that provides \$184 million to fund an American rocket to end our reliance on Russian-made rocket engines. This is a bill that provides the President’s request of \$358 million for Cooperative Threat Reduction activities.

What does that mean? That is how we fight Ebola.

Mr. Speaker, my fellow Members, there are some tough votes that we have to take around here from time to time. This is not one of them. Vladimir Putin is bombing U.S.-backed anti-Assad forces in Syria. If you want to make Putin happy, vote against this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, the reason that we are at the ragged edge of what defense needs is because of the budget caps. That is the issue. That is the substantive issue and why this is important.

Tied into that is a regrettable fact. The chairman says repeatedly, look, this is the authorizing bill. Don’t talk to me about the budget. Don’t talk to me about appropriations. The defense budget is over half of the discretionary budget. So, unfortunately, the defense bill is about the budget and about the appropriations process.

As long as we have those budget caps locked in place, we will be at the ragged edge of what we can do to protect our national security. We shouldn’t be there. We should lift the budget caps. This NDAA locks in those budget caps and uses the OCO dodge, which, as I have pointed out, the Senate isn’t agreeing to, so the \$38 billion isn’t going to be there.

Even worse, what Secretary Carter has also said is that the OCO funding simply perpetuates the 5 years of budg-

et cuts and uncertainty, of CRs, of government shutdowns, of threatened government shutdowns, and of not being able to plan. Secretary Carter has been very clear. He opposes this bill because the OCO funding is not an adequate way to fund defense because it is 1-year money. It is a budget gimmick. It doesn’t give them the ability to plan and do what they need to protect our country and take care of our troops.

So opposing this bill because of the OCO funding is enormously important to our troops and is a substantive part of this. We cannot simply dodge the budget issues.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to respond briefly to the comment about the committee vote. We in committee said we didn’t like the OCO funding and that we needed that to be fixed. But we are coming out of committee. We are going to give it a chance to work its way through the process. No changes were made, so we opposed it on the floor.

We didn’t just wake up yesterday and oppose this. Democrats voted against this bill when it came through the House in the first place. The critically important issue that we absolutely made a point of in committee was not fixed, so that is why we are opposing this bill.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), the distinguished chair of the Subcommittee on Readiness.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask Congress to vote in favor of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY16. I am proud that this conference report takes significant steps towards rebuilding our military and readiness.

We prioritize training for our troops and maintenance and modernization of our equipment and technology. This NDAA is critical to carry out the military missions of this Nation effectively and successfully in an increasingly dangerous world.

Recently, former Secretary of State Dr. Henry Kissinger proclaimed: “The United States has not faced a more diverse and complex array of crises since the end of the Second World War.” This statement holds true today as we combat ISIS in the Middle East, as Russia again tests our commitment to global leadership, and as China continues to increase its defense spending to record levels.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has a constitutional duty of providing for the common defense of our Nation. If Congress and the President fail to act on the NDAA, we forgo our constitutional duty, and we weaken the security of our Nation and ability to confront crises that occur around the globe.

It is also important to point out that this is not the time to play political games with our national security or to hold hostage funding and authorization for the military for political gain. Our

Nation and our men and women in the military deserve better, and they deserve the proper support that Congress is under obligation to provide.

As we have heard through testimony from our military leaders before the committee, our military is approaching the ragged edge of being able to execute our Nation's defense strategy. By not passing this NDAA, or by allowing sequestration to continue to devastate our Nation's military readiness, we place ourselves in a position where we will be unable to defend against the threats we face today and in the future.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and vote in favor of the National Defense Authorization Act of FY16.

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

Mr. Speaker, I agree with a lot of what the gentleman just said about how critical national security is, yet the Republican majority insists on maintaining those budget caps that are devastating to our national security. They will not lift the caps that are causing precisely the problems that were just described, and 151 of them voted yesterday to defund the entire military by shutting down the government. So if we really believe in all of those national security priorities, let's start funding them. Lift the budget caps and actually pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the ranking member because I think that we all work very, very hard on this committee, and I appreciate the work that our chairman has done as well. I have to say I am speaking largely as someone who has never not supported an NDAA. I actually did support it in committee, and I support it on the floor. But I think we are in a box, and sometimes when you get in a box, you have got to do something about it. You can't just stay in there and sit. It means making some hard decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened in the committee when Secretary Carter was there. I have to say I think he was a bit badgered in that discussion, but at the same time, he is a big boy and he can handle that. Basically what he said is of course we support all those issues, of course we want a better budget for the men and women who serve our country because it is in the best interests of the United States of America, but we also have to be concerned about the future, not just about tomorrow. We have got to be able to do this for the men and women and for our country as we move forward.

That is what this doesn't do. We have got to give this a chance. There has got to be a better chance. That is why I feel that I have been there. I have compromised; and there are a lot of members on that committee, honestly, who are not willing to compromise. We have tried to find that balance.

Mr. Speaker, I am really proud of the work that we have done on the Military Personnel Subcommittee. I am proud because we made some gains. We have sort of shuffled some issues a little bit to be able to say to our leaders that we understand their concerns, we understand what readiness means in this country, and we have got to deal with that. Maybe we can't deal with all these issues that we have tried to make sure we funded to the very, very highest limit that we could possibly do.

We know there are some changes perhaps that are coming, and so we do it in an incremental way, in a slow way, and something that we think is in the best interests of the men and women and the country all at the same time. We have got to do that. We have multiple global crises going on in this country. So we can't just make a decision for today; it has got to be down the line.

What is it that we need to do?

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. What is important? What was Secretary Carter talking about? Predictability. Not just for our folks at the Pentagon to be able to make sure the men and women of this country are provided with everything that they need, but we also need to be sure that those who work with our country—we have a very strong contractual relationship with the public-private sector in this country, and we need to provide prediction for them as well. That is why I stand today. I believe it is in the best interests to go back and work this out.

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

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I work in a community of large numbers of military families. And guess what, the military is no different from the rest of our country. It is made safer and stronger by Homeland Security, by law enforcement, by environmental protection, and by strong education programs. They care about all those things, so they want us to stand up for their children and for their future.

Mr. Speaker, we can do this together. Let's take that chance. It is worth it.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), the distinguished chair of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the lady that we need to make hard choices, but we don't need to do this in this bill. We can't solve the problems that have been reiterated in this bill. This is a budget issue.

I serve on the Budget Committee as well, and I believe we need to undo sequestration for our national defense. We need to come up with a comprehensive plan to address the cost drivers of our country that are causing us to go into debt.

□ 1230

We need to get our priorities back as a country and make sure we provide for the common defense. We need to do that in the budget in a comprehensive way.

But we don't need to hold our military hostage today by not approving the expenditure of funds for the vital things that they need. That is what my colleagues are doing. I appreciate their intent. I look forward to working with them—many of us do—to solve this overall problem, but today our military need to know that we are standing behind them and that we are going to authorize them with the things that they need.

This bill is full of the things that our country and our men and women in uniform need. As the chairman of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, we are doing an investigation dealing with the transfer of detainees out of GTMO and what happened with Sergeant Bergdahl and the Taliban Five. So I was especially proud of the part in here that makes sure that the detainees are not removed from Guantanamo Bay and brought into our local communities. In addition, we set up an additional protocol so that the Secretary of Defense has to certify that any detainees that go to a foreign country, that that country is able to detain them, keep them safe, and make sure that they don't go back into the fight and continue their terrorist activities.

This bill takes care of our troops. It addresses the threats facing us. We have so many. Whether it is what is going on in Ukraine and with Russia, whether it is dealing with ISIL, or whether it is a cyber threat that we have, every day there are threats coming around us, and we address them in this bill. That is why we need to pass it. It also provides for the platforms that we need.

I urge my colleagues to do the right thing, to stand with our troops, to provide them with what they need, and to support this bill.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK), the distinguished chair of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

As chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel, I appreciate Chairman THORNBERRY's efforts to bring this conference report to the floor. His dedication to our Armed Forces, their families, and our veterans is commendable.

Supporting the men and women who volunteer to pick up a weapon, stand a post, and guard the freedoms and liberties that make our Nation great is a primary function of the Federal Government. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution, “to raise and support Armies,” “to provide and maintain a Navy,” today with adoption of this conference report, we achieve that goal.

Included in the report are personnel provisions that will allow us to recruit and retain the best and brightest, maintain an agile military force, and ensure our brave men and women in uniform are given the benefits they have earned and deserve.

The President has threatened to veto this conference report, even though the report authorizes the amount he requested in his own budget, because he is not happy with the manner in which it is provided. He is using our military men and women as political pawns to get increases in nondefense spending. I understand that he has urged some of my colleagues to vote “no” today, and I want to make sure my colleagues know some of the things they would be voting against:

A new retirement plan that provides options and portable retirement benefits for individuals who serve less than 20 years, roughly 83 percent of the force;

A pay raise for our military men and women, along with many special pays and bonuses, that are critical to maintaining the all-volunteer force;

A joint uniform drug formulary between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs so that transitioning servicemembers get to stay on the drugs that are working for them as they leave active service; and

Enhanced protections for sexual assault victims to include expanding access to Special Victims’ Counsel, protecting victims from retaliation, and improving the military rules of evidence.

If the President follows through with his veto threat, servicemembers and their families will be deprived of these significant improvements to their compensation and quality of life.

I urge my colleagues to stand with our military men and women and their families and support this report.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

There was a comment earlier about the military being held hostage by these other needs, and I think it is really important to understand that, over the course of the last 5 years, what the military has really been held hostage to is the budget caps, one government shutdown, multiple CRs, and

multiple threatened government shutdowns. That is what is holding the military hostage.

If you talk to them about how they have tried to figure out what they can spend money on and what they can’t spend money on throughout that madness—because we can’t pass along a long-term budget, because we can’t lift the budget caps, because we can’t pass appropriations—that is what is holding them hostage.

A 1- or 2-month delay in passing the NDAA—which, by the way, we have passed in December for the last 3 or 4 years—isn’t going to hold them hostage at all. What is holding them hostage is that ridiculous budget process that I just mentioned.

And why do we have that ridiculous budget process? Because the Republican majority insists on maintaining those budget caps. It is those budget caps that are holding our military hostage. Unless we lift them, we will not be able to adequately fund defense.

I heard a number of times over here that the only reason we oppose this is because we want more spending on other programs. That is not even close to true, and it is obvious that no one has been listening to the arguments that I have been making.

The reason we propose this is because it perpetuates our military being held hostage to budget caps, budget gimmicks, CRs, and threatened government shutdowns. This bill has OCO funding in it. It does not have base budget funding. It does not provide the same amount of money for the President that the President’s budget provides because it is not the same money, and the type of money does matter. If you have actual budget authority, if you have actual appropriations, you can spend them over multiple years because you know that they are going to be there.

It is absurd the way we have budgeted for the last 5 years, and what we are doing in opposing this bill is standing up to that absurdity for many reasons, I will grant you. Number one is to protect our national security and the men and women who serve in the Armed Forces who have had to live with that government shutdown, those CRs, those threatened government shutdowns, and, most importantly, those budget caps that the majority refuses to lift. Unless we lift those, the military is going to be in this situation in perpetuity, and that is unacceptable for our national security.

It is all about national security. It is all about defense for why we are opposing this bill. We can’t go on like this and have an adequate national security. We have to lift the budget caps.

I will say one other thing. We have to raise taxes somewhere. In the last 14 years, we have cut taxes by somewhere in the neighborhood of \$7 trillion. Now, granted, there are unquestionably places in the budget we can cut, and we cut.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

We have cut Medicare. I know we have cut Medicare because the Republican Party ran all kinds of ads bashing us for cutting Medicare back in 2010. We found about \$700 billion in savings that has extended the life of the program and saved money, so we have saved money.

But the flat refusal to raise any revenue is what has got our military with a hand around its throat, because, believe it or not, you have to actually raise the money if you are going to spend it.

So as you stand up here complaining about all the things that we are not funding in national security and then insist on maintaining the budget caps and insist on not raising a penny in taxes, that is the grossest hypocrisy I can imagine. If you are unhappy with how much money is being spent on the military, then have the guts to raise the caps and raise the taxes to actually pay for it, or just stop talking about it and accept it at that level.

We are opposing this bill because the budget process that we have been under is what is throttling our military. Until we break that grip, until we get an actual appropriations process, until we get the budget caps lifted, and until, I believe, we actually raise some revenues to pay for it, we are not going to be doing adequate service to the men and women of our military.

I also want to say that I oppose this bill because it also continues to keep Guantanamo Bay open at the cost of nearly \$3 million per inmate. In addition to being an international problem, it is unbelievably expensive and not necessary. We should shut Guantanamo. This bill locks in place for another year that it will stay open and does not give the President any option or any flexibility in that regard.

So, again, don’t tell me or anyone over here that we are voting “no” for reasons that have nothing to do with national security. How can you possibly look at the last 5 years of budgeting and the impact that it has had on the Department of Defense and say that getting rid of the budget caps isn’t absolutely critical to national security? I believe that it is, and that is why we oppose this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a couple of points. Number one is I share a lot of the concerns about the effect of sequestration on the military, but as this conversation continues, it is clearer and clearer that the real problem here is budgets, and now we hear taxes.

This bill cannot solve either of those problems. We cannot rewrite the Tax Code or raise taxes. We can’t repeal ObamaCare. There are lots of things we can’t do. But we can do some things, and we should do that.

Secondly, a dollar of OCO is a dollar spent just as much as a dollar of base

is spent, and that is why I say I don't really think if you are on the ground in Afghanistan you care about what the label put on the money is. And, by the way, the increase in the OCO account is operations and maintenance money, which is only good for 1 year anyway.

Next point. In fiscal year 2013, Israel missile defense was funded in OCO, and yet we had Members on that side of the aisle, including some who are complaining about that, vote for it. That is what we do sometimes.

Finally, this President signed into law the exact provisions on restricting GTMO transfers.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, in 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, this President signed into law the exact restrictions on Guantanamo transfers that we have in this bill. Now, is it all of a sudden such a big deal that he has decided that he is going to veto the bill over it? I think that is a hard case to make.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the distinguished chair of the House Small Business Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, the passage of an annual National Defense Authorization Act to lay out our Nation's defense and national security priorities is one of our most important duties as Members of Congress.

This year is no different, especially given the very serious conflicts happening around the globe—in Eastern Europe, in the Middle East, in the South China Sea—which have serious implications for our own security and for our allies.

This year's NDAA makes a number of positive changes to DOD small business contracting policies to help ensure that small businesses throughout the country can continue to perform the critical support functions that help make America's military still the best in the world.

Mr. Speaker, having a small business industrial base means taxpayers benefit from increased competition, innovation, and job creation. Since 2013, we have lost over 25 percent of the small firms registered to do business with the government—25 percent. That is over 100,000 small businesses. The reforms in this year's NDAA, the bill that we are considering now, takes steps to reverse that trend.

The White House has threatened to veto this bill. That is a shame because this bipartisan, bicameral bill defends small businesses and ensures that the spirit of entrepreneurship is alive and well in our industrial base. This isn't about political gamesmanship—at least it shouldn't be. This is about two of the most bipartisan issues in the political arena: the men and women in uniform and the small businesses that employ half of our American workforce.

I sincerely hope that the President reconsiders and enacts this bipartisan, bicameral bill.

I want to thank a number of members of my committee who have contributed to this year's bill, including Mr. HARDY of Nevada, Mr. KNIGHT of California, Mr. BOST of Illinois, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mrs. RADEWAGEN of American Samoa, and Mr. HANNA of New York. I would also like to thank a number of other Members and thank Mr. THORNBERRY.

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

□ 1245

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, our military must always be available and able to ready, aim, fire at a moment's notice. The threats we face around the world today demand it; and as soldier and a veteran, I can tell you that "ready" in the military needs to be spoken as a command, not proposed as a question.

There is one crucial element: our military has to be ready to engage the threats. This bill ensures our military readiness, and it ensures that there is a plan for 2016.

From ISIS to Russia to North Korea, the threats we face are too serious to wait any longer. But in the same week that the President was surprised by the Russians bombing U.S.-backed forces in Syria, he is threatening to veto this National Defense bill.

Veto our national security, really?

I encourage the President to use his phone, and to paraphrase his own words, to call the 1980s and ask for their foreign policy back because we need it. That policy demands that our military must be backed by the full confidence of this government now. This can't wait.

Pass this pay raise for our troops. Pass this to give our troops new retirement benefits. Pass this to keep our critical weapons systems at an operational level.

Mr. Speaker, we have been working on this legislation since the beginning of this year. It is a good bill that adheres to the law, and it is the certainty our troops need.

Pass this bill. Our troops need it. They don't let you down. Don't let them down.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK), the distinguished vice chair of the Subcommittee on Readiness.

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report to H.R. 1735, the fiscal year 2016 NDAA. I thank Chairman THORNBERRY for his leadership, guidance, and tireless efforts on this imperative piece of legislation.

Just this past week, the major headline coming out of Afghanistan was the Taliban's seizure of the prominent town of Kunduz. This serves as yet another reminder to us all that this region of the world remains unstable and brings about challenges to our national security. The fiscal year 2016 NDAA provides our Nation's Armed Forces with the resources they need to defend our national security.

Since September 11, the Army's 10th Mountain Division out of Fort Drum, which I am honored to represent, has been the most actively forward deployed division to Iraq and Afghanistan. Yet sadly, just this past month, Specialist Kyle Gilbert, a soldier from the 10th Mountain Division, died in Afghanistan while serving our Nation.

In New York's North Country, our community and our military families understand what fighting for our Nation's liberties and freedoms truly means.

So when I express my support for the NDAA, the tools it provides and how it enables our Armed Forces to defend our Nation from organizations who create volatility and terrorism around the world, I am speaking for my constituents, those servicemen and -women who are overseas right now in highly kinetic combat zones fighting to protect you and me, our families, and our Nation.

Colleagues, the fiscal year 2016 NDAA allows for our Armed Forces to plan and operate according to what we as a nation have asked of them. We must support the NDAA to maintain our readiness and provide for our military.

As leaders here today, we know we cannot continue to task our troops with doing more with less as defense sequestration cuts remain. The conference report to FY 2016 NDAA provides relief from these harmful defense sequestration cuts, but more must be done.

Let me remind my colleagues across the aisle sequestration was proposed by this administration, signed into law by this President, and passed by a previous Congress.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. STEFANIK. When the NDAA comes before the President's desk, I hope he realizes a veto threat could threaten the safety of our Nation's servicemembers and our country's defense.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting and voting for the NDAA.

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

I will go ahead and start with that last comment because it is a popular trope that is trotted out all the time about how sequestration was the President's idea and, therefore, it is not our fault, which is a fascinating argument because I was actually here when that

happened, and I don't think it is clear exactly whose idea sequestration was.

What is clear is that the reason that we did the Budget Control Act and sequestration was because the Republican majority in the House was refusing to raise the debt ceiling, refusing to allow us to borrow money at a time when we had to borrow it. How do we think that would have impacted national security and our troops?

I voted against the Budget Control Act, but I have often said I don't hold anything against those who voted for it because they basically had a gun to their head. The Budget Control Act was an awful piece of legislation, but not raising the debt ceiling, not paying our debts, you know, stopping the ability of the United States of America to borrow money, was clearly worse.

So this partisan argument that, oh, you know, sequestration was the President's idea so therefore it is not our fault is about as absurd an argument as I have ever heard. Number one, because like I said, the only reason that that discussion was on the table was because it was blackmail for raising the debt ceiling, which had to be raised.

Number two, it has been a good 5 years since then. The Republicans now control both the House and the Senate, and they had an opportunity to pass a budget resolution this year. They passed a budget resolution that held those caps and sequestration firmly in place, and that is not good for our troops and it is not good for our national security.

So let's move on to that appropriations process; get those budget caps lifted for the sake of a whole lot of different issues. That brings me back to the National Defense Authorization Act and the fact that, by locking in the OCO, by accepting those budget caps, by using OCO funds, we are once again putting the Pentagon in a situation where they don't know how much money they are going to have and they have no predictability whatsoever.

It is the OCO in this bill that is the reason that I oppose it and the reason that most Democrats oppose it because that OCO is harmful to national security. We need a real budget. We need real budget authority and real appropriations. Voting for a bill that puts in place the OCO instead of that simply perpetuates the nightmare of the last 5 years of uncertainty. Like I said, we are going to have a motion to recommit here in a moment that easily fixes this problem.

I agree with 95 percent of the rest of the bill. I don't agree with all of it. The chairman said, you know, we negotiated some things; they were up, they were down. By and large, it is a good bill. But the 5 percent that is bad is so bad that it does justify a "no" vote because it perpetuates this bad budget situation and is a very easy fix.

Take the OCO out of it and put it in the base budget. It is very simple. That is what we are going to propose in the motion to recommit. You will see

Democrats vote for that because we support funding this. What we don't support is maintaining the budget caps through an obvious budget gimmick.

I had a fascinating conversation with a member of the Rules Committee yesterday on the other side of the aisle who said he was very, very proud of the Budget Control Act, said it was the best vote he had taken in Congress. Interesting that it was supposedly all the President's fault. But he really supported the Budget Control Act. He felt those caps were absolutely necessary. And I said: Well, then you must oppose the NDAA because it busts those caps by \$38 billion. He said a lot of things at that point, but he never answered my question.

So this dodge of saying that we are going to create sort of money that really isn't money in order to, for one brief period of time, fund isolated programs within the Pentagon does not help national security. The only thing that is going to help national security is by getting rid of the OCO dodge and budgeting honestly. So that is why we oppose this bill.

Yes, I believe that budget caps should be raised for the other bills as well, in part, because I think a lot of those Departments are important to national security, as I mentioned: the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, the Department of the Treasury.

More than anything, we oppose this bill because of how bad it is for the Pentagon. That is the reason the Secretary of Defense opposed it. That is the reason all of the Joint Chiefs of Staff oppose it. They want an actual budget. They want actual, dependable money, the way things used to be before 2010 when we would actually pass appropriations bills and they could plan more than a month or two at a time. If we pass this bill, we simply perpetuate that process.

We will pass an NDAA. We will resolve one way or the other our appropriations difference, and we will get it done, but passing this bill now simply perpetuates a bad situation that is bad for our troops and bad for national security. For that reason, I oppose it.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to start with one of the points I made at the beginning, and that is to thank the staff, especially on both sides of the aisle, who spent a lot of hours, disrupted a lot of plans, put in incredible effort back and forth to come up with this conference report. Members on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol contributed to the product that we are about to vote on.

Mr. Speaker, for 53 straight years Congresses of both parties have passed and Presidents of both parties have signed into law Defense Authorization bills.

There were a handful of times—and it is exactly four—when a President ve-

toed a Defense Authorization bill, and every single time it was because of something that was in the bill. So it came back to Congress, there were adjustments made, it went back to the White House, and he signed it into law.

Never before has a Defense Authorization bill been held hostage, not because of something that is in it, but trying to force Congress to take action on some other matter. Now, we have talked a lot today about appropriations, about budget, even about taxes. None of those things can happen with the Defense Authorization bill.

The reason it has never happened before is because it would be irresponsible to hold defense hostage to another domestic agenda, a political agenda, even a broader budget agenda. And it unnecessarily threatens the national security of the United States. This is a first, and this first is happening at a particularly dangerous time.

There is nothing in this bill that could solve the problem that we have heard so much about. It is an authorization bill. It is not appropriations. It is not budget. It is not a tax bill. It is a defense policy bill.

We have heard from time to time the military opposes it. No. They say, "I would rather do it differently," and I would, too. But I have specifically asked general after general, Would you rather have the money or not, and they always say they would rather have the money. Even though it is not an ideal way to do budgets, it is better to have the money than not.

By the way, there is a provision in here so that if we can, as I hope we do, reach a budget agreement in a different appropriations matter, the authorizations are adjusted accordingly.

The bottom line is, if Members vote against this bill, they are voting against everything in it. You may say you are for it, but you are voting against it.

So what I think our troops deserve and what the world needs to hear, especially at this point in time, is that Washington can work. We may not solve all the problems today, but we can do something that is good and that we are willing to stand up and take action to help defend ourselves. That is what this bill is about.

I hope Members will support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today I will vote against H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 because it is a budget gimmick, shamelessly hiding behind the guise of national security. Make no mistake—America would be less safe were this bill to move forward in its present form.

The President has already said—as he has been saying for months—that he will veto this bill if it misuses Overseas Contingency Operation funds to evade the congressionally mandated budget caps. Sadly, but not surprisingly, Congressional Republicans did exactly that and worse. They had an opportunity to avoid leaving our troops in the lurch by pursuing a

balanced and fair budget deal that would unwind the reckless sequester for the national security activities at non-defense agencies like State, Homeland Security, and the VA.

In addition, this Authorization contains a budget-busting time bomb, the National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund, which is such a naked attempt to rob sister accounts to pay for pet projects that, for the third year in a row, Congressional appropriators have refused to fund.

The Sea-Based Deterrence Fund was created in the FY15 Defense Authorization because the Navy could not afford to simultaneously build back up to a 300-plus surface fleet and procure 12 Ohio-class replacement nuclear submarines. The Sea-Based Deterrence Fund didn't solve their problem of how SSBN(X) would be paid for. It simply shifted that burden onto the larger Pentagon budget. According to a recent Congressional Research Service report, the new ballistic missile submarine program is expected to cost \$139 billion. Sadly, the account grew worse in conference by expanding its use to also include attack submarines and aircraft carriers. This account is emblematic of a larger problem, which is that this Defense Authorization marches our country towards a complete rebuild of our nuclear arsenal and triad, something that a Congressionally-appointed National Defense Panel estimated will cost up to \$1 trillion.

While I cannot support this bill, I want to acknowledge the leadership taken by the House and Senate Armed Services Committee Chairs and Ranking Members for tackling some tough issues in this Authorization that previous efforts have ignored. This bill includes bipartisan acquisition reform aimed at containing defense spending, difficult but necessary military retirement and benefit changes, and makes strides towards rightsizing the Pentagon workforce.

Critically, it includes provisions that I championed to reform and extend the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa (SW) program for those brave Afghan men and women who risked their lives to aid our troops, but are now in danger as a result of their courageous service. We cannot allow more of our Afghan allies, and their families, to fall victim to the merciless Taliban. Should this Defense Authorization succumb to a protracted political fight, these provisions dealing with the Afghan SIV program should be broken off and moved through Congress as standalone legislation. I am prepared to introduce and push such a bill, as I've done in the past.

Though some hard decisions were made in this Defense Authorization, that leadership is overshadowed by continued budget gimmickry on Overseas Contingency Funds, the Sea Based Deterrence Fund, and harmful policy riders such as the continued effort to prevent the administration from rightfully closing Guantanamo Bay.

Both the House and Senate Ranking Members of the Armed Services Committees could not support this bill. Nor can I. The president will veto it. That's because our men and women in uniform should not be taken hostage in a budgetary circus. Just yesterday, 151 Republicans voted to shutdown the government, including our military. America cannot be great if it's subject to one manufactured crisis after another. We can get this right. All it would take is a little leadership and some common sense. Sadly, both are in short supply in this process.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 449, the previous question is ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Smith of Washington moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 1735 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to—

(1) agree to section 1501 of the Senate amendment in lieu of section 1501, as passed by the House;

(2) agree to section 1505 of the Senate amendment in lieu of section 1504, as passed by the House;

(3) disagree to section 4303 in the conference substitute recommended by the committee of conference; and

(4) insist that the conference substitute recommended by the committee of conference be modified—

(A) by transferring the funding table in section 4303 to appear after the last line of section 4301 so as to be included in the funding table in section 4301;

(B) in section 1301(b), by striking “section 1504” and inserting “section 301”;

(C) in section 1301(b), by striking “section 4303” and inserting “section 4301”;

(D) in section 1522(a), by striking paragraph (4).

Mr. SMITH of Washington (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion is not debatable.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of the conference report, if ordered; and passage of H.R. 3457.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 186, nays 241, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 531]

YEAS—186

Adams	Beatty	Bishop (GA)
Aguilar	Becerra	Blumenauer
Ashford	Bera	Bonamici
Bass	Beyer	

Boyle, Brendan F.	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Brady (PA)	Green, Gene	Pallone
Brown (FL)	Grijalva	Pascarell
Brownley (CA)	Hahn	Payne
Bustos	Hastings	Pelosi
Butterfield	Heck (WA)	Peters
Capps	Higgins	Peterson
Capuano	Himes	Pingree
Cárdenas	Hinojosa	Pocan
Carney	Honda	Polis
Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Cartwright	Huffman	Quigley
Castor (FL)	Israel	Rangel
Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Chu, Judy	Jeffries	Richmond
Ciçilline	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Clark (MA)	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Clarke (NY)	Jones	Ruppersberger
Clay	Kaptur	Rush
Cleaver	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Clyburn	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cohen	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Connolly	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Conyers	Kind	Schakowsky
Cooper	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Costa	Kuster	Schrader
Courtney	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Cummings	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Davis (CA)	Lee	Sherman
Davis, Danny	Levin	Sinema
DeFazio	Lewis	Sires
DeGette	Lieu, Ted	Slaughter
Delaney	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Loeb	Speier
DeBene	Loeb	Swalwell (CA)
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Takai
Deutch	Lowenthal	Takano
Dingell	Lowe	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Thompson (MS)
Doyle, Michael F.	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Titus
Duckworth	Lynch	Tonko
Duncan (TN)	Maloney	Torres
Edwards	Malone, Carolyn	Tsongas
Ellison	Maloney, Sean	Van Hollen
Engel	Matsui	Vargas
Eshoo	McCollum	Veasey
Esty	McDermott	Vela
Farr	McGovern	Velázquez
Fattah	McNerney	Viscosky
Foster	Meeks	Walz
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Wasserman Schultz
Fudge	Moore	Waters, Maxine
Gabbard	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Gallego	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Garamendi	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Graham	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Grayson	Nolan	
	Norcross	

NAYS—241

Abraham	Collins (GA)	Gohmert
Aderholt	Collins (NY)	Goodlatte
Allen	Comstock	Gosar
Amash	Conaway	Gowdy
Amodel	Cook	Granger
Babin	Costello (PA)	Graves (GA)
Barletta	Cramer	Graves (LA)
Barr	Crawford	Graves (MO)
Barton	Crenshaw	Griffith
Benishek	Curbelo (FL)	Grothman
Billirakis	Davis, Rodney	Guinta
Bishop (MI)	Denham	Guthrie
Bishop (UT)	Dent	Hanna
Black	DeSantis	Hardy
Blackburn	DesJarlais	Harper
Blum	Diaz-Balart	Harris
Bost	Dold	Hartzler
Boustany	Donovan	Heck (NV)
Brady (TX)	Duffy	Hensarling
Brat	Duncan (SC)	Herrera Beutler
Bridenstine	Ellmers (NC)	Hice, Jody B.
Brooks (AL)	Emmer (MN)	Hill
Brooks (IN)	Farenthold	Holding
Buchanan	Fincher	Huelskamp
Buck	Fitzpatrick	Huizenga (MI)
Bucshon	Fleischmann	Hultgren
Burgess	Fleming	Hunter
Byrne	Flores	Hurd (TX)
Calvert	Forbes	Hurt (VA)
Carter (GA)	Fortenberry	Issa
Carter (TX)	Fox	Jenkins (KS)
Chabot	Franks (AZ)	Jenkins (WV)
Chaffetz	Frelinghuysen	Johnson (OH)
Clawson (FL)	Garrett	Johnson, Sam
Coffman	Gibbs	Jolly
Cole	Gibson	Jordan

Joyce	Neugebauer	Sessions	Buchanan	Hice, Jody B.	Pitts	Edwards	Levin	Rush
Katko	Newhouse	Shimkus	Buck	Hill	Poe (TX)	Ellison	Lewis	Ryan (OH)
Kelly (MS)	Noem	Shuster	Bucshon	Holding	Poliquin	Engel	Lieu, Ted	Sánchez, Linda
Kelly (PA)	Nugent	Simpson	Burgess	Huizenga (MI)	Pompeo	Eshoo	Loeb sack	T.
King (IA)	Nunes	Smith (MO)	Bustos	Hultgren	Posey	Farr	Lofgren	Sanford
King (NY)	Olson	Smith (NE)	Byrne	Hunter	Price, Tom	Fattah	Lowenthal	Sarbames
Kinzinger (IL)	Palazzo	Smith (NJ)	Calvert	Hurd (TX)	Ratcliffe	Frankel (FL)	Lowe y	Schakowsky
Kline	Palmer	Smith (TX)	Carter (GA)	Hurt (VA)	Reed	Fudge	Luján, Ben Ray	Schiff
Knight	Paulsen	Stefanik	Carter (TX)	Issa	Renacci	Gallego	(NM)	Schrader
Labrador	Pearce	Stewart	Cartwright	Jenkins (KS)	Ribble	Grayson	Lynch	Scott (VA)
LaHood	Perry	Chabot	Chabot	Jenkins (WV)	Rice (NY)	Green, Al	Maloney,	Scott, David
LaMalfa	Pittenger	Chaffetz	Stutzman	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)	Green, Gene	Carolyn	Serrano
Lamborn	Pitts	Clawson (FL)	Thompson (PA)	Johnson, Sam	Rigell	Griffith	Massie	Sewell (AL)
Lance	Poe (TX)	Clay	Thornberry	Jolly	Roby	Grijalva	Matsui	Sherman
Latta	Poliquin	Coffman	Tiberi	Jordan	Roe (TN)	Hahn	McCollum	Sires
LoBiondo	Pompeo	Cole	Tipton	Joyce	Rogers (AL)	Hastings	McDermott	Slaughter
Long	Posey	Collins (GA)	Trott	Katko	Rogers (KY)	Higgins	McGovern	Smith (WA)
Loudermilk	Price, Tom	Collins (NY)	Turner	Kelly (MS)	Rokita	Himes	McNerney	Speier
Love	Ratcliffe	Comstock	Upton	Kelly (PA)	Rooney (FL)	Hinojosa	Meeks	Swalwell (CA)
Lucas	Reed	Conaway	Valadao	Kilmer	Ros-Lehtinen	Honda	Meng	Takano
Luetkemeyer	Renacci	Cook	Wagner	King (IA)	Roskam	Hoyer	Moore	Thompson (CA)
Lummis	Ribble	Costa	Walberg	King (NY)	Ross	Huelskamp	Moulton	Thompson (MS)
MacArthur	Rice (SC)	Costello (PA)	Walden	Kinzinger (IL)	Rothfus	Huffman	Mulvaney	Titus
Marchant	Rigell	Courtney	Walker	Kirkpatrick	Rouzer	Israel	Nadler	Tonko
Marino	Roby	Cramer	Walorski	Kline	Royce	Jackson Lee	Napolitano	Torres
Massie	Roe (TN)	Crawford	Walters, Mimi	Knight	Ruiz	Jeffries	Nolan	Tsongas
McCarthy	Rogers (AL)	Crenshaw	Weber (TX)	Kuster	Ruppersberger	Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Van Hollen
McCaul	Rogers (KY)	Cuellar	Webster (FL)	LaHood	Russell	Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell	Vargas
McClintock	Rohrabacher	LaMalfa	Wenstrup	Curbelo (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Jones	Payne	Veasey
McHenry	Rokita	Lamborn	Westerman	Davis, Rodney	Salmon	Kaptur	Pelosi	Vela
McKinley	Rooney (FL)	Lance	Westmoreland	Delaney	Scalise	Keating	Pingree	Velázquez
McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen	Langevin	Whitfield	Denham	Schweikert	Kennedy	Pocan	Visclosky
Rodgers	Roskam	Lat ta	Williams	Dent	Scott, Austin	Kildee	Polis	Wasserman
McSally	Ross	Lipinski	Wilson (SC)	DeSantis	Sensenbrenner	Kind	Price (NC)	Schultz
Meadows	Rothfus	LoBiondo	Wittman	DesJarlais	Sessions	Labrador	Quigley	Waters, Maxine
Meehan	Rouzer	Long	Womack	Diaz-Balart	Shimkus	Larsen (WA)	Rangel	Watson Coleman
Messer	Royce	Loudermilk	Woodall	Dold	Shuster	Larson (CT)	Richmond	Welch
Mica	Russell	Love	Yoder	Donovan	Simpson	Lawrence	Rohrabacher	Wilson (FL)
Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Lucas	Yoho	Duckworth	Sinema	Lee	Roybal-Allard	Yarmuth
Miller (MI)	Salmon	Duffy	Young (AK)	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)			
Moolenaar	Sanford	Duncan (SC)	Young (IA)	Lujan Grisham	Smith (NE)			
Mooney (WV)	Scalise	Ellmers (NC)	Young (IN)	(NM)	Smith (NJ)			
Mullin	Schweikert	Emmer (MN)	Zeldin	Lummis	Smith (TX)			
Mulvaney	Scott, Austin	Esty	Zinke	MacArthur	Stefanik			
Murphy (PA)	Sensenbrenner	Farenthold		Maloney, Sean	Stewart			
		Fincher		Marchant	Stivers			
		Fitzpatrick		Marino	Stutzman			
		Fleischmann		McCarthy	Takai			
		Fleming		McCaul	Thompson (PA)			
		Flores		McClintock	Thornberry			
		Forbes		McHenry	Tiberi			
		Fortenberry		McKinley	Tipton			
		Foster		McMorris	Trott			
		Fox		Rodgers	Turner			
		Franks (AZ)		McSally	Upton			
		Frelinghuysen		Meadows	Valadao			
		Gabbard		Meehan	Wagner			
		Garamendi		Messer	Walberg			
		Garrett		Mica	Walden			
		Gibbs		Miller (FL)	Walker			
		Gibson		Miller (MI)	Walorski			
		Gohmert		Moolenaar	Walters, Mimi			
		Goodlatte		Mooney (WV)	Walz			
		Gosar		Mullin	Weber (TX)			
		Gowdy		Murphy (FL)	Webster (FL)			
		Graham		Murphy (PA)	Wenstrup			
		Granger		Neugebauer	Westerman			
		Graves (GA)		Newhouse	Westmoreland			
		Graves (LA)		Noem	Whitfield			
		Graves (MO)		Norcross	Williams			
		Grothman		Nugent	Wilson (SC)			
		Guinta		Nunes	Wittman			
		Guthrie		O'Rourke	Womack			
		Hanna		Olson	Woodall			
		Hardy		Palazzo	Yoder			
		Harper		Palmer	Yoho			
		Harris		Paulsen	Young (AK)			
		Hartzler		Pearce	Young (IA)			
		Heck (NV)		Perry	Young (IN)			
		Heck (WA)		Peters	Zeldin			
		Hensarling		Peterson	Zinke			
		Herrera Beutler		Pittenger				

NOT VOTING—7

Culberson Kelly (IL) Reichert
Gutiérrez Neal
Hudson Perlmutter

□ 1326

Mr. JOLLY changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Messrs. ENGEL, SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and RUSH changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 270, nays 156, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 532]

YEAS—270

Abraham	Barton	Blum
Aderholt	Benishek	Bost
Aguilar	Bera	Boustany
Allen	Bilirakis	Brady (TX)
Amodei	Bishop (GA)	Brat
Ashford	Bishop (MI)	Bridenstine
Babin	Bishop (UT)	Brooks (AL)
Barletta	Black	Brooks (IN)
Barr	Blackburn	Brownley (CA)

Buchanan	Hice, Jody B.	Pitts
Buck	Hill	Poe (TX)
Bucshon	Holding	Poliquin
Burgess	Huizenga (MI)	Pompeo
Bustos	Hultgren	Posey
Byrne	Hunter	Price, Tom
Calvert	Hurd (TX)	Ratcliffe
Carter (GA)	Hurt (VA)	Reed
Carter (TX)	Issa	Renacci
Cartwright	Jenkins (KS)	Ribble
Chabot	Jenkins (WV)	Rice (NY)
Chaffetz	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)
Clawson (FL)	Johnson, Sam	Rigell
Clay	Jolly	Roby
Coffman	Jordan	Roe (TN)
Cole	Joyce	Rogers (AL)
Collins (GA)	Katko	Rogers (KY)
Collins (NY)	Kelly (MS)	Rokita
Comstock	Kelly (PA)	Rooney (FL)
Conaway	Kilmer	Ros-Lehtinen
Cook	King (IA)	Roskam
Costa	King (NY)	Ross
Costello (PA)	Kinzinger (IL)	Rothfus
Courtney	Kirkpatrick	Rouzer
Cramer	Kline	Royce
Crawford	Knight	Ruiz
Crenshaw	Kuster	Ruppersberger
Cuellar	LaHood	Russell
Curbelo (FL)	LaMalfa	Ryan (WI)
Davis, Rodney	Lamborn	Salmon
Delaney	Lance	Scalise
Denham	Langevin	Schweikert
Dent	Lat ta	Scott, Austin
DeSantis	Lipinski	Sensenbrenner
DesJarlais	LoBiondo	Sessions
Diaz-Balart	Long	Shimkus
Dold	Loudermilk	Shuster
Donovan	Love	Simpson
Duckworth	Lucas	Sinema
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
Duncan (SC)	Lujan Grisham	Smith (NE)
Ellmers (NC)	(NM)	Smith (NJ)
Emmer (MN)	Lummis	Smith (TX)
Esty	MacArthur	Stefanik
Farenthold	Maloney, Sean	Stewart
Fincher	Marchant	Stivers
Fitzpatrick	Marino	Stutzman
Fleischmann	McCarthy	Takai
Fleming	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
Flores	McClintock	Thornberry
Forbes	McHenry	Tiberi
Fortenberry	McKinley	Tipton
Foster	McMorris	Trott
Fox	Rodgers	Turner
Franks (AZ)	McSally	Upton
Frelinghuysen	Meadows	Valadao
Gabbard	Meehan	Wagner
Garamendi	Messer	Walberg
Garrett	Mica	Walden
Gibbs	Miller (FL)	Walker
Gibson	Miller (MI)	Walorski
Gohmert	Moolenaar	Walters, Mimi
Goodlatte	Mooney (WV)	Walz
Gosar	Mullin	Weber (TX)
Gowdy	Murphy (FL)	Webster (FL)
Graham	Murphy (PA)	Wenstrup
Granger	Neugebauer	Westerman
Graves (GA)	Newhouse	Westmoreland
Graves (LA)	Noem	Whitfield
Graves (MO)	Norcross	Williams
Grothman	Nugent	Wilson (SC)
Guinta	Nunes	Wittman
Guthrie	O'Rourke	Womack
Hanna	Olson	Woodall
Hardy	Palazzo	Yoder
Harper	Palmer	Yoho
Harris	Paulsen	Young (AK)
Hartzler	Pearce	Young (IA)
Heck (NV)	Perry	Young (IN)
Heck (WA)	Peters	Zeldin
Hensarling	Peterson	Zinke
Herrera Beutler	Pittenger	

NAYS—156

Adams	Cárdenas	Crowley
Amash	Carney	Cummings
Bass	Carson (IN)	Davis (CA)
Beatty	Castor (FL)	Davis, Denny
Becerra	Castro (TX)	DeFazio
Beyer	Chu, Judy	DeGette
Blumenauer	Cicilline	DeLauro
Bonamici	Clark (MA)	DelBene
Boyle, Brendan	Clarke (NY)	DeSaulnier
F.	Cleaver	Deutch
Brady (PA)	Clyburn	Dingell
Brown (FL)	Cohen	Doggett
Butterfield	Connolly	Doyle, Michael
Capps	Conyers	F.
Capuano	Cooper	Duncan (TN)

Edwards	Levin	Rush
Ellison	Lewis	Ryan (OH)
Engel	Lieu, Ted	Sánchez, Linda
Eshoo	Loeb sack	T.
Farr	Lofgren	Sanford
Fattah	Lowenthal	Sarbames
Frankel (FL)	Lowe y	Schakowsky
Fudge	Luján, Ben Ray	Schiff
Gallego	(NM)	Schrader
Grayson	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Green, Al	Maloney,	Scott, David
Green, Gene	Carolyn	Serrano
Griffith	Massie	Sewell (AL)
Grijalva	Matsui	Sherman
Hahn	McCollum	Sires
Hastings	McDermott	Slaughter
Higgins	McGovern	Smith (WA)
Himes	McNerney	Speier
Hinojosa	Meeks	Swalwell (CA)
Honda	Meng	Takano
Hoyer	Moore	Thompson (CA)
Huelskamp	Moulton	Thompson (MS)
Huffman	Mulvaney	Titus
Israel	Nadler	Tonko
Jackson Lee	Napolitano	Torres
Jeffries	Nolan	Tsongas
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Van Hollen
Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell	Vargas
Jones	Payne	Veasey
Kaptur	Pelosi	Vela
Keating	Pingree	Velázquez
Kennedy	Pocan	Visclosky
Kildee	Polis	Wasserman
Kind	Price (NC)	Schultz
Labrador	Quigley	Waters, Maxine
Larsen (WA)	Rangel	Watson Coleman
Larson (CT)	Richmond	Welch
Lawrence	Rohrabacher	Wilson (FL)
Lee	Roybal-Allard	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Culberson Kelly (IL) Reichert
Gutiérrez Neal Sánchez, Loretta
Hudson Perlmutter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1333

So 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. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, while I voted “no” on rollcall vote 532, I intended to vote “yes” on H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF IRANIAN TERRORISM ACT

Blackburn Heck (NV) Poe (TX) Doyle, Michael Lee Richmond
Blum Hensarling Poliquin F. Roybal-Allard
Bost Herrera Beutler Pompeo Levin Ruiz
Boustany Hice, Jody B. Posey Edwards Ruppertsberger
Boyle, Brendan Hill Price, Tom Ellison Lipinski Rush
F. Holding Ratcliffe Engel Loebsock Ryan (OH)
Brady (TX) Huelskamp Reed Eshoo Lofgren Sánchez, Linda
Brat Huizenga (MI) Renacci Esty Lowenthal T.
Bridenstine Hultgren Ribble Farr Lowey Sanchez, Loretta
Brooks (AL) Hunter Rice (SC) Foster Lujan Grisham Sarbanes
Brooks (IN) Hurd (TX) Frankel (FL) (NM) Schakowsky
Buchanan Hurt (VA) Roby Luján, Ben Ray Schiff
Buck Issa Gabbard (NM) Lynch Serrano
Bucshon Jenkins (KS) Gallego Maloney, Carolyn Sherman
Burgess Jenkins (WV) Garamendi Matsui McDermott Sires
Byrne Johnson (OH) Grayson Green, Al McGovern McGovern Slaughter
Calvert Johnson, Sam Rokita Grijalva Hahn McColium McDerney Smith (WA)
Carter (GA) Jolly Jones Rooney (FL) Hahn McDerney Smith (WA)
Carter (TX) Jordan Ros-Lehtinen Hahn McDerney Speier
Chabot Joyce Ross Roskam Heck (WA) McDerney Swallowell (CA)
Chaffetz Joyce Ross Roskam Heck (WA) McDerney Swallowell (CA)
Clawson (FL) Katko Kelly (MS) Rouzer Higgins Himes Meng Moore
Coffman Kelly (PA) Royce Hines Meng Moore
Cole Kelly (PA) Royce Hines Meng Moore
Collins (GA) King (IA) Royce Hines Meng Moore
Comstock King (NY) Ryan (WI) Hoyer Murphy (FL) Takai
Conaway Kinzinger (IL) Salmon Sanford Israel Napolitano Takano
Cook Kline Scalise Schweikert Jeffries Scott, Austin O'Rourke Pallone Pascrell Payne Pelosi Peters Pingree Pocan Thompson (CA)
Costello (PA) Knight Labrador LaHood LaMalfa Lamborn Sessions Shimkus Shuster Simpson Sinema Smith (MO) Smith (NE) Smith (NJ) Smith (TX) Stefanik Stewart Stivers Stutzman Thompson (PA)
Cramer LaHood LaMalfa Lamborn Sessions Shimkus Shuster Simpson Sinema Smith (MO) Smith (NE) Smith (NJ) Smith (TX) Stefanik Stewart Stivers Stutzman Thompson (PA)
Crawford LaHood LaMalfa Lamborn Sessions Shimkus Shuster Simpson Sinema Smith (MO) Smith (NE) Smith (NJ) Smith (TX) Stefanik Stewart Stivers Stutzman Thompson (PA)
Crenshaw LaMalfa Lamborn Sessions Shimkus Shuster Simpson Sinema Smith (MO) Smith (NE) Smith (NJ) Smith (TX) Stefanik Stewart Stivers Stutzman Thompson (PA)
Curbelo (FL) Lamborn Sessions Shimkus Shuster Simpson Sinema Smith (MO) Smith (NE) Smith (NJ) Smith (TX) Stefanik Stewart Stivers Stutzman Thompson (PA)
Davis, Rodney Latta LoBiondo Long Loudermilk Love Lucas Luetkemeyer Lummis MacArthur Maloney, Sean Marchant Marino Massie McCarthy McCaul McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Dent Long Loudermilk Love Lucas Luetkemeyer Lummis MacArthur Maloney, Sean Marchant Marino Massie McCarthy McCaul McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
DeSantis Long Loudermilk Love Lucas Luetkemeyer Lummis MacArthur Maloney, Sean Marchant Marino Massie McCarthy McCaul McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
DesJarlais Loudermilk Love Lucas Luetkemeyer Lummis MacArthur Maloney, Sean Marchant Marino Massie McCarthy McCaul McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Diaz-Balart Love Lucas Luetkemeyer Lummis MacArthur Maloney, Sean Marchant Marino Massie McCarthy McCaul McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Dold Lucas Luetkemeyer Lummis MacArthur Maloney, Sean Marchant Marino Massie McCarthy McCaul McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Donovan Luetkemeyer Lummis MacArthur Maloney, Sean Marchant Marino Massie McCarthy McCaul McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Duffy Lummis MacArthur Maloney, Sean Marchant Marino Massie McCarthy McCaul McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Duncan (SC) MacArthur Maloney, Sean Marchant Marino Massie McCarthy McCaul McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Duncan (TN) Maloney, Sean Marchant Marino Massie McCarthy McCaul McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Ellmers (NC) Marchant Marino Massie McCarthy McCaul McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Emmer (MN) Marino Massie McCarthy McCaul McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Farenthold Massie McCarthy McCaul McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Fattah McCarthy McCaul McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Fincher McCaul McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Fitzpatrick McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Fleischmann McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Fleming McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Flores McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Forbes McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Fortenberry McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Foxy McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Franks (AZ) McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Frelinghuysen McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Garrett McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Gibbs McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Gibson McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Gohmert McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Goodlatte McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Gosar McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Gowdy McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Graham McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Granger McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Graves (GA) McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Graves (LA) McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Graves (MO) McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Green, Gene McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Griffith McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Grothman McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Guinta McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Guthrie McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Hanna McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Hardy McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Harper McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Harris McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts
Hartzler McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palazzio Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Peterson Pittenger Pitts

NAYS—173

Adams Cárdenas Costa
Aguilar Carney Courtney
Bass Carson (IN) Crowley
Beatty Cartwright Cuellar
Becerra Castor (FL) Cummings
Bera Castro (TX) Davis (CA)
Beyer Chu, Judy Davis, Danny
Bishop (GA) Cicilline DeFazio
Blumenauer Clarke (MA) DeGette
Bonamici Clarke (NY) Delaney
Brady (PA) Clay DeLauro
Brown (FL) Cleaver DelBene
Brownley (CA) Clyburn DeSaulnier
Bustos Cohen
Butterfield Connolly
Capps Conyers
Capuano Cooper

Doyle, Michael Lee Richmond
F. Levin Roybal-Allard
Duckworth Lewis Ruiz
Edwards Lieu, Ted Ruppertsberger
Ellison Lipinski Rush
Engel Ryan (OH)
Eshoo Lofgren Sánchez, Linda
Esty Lowenthal T.
Farr Lowey Sanchez, Loretta
Foster Lujan Grisham Sarbanes
Frankel (FL) (NM) Schakowsky
Fudge Luján, Ben Ray Schiff
Gabbard (NM) Lynch Schrader
Gallego Lynch Scott (VA)
Garamendi Maloney, Carolyn Scott, David
Grayson Carolyn Serrano
Green, Al Matsui Sewell (AL)
Grijalva McCollum Sherman
Hahn McDermott Sires
McGovern McGovern Slaughter
Heck (WA) McDerney Smith (WA)
Higgins Meeks Speier
Himes Meng Swalwell (CA)
Hinojosa Moore Takai
Honda Moulton Takano
Hoyer Murphy (FL) Thompson (CA)
Huffman Nadler Thompson (MS)
Israel Napolitano Titus
Jackson Lee Nolan Tonko
Jeffries Norcross Torres
Johnson, E. B. O'Rourke Tsongas
Kaptur Pallone Van Hollen
Keating Pascrell Veasey
Kennedy Payne Velazquez
Kildee Pelosi Visclosky
Kilmer Peters Walz
Kind Pingree Wasserman
Kirkpatrick Pocan Schultz
Kuster Polis Waters, Maxine
Langevin Price (NC) Watson Coleman
Larsen (WA) Quigley Welch
Larson (CT) Rangel Wilson (FL)
Lawrence Rice (NY) Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Collins (NY) Johnson (GA) Reichert
Culberson Kelly (IL) Russell
Gutiérrez Neal
Hudson Perlmutter

□ 1341

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes on Thursday, October 1, 2015 due to a family emergency.

Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall vote 532, a vote on agreeing to the Conference Report to Accompany H.R. 1735, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 because we cannot continue to put military spending on the credit card and violate our budget rules while critical domestic investments are slashed.

I would have voted “nay” on rollcall vote 533, a vote on final passage of H.R. 3457, Justice for Victims of Iranian Terrorism Act because I support peace and the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) to prevent a nuclear Iran.

Finally, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall votes 529 and 530, and “yea” on rollcall vote 531.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2835. An act to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating

from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers.

PROVIDING FOR CORRECTIONS TO THE ENROLLMENT OF THE BILL H.R. 1735

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 81

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 1735, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall in section 1301(b)—

- (1) strike “section 1504” and insert “section 301”; and
- (2) strike “section 4303” and insert “section 4301”.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 702

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 702.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1345

AMERICAN SAMOA MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE POSTPONEMENT

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker’s table the bill (H.R. 2617) to amend the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 to postpone a scheduled increase in the minimum wage applicable to American Samoa, with the Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. MINIMUM WAGE FOR AMERICAN SAMOA.

(a) MINIMUM WAGE.—Paragraph (2) of section 8103(b) of the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 (29 U.S.C. 206 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) the minimum wage applicable to American Samoa under section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1)) shall be—

“(A) the applicable wage rate in effect for each industry and classification as of September 29, 2015; and

“(B) increased by \$0.40 an hour (or such lesser amount as may be necessary to equal the minimum wage under section 6(a)(1) of such Act), beginning on September 30, 2015, and on September 30 of every third year thereafter, until the minimum wage applicable to American Samoa under this paragraph is equal to the minimum wage set forth in such section.”.

(b) GAO REPORTS.—Section 8104 of the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 (29 U.S.C. 206 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “September 1, 2011” and inserting “April 1, 2017”; and

(B) by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: “The Government Accountability Office shall submit a subsequent report not later than April 1, 2020.”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “the study under subsection (a)” and inserting “any report under subsection (a)”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) REPORT ON ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF INCREASING THE MINIMUM WAGE IN AMERICAN SAMOA.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of ‘An Act to amend the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 to reduce a scheduled increase in the minimum wage applicable to American Samoa’, the Government Accountability Office shall transmit to Congress a report on alternative ways of increasing the minimum wage in American Samoa to keep pace with the cost of living in American Samoa and to eventually equal the minimum wage set forth in section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1)).”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall take effect as of September 29, 2015.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “An Act to amend the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 to reduce a scheduled increase in the minimum wage applicable to American Samoa.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for the second vote in the series of votes that we just took on rollcall vote No. 532. If I had been present, I would have voted “nay.”

PERMISSION TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 702

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Commerce be authorized to file a supplemental report on the bill H.R. 702.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTERMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

STEM EDUCATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1020) to define STEM education to include computer science, and to support existing STEM education programs at the National Science Foundation, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

On page 5, strike lines 3 through 4 and insert the following:

(3) in subsections (e) and (f), by striking “subsection (g)” each place it appears, and inserting “subsection (h)”;

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 3192, the Homebuyers Assistance Act, sponsored by Representative FRENCH HILL of Arkansas. This bipartisan bill will provide relief to everyone who is doing their best to comply with the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's mortgage loan disclosure rule.

Mr. Speaker, the House will also consider H.R. 538, the Native American Energy Act, sponsored by Representative DON YOUNG of Alaska, which is necessary to expedite energy production on tribal lands.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 702, sponsored by Representative JOE BARTON of Texas. Oil exports are key to creating American jobs and furthering America's energy renaissance.

Given the increased security threats facing the United States and its allies, the presence of more American oil in the global marketplace will offer more secure supply options. This will provide America with greater foreign policy influence as well as strengthening our economic and national security.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

Mr. Speaker, the last 2 weeks have been filled with a lot of things going on in this House. But I know the majority leader would be profoundly disappointed if I didn't ask him about one thing that doesn't seem to be going on, but which I think is critically important.

I know the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, joins with me in not wanting to see American jobs lost overseas or American jobs not created here in America for American workers because we are able to make products and sell them overseas.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the distinguished majority leader, knowing full well, as he does, that Jeff Immelt, the CEO of GE, was here; and he spoke to both Democrats and Republicans. I know he talked about 500 U.S. jobs going overseas because we have not yet reauthorized the Export-Import Bank.

The Senate voted 64-29 to reopen the Bank. They voted in July. Almost two-thirds of the United States Senate.

As the majority leader is tired of hearing, I know, but I still believe there is a significant majority of Members in this House that would vote for it.

Now, I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I was extraordinarily pleased to read—I didn't hear, but read—the majority leader's comments when he was talking about the failure of the Senate to proceed on a vote of disapproval or approval on the agreement with Iran on nuclear arms control.

He said he was deeply distressed that “so consequential that they demand revisions to the Senate's procedures.” And he went on to say those revisions would be “to let the people”—in this case, the Senate—“have a voice” That was quoted in The Wall Street Journal just a few days ago.

I know the gentleman doesn't want us to lose jobs. I know he is quoted as saying that the people's voice ought to be heard. I know that he shares with me that this is the people's House.

And I ask the gentleman: It is not on the schedule next week, but does the gentleman expect the Export-Import Bank to be voted on in this House before the end of this month?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman.

In honor of the late Yogi Berra, “It's like deja vu all over again.” There is no action scheduled in the House on Ex-Im.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, that is the answer I expected. That is the answer I have been getting. And, very frankly,

that is the answer this House has been getting.

I know some of my Republican friends are very frustrated by that answer, and I know all of our side is frustrated by that answer.

I will say respectfully to my friend I would certainly hope we could bring that bill to the floor.

Win or lose, whether you win or I win or Export-Import Bank is reauthorized or not, you are correct: the voice of the people should be heard on such a critical issue for jobs in this country.

Also, I know that we had marked up in committees reconciliation bills. Those reconciliation bills repeal provisions of the Affordable Care Act and defund Planned Parenthood.

The gentleman I think knows full well that the United States Senate voted on the Planned Parenthood issue and only got 47 votes for it. So in the one instance, we have an issue that got three less than one-half of the United States Senate being proposed to come to this floor, and an issue that got 64 votes in the United States Senate, as the gentleman so correctly observed, is not yet scheduled.

Can the gentleman tell me whether or not these reconciliation provisions are going to be brought to this floor, knowing full well that they won't pass the Senate and, even if they did, the President wouldn't sign them and we would sustain that veto?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Knowing the rules of reconciliation, I do believe it will pass the Senate.

The three committees that received reconciliation instructions from the Budget Committee have marked up their portions, as the gentleman has said.

I do expect the Budget Committee to meet in the near future to complete their work, and we will notify Members as soon as that is scheduled for the floor.

Mr. HOYER. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, we may have a difference of opinion, but perhaps we will see who is right on whether it passes the United States Senate or not. I understand reconciliation only needs a majority, but we will see.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also ask the majority leader: One of the issues that I know the majority leader has been working on—and I know that all of us on this floor feel it to be very, very important to pass before October 30, when the highway bill authorization expires, and I know the gentleman from California is a strong supporter of it. Clearly we need to invest in infrastructure, again, to expand the economy.

Can the gentleman tell me what prospects we have on passing or at least considering the highway bill?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, the hardest thing to do in this town is to find pay-

fors. But Chairman RYAN continues to have bipartisan discussions on ways to pay for the long-term highway bill.

I have had follow-up meetings with him today, and they are progressing over in the Senate. I have met with Chairman SHUSTER even today as well, and I expect an announcement very shortly on committee movement.

We will advise Members as soon as action is taken to schedule it for the floor.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the leader.

I hope that optimism is realized and that we do have the opportunity to consider a highway bill. I would urge the majority leader to urge those who are working on a resolution that the pay-fors, which are difficult, as he observes, are pay-fors which can be supported in a bipartisan fashion.

I think that is important not only to pass the Senate, but to be signed by the President. And we all, I think, share the view that this is a very, very important bill for us to get done.

With that, unless the majority leader may want to reconsider and tell me the Export-Import Bank is coming to the floor, which apparently he doesn't, I yield back the balance of my time.

HR. 1400 HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW; AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, OCTOBER 2, 2015, TO TUESDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2015

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. tomorrow, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, October 6, 2015, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1400

CONGRATULATING JOHNSTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA, HOCKEYVILLE, USA

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Johnstown, Pennsylvania, for hosting the first-ever Kraft Hockeyville USA game this week and the Pittsburgh Penguins for their 4-2 victory over the Tampa Bay Lightning in the game.

The Kraft competition to choose America's Hockeyville was conducted in partnership with the National Hockey League Players' Association and the National Hockey League. Towns across the country submitted stories showing their passion for hockey, and more than 20 million votes were cast. But as the contest results revealed, few places in America love hockey like Johnstown

does, and Johnstown rightly deserves the title, "Hockeyville, USA."

Johnstown was the home of the fictional hockey team the Charleston Chiefs in the 1977 movie, "Slap Shot." Scenes from the movie were filmed at Cambria County War Memorial Arena. We also can't forget the Johnstown Jets, who played here from 1950 to 1977 and won five Eastern Hockey League championships from 1951 to 1962.

As Penguins coach Mike Johnston said after the Penguins' victory: "It's a great arena. The excitement in the building, the excitement in town, I just think it's special."

RECOGNIZING THE GROWING HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN SYRIA

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the growing humanitarian crisis in Syria. As a result of the Syrian civil war and continuing military operations against ISIL, over 4 million people have been forced to seek refuge outside of Syria.

The Syrian crisis has quickly become an international crisis, and it requires the attention and the assistance of every nation. Many may see this crisis as a distant problem, but the reality is this is a global world now and everyone is interconnected.

As each nation continues to resettle refugees, we must ensure that they are provided the best resources, and this requires international cooperation. It is not just about providing financial assistance, but understanding that these refugees are people. They are people who have been forced out of their country, might have left their families, and are struggling to survive on a daily basis.

Mr. Speaker, as the U.S. is committed to accepting more refugees, I urge our country to have compassion and to commit to providing the necessary resources to address this ongoing crisis.

THE GENOCIDE OF CHRISTIANS ACROSS THE MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. ROHRBACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from Orange County, California, and her deep concern for what is going on in the Middle East.

Today I rise to speak out about the genocide that is taking place in the Middle East, that is being committed against Christians across the Middle East. They are being victimized and targeted for genocide. Violent radical Islamists have targeted Middle Eastern Christians for extinction, killing them, forcing them from their homes, and burning their churches.

Hundreds of thousands of Christians have been forced to flee. The United States needs to do what we can to save these Christian victims, as we have saved other refugees throughout our history.

Mr. Speaker, all of us who believe in religious freedom and tolerance need to stand up and state clearly that we won't sit quietly as a genocide takes place on our watch. I ask my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring a resolution that I have here in my hand, that resolution declaring Middle Eastern Christians as targets of genocide and giving them priority for immigration and refugee status.

We have been silent already for too long. It is time for this body to make sure that our words are heard and our deeds are taken. This is a good place to start, and I ask my colleagues to join me in this resolution which I will now submit to the United States House of Representatives.

BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I and many of my colleagues had to hold our noses as we voted for a short-term continuing resolution. The CR, thankfully, did not cut funding to Planned Parenthood, which provided 2.7 million Americans—women, men, and youth—with medical services last year. But this CR is only good until December 11, and it leaves out funding for a vital program like the Ex-Im Bank. In less than 10 weeks, we will be right back here fighting against another government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, do we really want to fail our military veterans, our seniors, our families, and our voters? I say no. Let's do the right thing. Let's do our job. Let's come up with a long-term budget that serves the American people, American businesses, and the American economy.

RECOGNIZING LOREN THORSON OF GREEN VALLEY, ARIZONA

(Ms. MCSALLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, we are called the people's House for a reason. We are sent to Washington to be the direct voices of our constituents back home. Last week, it was my honor to take action on an issue that was originally brought to my attention by one of my constituents from Green Valley, Arizona.

Loren Thorson served in World War II as a Navy commander. When he saw a report 5 years ago describing a little-known tax increase in the Affordable Care Act that is hurting families and is scheduled to hit seniors in 2017, he looked into it and knew something had to be done. He has sent letters, made

phone calls, written editorials, and done much more to raise the alarm about this little-known issue.

After hearing about this issue from him, my office has worked with Members from both parties in the House and in the Senate to move the issue forward and fix it. Those efforts resulted in my introduction last week of bipartisan legislation, with my lead, to repeal this tax hike and put Loren's ideas into action.

Mr. Speaker, this is how our government is supposed to work. I am grateful for Loren's tireless efforts to protect seniors and middle class families, and I will continue to work to advance his and my constituents' ideas in Congress.

REAUTHORIZE THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, for too long, this Congress has governed from one crisis to the next. Yesterday, when we were just hours away from another self-inflicted Washington wound, two news pieces were published that I would like to share: number one, the CEO of Honeywell, a company with a significant presence in my district, published an article about the economic damage of Congress' failure to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank; then Bloomberg published a story with the headline, "Boeing Risks Losing \$1.1 Billion Jet Order on Ex-Im Shutdown."

Washington gridlock is putting the jobs of thousands of Americans at risk. This includes hundreds of the people I serve in Rockford and the Quad Cities.

But today is a new day; it is a new month. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to turn over a new leaf of bipartisanship. Let's work together, reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank, and protect these good-paying manufacturing jobs before it is too late.

THE MEDICAL EVALUATION PARITY FOR SERVICEMEMBERS ACT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago, I cast an affirmative vote for the National Defense Authorization Act for 2016. However, I do have great concern over an important measure which was all but removed from the legislation we voted on today.

Earlier this year, I authored the Medical Evaluation Parity for Servicemembers, or MEPS, Act. The MEPS Act would improve military suicide prevention by instituting a mental health assessment for all incoming military recruits, which can be used as a baseline for evaluations throughout their military careers. The conferenced version of the NDAA merely calls for

the Department of Defense to continue to study such a screening.

Mr. Speaker, this issue has been studied thoroughly over the past several years. I strongly urge the Pentagon to act quickly to take steps in better assessing the mental health of our servicemen and -women with a commonsense baseline evaluation.

A recent Army study found that nearly one in five Army soldiers enter the service with a psychiatric disorder, and nearly half of all soldiers who tried suicide first attempted it before enlisting.

I call on the Pentagon to stop studying to death the death of our soldiers. Mr. Speaker, we need to act now.

THE BENGHAZI COMMITTEE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for this institution that I have had the privilege of serving. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I am very grateful for the extent of our jurisdiction that embraces the Constitution, and I believe justice is important.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in great consternation, concern, and condemnation of the statement made by the Republican leadership that the Benghazi Committee is not for factfinding, it is not for recognizing the tragic loss of four Americans, but it is really to insult and degrade a public servant who happens to be a Presidential candidate. How tragic that we would engage in such tomfoolery. In spite of the Constitution and the Madison Papers, it talks about doing justice.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I was engaged in impeachment proceedings, the investigation of Waco, investigation of antitrust issues, held a trial for a judge who acted improperly, a Federal judge. That is the factfinding role of this Nation.

While we are fooling around with a committee that is there to do nothing but deal with political aggrandizing and we have not passed a Zadroga Act that helps our 9/11 first responders, I would only ask that we stop and end this committee because it is not doing justice as the United States calls us to do.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution gives us our guideposts. Why don't we follow it?

HONORING ARTHUR WILLIAM "BILL" BAILEY, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Arthur William "Bill" Bailey, Jr., of Waco, Texas, who passed away on August 18, 2015.

Bill Bailey was a Korean war veteran, a renowned Waco businessman, and a distinguished alumnus and former regent at Baylor University. He touched many lives in the Waco and Baylor communities, and he will be greatly missed.

Bill was born in Waco on April 24, 1929. He graduated from Waco High School in 1946 and enrolled in Baylor University. On December 15, 1950, Bill married his high school sweetheart, Roberta Hatch. They were married for almost 64 years prior to Roberta's passing in 2014. Roberta and Bill had 3 sons and were blessed with 10 grandchildren and 4 great-grandchildren.

Bill graduated from Baylor University in 1951 with a B.A. degree and a law degree. While at Baylor, he was a member of the debate team and the Baylor Chamber of Commerce.

Bill served our Nation in the United States Air Force as a first lieutenant in the JAG division during the Korean war. He was ultimately promoted to captain in the U.S. Air Force Reserves.

After concluding his service to our Nation, Bill returned to Waco to enter into the insurance business. In 1956, he established his own independent insurance agency, Bill Bailey Insurance Agency, which is now known as Bailey Insurance and Risk Management, Inc. He became a noted State and national leader in the insurance industry.

Mr. Speaker, because of his expertise in risk management, he was called upon to testify before the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives committees as well as the Federal Reserve Board, all on behalf of the insurance industry.

In 1969, Bill teamed up with a group of his fellow Texas insurance agents to establish the Certified Insurance Counselors Program, which focused on teaching advanced insurance topics to ensure high-quality standards of ethics and professionalism in the insurance industry. This program would become the foundation of the National Alliance for Insurance Education and Research. Today, these certification programs are conducted in all 50 States with more than 150,000 participants annually.

Bill held many prestigious positions on various boards, including as the chairman of the Board of Governors for the National Alliance for Insurance Education and Research; the president of the Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers Association of America; the liaison to the National Association of Insurance Commissioners for the Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers Association of America; and as director, executive committee member, and past vice chairman of the Texas National Bank of Waco.

Bill's work in the insurance industry was honored by the Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers Association of America when they dedicated their conference room in the Washington, D.C., office as the A. William Bailey, Jr., Conference Room.

He was also a recipient of the Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers Association of America Woodworth Memorial Award for Meritorious Service to the Insurance Profession, as well as the Drex Foreman Award of the Independent Insurance Agents of Texas. Both of these are the highest distinctions for these respective organizations.

□ 1415

Bill was active in the Waco and Baylor University communities and served as the following: Trustee, Vice Chairman of the Board, and Regent of Baylor University; Officer, Director, and Executive Committee Member of the Waco Industrial Foundation; Member and Chairman of the Hillcrest Baptist Medical Center Board of Development; Founder and Past President of the Waco Business League; and President of the following organizations: the Greater Waco United way; the Baylor-Waco and Baylor Bear Foundations; the Waco and Northwest Waco Rotary Clubs; the Waco YMCA; the Waco Camp Fire Girls; and the Baylor Stadium Corporation.

In 1988, Bill was honored by the Baylor Alumni Association with the W.R. White Meritorious Service Award. In 1997, they honored him as a Distinguished Alumnus. Additionally, in 2008, the Waco Public Schools honored him as a Distinguished Alumnus.

Bill was an active member of the First Baptist Church of Waco, where he served as Trustee, Deacon, and Chairman of the Board of Deacons; Chairman of the Finance Committee; Founding Chairman of the First Baptist Church of Waco Foundation; President of the McCall Sunday School Class; and Co-Superintendent of the College Sunday School Department.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Bailey will not only be remembered for his long list of accomplishments, but, most importantly, he will be forever remembered as a loving husband, a father, a grandfather, a great-grandfather, and a loyal friend to hundreds of central Texans.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Bailey family. We also lift up the family and friends of Bill Bailey in our prayers.

As I close, I ask that all Americans continue to pray for our country, for our military men and women who protect us abroad, and for our first responders who protect us here at home.

HONORING MATTIE LEE PHILLIPS

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mattie Lee Phillips from Bryan, Texas, who passed away on August 25, 2015, her 103rd birthday.

Mrs. Phillips was born in Washington County, Texas, on August 25, 1912. Growing up, Mrs. Phillips attended school in the Waco and McGregor areas and later attended Bryan Public School for Colored. She married Willie Sterling in 1931. They were blessed with five children. Later she married Eddie Phillips. They were blessed with four children.

Mrs. Phillips was a member of the New Liberty Baptist Church in Boonville, Texas, at an early age and remained a member until 1941, when she became a member of the Pleasant Grove Missionary Baptist Church in Bryan.

She was an avid church worker, serving on the Pleasant Grove Church Usher Board for 35 years and as a Sunday school teacher and a mission teacher. She served on various programs and committees at the church and worked tirelessly raising funds to help improve their church facilities.

Mrs. Phillips taught and counseled numerous youth during her life. She was a staunch believer in higher education, and all nine of her children attended college.

Mrs. Phillips was an entrepreneur who took sewing and tailoring classes through the mail and worked for many years as a self-employed seamstress. She also bought, repaired, and resold real estate for additional income. In addition, she successfully owned and operated Phillips Cafe & Barbecue.

Mrs. Phillips led a full life and was well respected in our community. She will be forever remembered for her devotion to her church and her community and as a loving wife, a mother, a grandmother, a great-grandmother, and a great-great-grandmother, a youth mentor to hundreds, and a friend to many as well.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Phillips and Sterling families. We also lift up the family and friends of Mattie Lee Phillips in our prayers.

As I close, I ask that all Americans continue to pray for our country, for our military men and women who protect us abroad, and for our first responders who protect us here at home.

HONORING TOMMY BOSQUEZ

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Henry Thomas "Tommy" Bosquez, of Bryan, Texas, who passed away on September 12, 2015.

Tommy Bosquez selflessly served the Brazos Valley community in a variety of ways, and he will be missed greatly.

Tommy was born on August 9, 1962, in Bryan, Texas. He graduated from Bryan High School in 1980. When he was 19, he began his public service career as a City of Bryan police officer. He was the city's youngest policeman and served on the force for 8 years.

He held various assignments, including patrol, special advanced traffic investigations, the field training officer program, crime scene analysis, and honor guard detail.

Tommy was also a member of the Texas State Guard. He was commissioned as a second lieutenant, serving as company commander in the 223rd Military Police Battalion, to assist State and local authorities in times of emergencies.

Tommy married his high school sweetheart, Stella Grimaldo. They were married for 29 years and were blessed with two daughters.

Tommy earned his associate's degree from Blinn College and later earned an undergraduate degree in political science in 1989 and a master's degree in public administration in 1995, each from Texas A&M University.

During his time at Texas A&M and the years that followed, he worked for the university. He started out in the College of Medicine, where he held various positions, including Director of Special Programs, Special Assistant to the Dean of Medicine, admissions committee member, principal investigator, and a lecturer in the Department of Humanities in Medicine.

He would go on to work for the university system in the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, where he assumed a leadership role with the Health Science Center, working as Special Assistant to the President.

Prior to his death, Tommy worked as the Chief Contracts Officer and Director for Contract Administrator in the Office of Finance and Administration at the Texas A&M Health Science Center.

Tommy was an active volunteer and an engaged parent in the Bryan Independent School District for over 25 years. He began his service as an elected school board trustee in 2012 and served as vice president of that board.

He also served extensively on various local and statewide charitable and educational organization boards such as the Texas Association for Access and Equity, the Texas Association of Advisers for the Health Professions, the Texas Area Health Education Centers—East, the Bryan-College Station Chamber of Commerce, the Bryan ISD Education Foundation, the Blinn College Advisory Board, the United Way, the Boy's and Girl's Club, the Kiwanis, Gear Up, Habitat for Humanity, and Junior Achievement.

Tommy received many acknowledgments throughout his career, including the 2007 Texas Association of Chicanos in Higher Education Outstanding Meritorious Public Service Award, and the Kiwanis International Walter Zeller Fellowship Award.

Tommy worked tirelessly to better our community. He will forever be remembered for his devotion to public service and as a loving husband, father, and friend to countless Brazos Valley citizens.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Bosquez family. We also lift up the family and friends of Tommy Bosquez in our prayers.

As I close, I ask that all Americans continue to pray for our country and for our military men and women, who protect us abroad, and for our first responders, who protect us here at home.

HONORING DR. JAMES COOPER

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. James F. Cooper of Bryan, Texas, who passed away on August 18, 2015.

Dr. James Cooper was a veteran of World War II and the Korean war. He

was a physician, an aviation medical examiner, and an active member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. He touched many lives in the Brazos Valley, and he will be greatly missed.

Dr. Cooper was born on August 30, 1927, in Farmersville, Louisiana. He was the son of a Baptist preacher and grew up in many towns throughout the South.

At the age of 17, Dr. Cooper enlisted in the Navy to serve aboard the USS Dorchester in the South Pacific. Upon returning to the U.S., he used his GI bill benefits to attend medical school in Tennessee.

He then served again in the Korean war as Deputy Medical Officer for the Destroyer Fleet Atlantic, stationed aboard its flagship, the USS Yosemite. Dr. Cooper retired from the Navy with a final rank of Lieutenant Commander, Medical Corps.

In 1955, Dr. Cooper moved to Bryan, Texas, and entered a medical practice with his brother, O.C. Dr. Cooper was a well-loved family doctor and a surgeon at St. Joseph's Hospital.

In addition to his medical practice, the good doctor had a strong affinity for aviation and specialized in aviation medicine. He was involved with the space programs at NASA and present at many of the Apollo launches. His knowledge and experience with NASA missions earned him the opportunity to do voice commentary for six Apollo launches for television broadcasts in Australia.

Dr. Cooper also served as a FAA Senior Aviation Medical Examiner. As a fellow pilot, I was fortunate and grateful to have Dr. Cooper as my medical examiner for many years. We developed a strong friendship and shared many stories about our mutual love for aviation.

Dr. Cooper was an extraordinary doctor not only specializing in aviation, but also serving as Chief Medical Officer for the Texas World Speedway in College Station.

In addition to his medical duties, Dr. Cooper was an active member of VFW Post No. 4692 in Bryan. He was very passionate about the VFW and even served as Commander of the post.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Cooper left a strong legacy for his family and for the Brazos Valley. He will be forever remembered as a great doctor, a dedicated veteran, a loving husband, a great father, a grandfather, and a loyal friend.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Cooper family. We also lift up the family and friends of Dr. James Cooper in our prayers.

As I close, I ask that all Americans continue to pray for our country, for our military men and women, who protect us abroad, and for our first responders, who protect us here at home.

HONORING ALAN WALDIE

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Alan Duane Waldie, of Bryan, Texas, who passed away on August 22, 2015.

Alan Waldie was a veteran, an electrical engineer, an Aggie, a pillar of the Brazos Valley community, and a great friend. He led a full life and will be missed greatly in our community.

Alan was born on April 23, 1928, in Iowa Park, Texas. He graduated from Lamar High School in Houston in 1945 and later attended Texas A&M University.

While at Texas A&M, Alan was a member of the nationally famous "Fightin' Texas Aggie Band" and served as drum major during his senior year. He graduated from Texas A&M University in 1951 with a bachelor's of science in electrical engineering.

From 1946 to 1948, Alan served in the U.S. Navy. From 1951 to 1953, he served as a lieutenant in the U.S. Army Signal Corps.

After his discharge from the Army, Alan began a successful business career, which took him to Houston; Tripoli, Libya; and Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

In 1995, he moved back to College Station to begin his retirement. There he served as a volunteer for the George Bush Presidential Library and was the member of the Bryan Rotary Club and the Central Baptist Church.

Mr. Speaker, Alan Waldie will be forever remembered as a dedicated veteran, a loving husband, a great father, and a loyal friend.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to his wife, Nancy, and to all of the Waldie family. We also lift up the family and friends of Alan Waldie in our prayers.

Mr. Speaker, as I close, I ask that all Americans continue to pray for our country, for our military men and women, who protect us abroad, and for our first responders, who protect us here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 30, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on September 30, 2015, at 8:45 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he notifies of designation of funding for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism as provided in the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2016.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

DESIGNATION OF FUNDING FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-62)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 114(c) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2016, also titled the TSA Office of Inspection Accountability Act of 2015 (the “Act”), I hereby designate for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism all funding (including the rescission of funds) and contributions from foreign governments so designated by the Congress in the Act pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, as outlined in the enclosed list of accounts.

The details of this action are set forth in the enclosed memorandum from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 30, 2015.*

□ 1430

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, September 30, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on September 30, 2015, at 8:45 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he notifies that he has designated an emergency requirement \$700 million in emergency funding for urgent wildland fire suppression activities as provided in the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2016.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

DESIGNATION OF FUNDING AS AN EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-63)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 135 of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2016, also titled the TSA Office of Inspection Accountability Act of 2015 (the “Act”), I hereby designate as an emergency requirement all funding so designated by the Congress in the Act pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, for the following account: “Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Wildland Fire Management.”

The details of this action are set forth in the enclosed memorandum from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 30, 2015.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of illness.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker on September 30, 2015:

H.R. 719. An act to require the Transportation Security Administration to conform to existing Federal law and regulations regarding criminal investigator positions, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 2, 2015, at 1 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2986. A letter from the Under Secretary for Management, Department of State, transmitting a letter reporting two violations of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of State, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2987. A letter from the Program Specialist (Paperwork Reduction Act), Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulatory Capital Rules: Regulatory Capital, Final Revisions Applicable to Banking Organizations Subject to the Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule [Docket ID: OCC-2014-0025] (RIN: 1557-AD88) received September 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2988. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's recommendations to Congress concerning energy performance requirements for fiscal years 2016 through 2025, in accordance with the National Energy Conservation Policy Act [45 U.S.C. 8253(a)(3)]; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2989. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's direct final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2015-0388; FRL-9933-30] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2990. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Primary Aluminum Reduction Plants [EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0797; FRL-9934-16-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AQ92) received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2991. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts; Approval of Regulations Limiting Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds and Nitrogen Oxides [EPA-R01-OAR-2014-0631; A-1-FRL-9932-12-Region 1] received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2992. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Volatile Organic Compounds Definition [EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0008; FRL-9934-11-Region 5] received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2993. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Georgia Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead NAAQS [EPA-R04-OAR-2014-0442; FRL-9934-84-Region 4] received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2994. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Butte County Air Quality Management District, Feather River Air Quality Management District, and San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District; Correcting Amendment [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0246; FRL-9931-19-Region 9] received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2995. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's direct final rule — Revision of Air Quality Implementation Plan; California; Feather River Air Quality Management District; Stationary Source Permits [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0542; FRL-9933-52-Region 9] received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-

121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2996. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's direct final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0510; FRL-9934-04-Region 9] received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2997. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; Mammoth Lakes; Redesignation; PM10 Maintenance Plan [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0279; FRL-9935-05-Region 9] received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2998. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Adoption of Control Techniques Guidelines for Metal Furniture Coatings and Miscellaneous Metal Parts Coatings [EPA-R03-OAR-2015-0404; FRL-9934-92-Region 3] received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2999. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; 2011 Base Year Inventories for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard for New Castle and Sussex Counties [EPA-R03-OAR-2015-0455; FRL-9934-81-Region 3] received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3000. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Redesignation Request and Associated Maintenance Plan for the Pittsburgh-Beaver Valley Nonattainment Area for the 1997 Annual and 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2015-0029; FRL-9934-82-Region 3] received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3001. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; South Dakota; Revisions to South Dakota Administrative Code [EPA-R08-OAR-2014-0916; FRL-9934-83-Region 8] received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3002. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri, Limited Maintenance Plan for the St. Louis Nonclassifiable Maintenance Area for the 8-Hour Carbon Monoxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0513; FRL-9934-98-Region 7] received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3003. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; Approval of the Base Year Emissions Inventory for the Liberty-Clairton Nonattainment Area for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standard and Approval of Transportation Conformity Insignificance Findings for the 1997 Annual and 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standards for the Liberty-Clairton Nonattainment Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2015-0470; FRL-9934-91-Region 3] received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3004. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Enhancing Support for the Cuban People [Docket No.: 150825774-5774-01] (RIN: 0694-AG67) received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3005. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report to Congress on United States Participation in the United Nations in 2014, pursuant to Sec. 4(a) of Pub. L. 79-264; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3006. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination for the use of funds to provide non-lethal assistance to the Syrian Opposition, pursuant to Sec. 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3007. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277, 5 U.S.C. 3345-3349d; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3008. A letter from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the Office's final rule — Organization and Functions; Implementation of Statutory Gift Acceptance Authority; Freedom of Information Act (RIN: 3209-AA40, RIN: 3209-AA41, RIN: 3209-AA39) received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3009. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Managing Senior Executive Performance (RIN: 3206-AM48) received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3010. A letter from the Division Chief, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Minerals Management; Adjustment of Cost Recovery Fees [L13100000 PP0000 LLW0310000] (RIN: 1004-AE44) received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3011. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollock in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No.:

141021887-5172-02] (RIN: 0648-XE143) received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3012. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Kentucky Regulatory Program [SATS No.: KY-253-FOR; Docket ID: OSM-2009-0014; SID1S SS08011000 SX064A000 156S180110; S2D2S SS08011000 SX064A000 15X501520] received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3013. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pennsylvania Regulatory Program [SATS No.: PA-154-FOR; Docket ID: OSM-2010-0002; SID1S SS08011000 SX064A000 156S180110 S2D2S SS08011000 SX064A000 15X501520] received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3014. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule — National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Electronic Reporting Rule [EPA-HQ-OECA-2009-0274; FRL-9930-70-OECA] (RIN: 2020-AA47) received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3015. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Return of Wine to Bonded Premises [Docket No.: TTB-2015-0013; T.D. TTB-130] (RIN: 1513-AB92) received September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. Supplemental report on H.R. 702. A bill to adapt to changing crude oil market conditions (Rept. 114-267, Pt. 2).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 538. A bill to facilitate the development of energy on Indian lands by reducing Federal regulations that impede tribal development of Indian lands, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-276). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1644. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to ensure transparency in the development of environmental regulations, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3192. A bill to provide for a temporary safe harbor from the enforcement of integrated disclosure requirements for mortgage loan transactions under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 and the Truth in Lending Act, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-278). Referred to

the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. POLIS, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BERA, Mr. FORBES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 3660. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 respecting the scoring of preventive health savings; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. GUINTA:

H.R. 3661. A bill to terminate the independent third-party program for sectors of the Northeast Multispecies Fishery unless the program is fully funded by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself, Mr. BRAT, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. YOHO, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HARDY, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. GIBBS, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. LOUDERMILK):

H.R. 3662. A bill to enhance congressional oversight over the administration of sanctions against certain Iranian terrorism financiers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FLORES (for himself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 3663. A bill to prevent certain discriminatory taxation of natural gas pipeline property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 3664. A bill to provide for the identification and documentation of best practices for cyber hygiene by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. SIRE):

H.R. 3665. A bill to authorize appropriations for the university transportation centers program for fiscal years 2016 through 2021, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 3666. A bill to coordinate and advance fibrosis research activities at the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 3667. A bill to promote transparency, accountability, and reform within the United Nations system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COOK (for himself and Mr. KNIGHT):

H.R. 3668. A bill to codify in law and expand certain off-highway vehicle recreation areas in the State of California, to designate as wilderness certain public lands in the State of California administered by the Bureau of Land Management, to expand the Death Valley National Park Wilderness and the San Geronio Wilderness in San Bernardino National Forest, to ensure the conservation and necessary management of wildlife in these wilderness areas, to establish the Mojave Trails Special Management Area in the State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FARR, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. MEEKS, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 3669. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a criminal penalty for operating drones in certain locations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 3670. A bill to amend chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code (popularly referred to as the Buy American Act) and certain other laws with respect to certain waivers under those laws, to provide greater transparency regarding exceptions to domestic sourcing requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 3671. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a 3-year recovery period for all race horses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 3672. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the holding period used to determine whether horses are section 1231 assets to 12 months; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENISHEK:

H.R. 3673. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mail paper forms to any individual who filed a paper return for the preceding taxable year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 3674. A bill to establish a commission to examine the processes used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics to provide unemployment rates and to make recommendations to Congress for any changes in methodology or improvements to such processes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DESAULNIER (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 3675. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to ensure that student

loans are available at interest rates that do not exceed the interest rates at which the Federal Government provides loans to banks through the discount window operated by the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Ms. ESTY, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 3676. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, acting through the Director of the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, to award grants to States to expand access to clinically appropriate services for opioid abuse, dependence, or addiction; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 3677. A bill to reduce opioid misuse and abuse; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. NEAL, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. NUNES):

H.R. 3678. A bill to clarify the orphan drug exception to the annual fee on branded prescription pharmaceutical manufacturers and importers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 3679. A bill to provide that the Social Security Administration pay fees associated with obtaining birth certificate or State identification card for purposes of obtaining a replacement social security card for certain victims of domestic violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 3680. A bill to provide for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out a grant program for co-prescribing opioid overdose reversal drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution providing for corrections to the enrollment of the bill H.R. 1735; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BARTON:

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 50th Anniversary of the White House Fellows Program; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr.

LEWIS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. HOYER):

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the ratification of the 13th Amendment; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution recognizing former United States Federal Judge Frank Minis Johnson, Jr. for his role in the civil rights movement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. YOHO, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. HARDY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. LOUDERMILK):

H. Res. 454. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives relating to the exercise of presidential waiver authority of certain sanctions imposed against Iran under United States law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida (for himself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida):

H. Res. 455. A resolution expressing support for designation of the inaugural "Cruise Travel Professional Month" in October; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. DELANEY):

H. Res. 456. A resolution expressing support for designation of October 2015 as "National Principals Month"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H. Res. 457. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that the House be in session at least 40 hours each week other than a week that is designated as a district work period; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Ms. MATSUL, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. HAHN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. MENG, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. ELLMERS of North

Carolina, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. ESTY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. GRAHAM, Ms. LEE, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. BLACK, Ms. MCSALLY, Ms. FOX, Mrs. ROBY, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, and Ms. PLASKETT):

H. Res. 458. A resolution celebrating 25 years of success from the Office of Research on Women's Health at the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. BARLETTA):

H. Res. 459. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Christians in the Middle East are victims of genocide; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 3660.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The attached bill is constitutional under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. GUINTA:

H.R. 3661.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 3662.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 3663.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 3664.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes)

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof)

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida:

H.R. 3665.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 3666.

In Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 3667.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 3668.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 3669.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 3670.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 3671.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 3672.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BENISHEK:

H.R. 3673.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads:

"The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 3674.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 3675.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 3676.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 3677.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3678.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution. The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 3679.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 Constitution of the United States, which states the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 3680.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 239: Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. POLIS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CARNEY, and Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 244: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 292: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 317: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 381: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 546: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 592: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 602: Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 664: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 829: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 836: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 837: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 879: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 969: Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 973: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 1019: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1062: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 1122: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1124: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1130: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 1141: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 1174: Mr. COHEN, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 1192: Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 1220: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. KEATING, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1258: Mr. DENT, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico.

H.R. 1283: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 1288: Mr. POSEY, Mr. SIREN, and Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 1427: Mrs. RADEWAGEN and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 1441: Mrs. DINGELL and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1459: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1475: Mr. JORDAN, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 1532: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 1538: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 1566: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1567: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1594: Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 1603: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1660: Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 1661: Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 1671: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1686: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1688: Mrs. RADEWAGEN and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 1706: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1716: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1736: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 1737: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. RIGELL, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. SIREN.

H.R. 1769: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 1779: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1814: Mr. KILDEE, Ms. BASS, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 1942: Mr. VARGAS and Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 1945: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1986: Mr. NEUHOUSE.

H.R. 2010: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BARR, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 2043: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 2050: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2076: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 2090: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2189: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2287: Mr. RIGELL and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 2292: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 2293: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2342: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MEHAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 2461: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2633: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2643: Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 2646: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 2657: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 2671: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2672: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2673: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2674: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2697: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 2698: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 2710: Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 2717: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GRAYSON, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2737: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2775: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2799: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 2805: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 2858: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 2869: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 2889: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2904: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 2944: Mr. HANNA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 3011: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 3029: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 3033: Mr. TAKANO and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 3048: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 3084: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3095: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 3099: Mr. POCAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 3102: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 3119: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 3130: Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 3144: Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 3151: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 3173: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 3229: Ms. ROSA-LEHTINEN, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. KATKO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 3310: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 3314: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 3326: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 3338: Mr. PETERS and Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 3381: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 3412: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LEE, and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 3457: Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 3458: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3459: Mr. HILL, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. ROSS, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. BUCK.

H.R. 3463: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 3516: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MOONRY of West Virginia, and Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.R. 3532: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 3542: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 3543: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 3573: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 3618: Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 3626: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 3628: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 3632: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 3640: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 3643: Mr. KIND and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 3646: Mr. VELA.

H.R. 3651: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. WOODALL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. KATKO, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BOST, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SHMKUS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. YODER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. DOLD, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. PETERS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HILL, Mr. BYRNE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 3643: Mr. KIND and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 3646: Mr. VELA.

H.R. 3651: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. WOODALL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. KATKO, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BOST, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SHMKUS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. YODER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. DOLD, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. PETERS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HILL, Mr. BYRNE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 3651: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. WOODALL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. KATKO, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BOST, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SHMKUS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. YODER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. DOLD, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. PETERS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HILL, Mr. BYRNE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 3651: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. WOODALL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. KATKO, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BOST, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SHMKUS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. YODER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. DOLD, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. PETERS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HILL, Mr. BYRNE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 3651: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. WOODALL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. KATKO, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BOST, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SHMKUS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. YODER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. DOLD, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. PETERS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HILL, Mr. BYRNE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 3651: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. WOODALL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. KATKO, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BOST, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SHMKUS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. YODER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. DOLD, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. PETERS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HILL, Mr. BYRNE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 3651: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. WOODALL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. KATKO, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BOST, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SHMKUS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. YODER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. DOLD, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. PETERS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HILL, Mr. BYRNE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 3651: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. WOODALL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. KATKO, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BOST, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SHMKUS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. YODER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. DOLD, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. PETERS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HILL, Mr. BYRNE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 3651: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. WOODALL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr.

H. Res. 428: Mr. POLIS.

H. Res. 453: Ms. FUDGE, Ms. BASS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. Adams, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

29. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Board of Chosen Freeholders, Morris County, New Jersey, relative to Resolution No. 59, strongly urging their Congressional delegation to reject the terms of the Iran Nuclear Agreement, and to vote to override the anticipated veto of President Obama; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

30. Also, a petition of Village Council of Bal Harbour Village, Florida, relative to

Resolution No. 2015-978, encouraging the Florida Delegation to the 114th Congress of the United States of America not to approve the proposed agreement between the United States and Iran regarding the operation of Iranian nuclear facilities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

31. Also, a petition of Council of the County of Maui, Hawaii, relative to Resolution No. 15-109, urging Congress to pass the Industrial Hemp Farming Act of 2015; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.