

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”; and

(C) in section 1301(b), by striking “section 4303” and inserting “section 4301”; and

(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
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass

Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer

Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici

Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
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
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson

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

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijaiva
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
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

NAYS—241

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)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson

O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
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
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
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

Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
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 T.
Kelly (PA)	Nugent	Simpson	Burgess	Huizenga (MI)	Pompeo	Eshoo	Loeb	Sanford
King (IA)	Nunes	Smith (MO)	Bustos	Hultgren	Posey	Farr	Lofgren	Sarbanes
King (NY)	Olson	Smith (NE)	Byrne	Hunter	Price, Tom	Fattah	Lowenthal	Schakowsky
Kinzinger (IL)	Palazzo	Smith (NJ)	Calvert	Hurd (TX)	Ratcliffe	Frankel (FL)	Lowe	Schiff
Kline	Palmer	Smith (TX)	Carter (GA)	Hurt (VA)	Reed	Fudge	Luján, Ben Ray	Schrader
Knight	Paulsen	Stefanik	Carter (TX)	Issa	Renacci	Gallego	(NM)	Scott (VA)
Labrador	Pearce	Stewart	Chabot	Jenkins (KS)	Ribble	Grayson	Lynch	Scott, David
LaHood	Perry	Stivers	Chaffetz	Jenkins (WV)	Rice (NY)	Green, Al	Maloney,	Serrano
LaMalfa	Pittenger	Stutzman	Johnson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)	Green, Gene	Carolyn	Sewell (AL)
Lamborn	Pitts	Thompson (PA)	Clawson (FL)	Johnson, Sam	Rigell	Griffith	Massie	Sherman
Lance	Poe (TX)	Thornberry	Clay	Jolly	Roby	Grijalva	Matsui	Sires
Latta	Poliquin	Tiberi	Coffman	Jordan	Roe (TN)	Hahn	McCollum	Slaughter
LoBiondo	Pompeo	Tipton	Cole	Joyce	Rogers (AL)	Hastings	McDermott	Smith (WA)
Long	Posey	Trott	Collins (GA)	Katko	Rogers (KY)	Higgins	McGovern	Speier
Loudermilk	Price, Tom	Turner	Collins (NY)	Kelly (MS)	Rokita	Himes	McNerney	Swalwell (CA)
Love	Ratcliffe	Upton	Comstock	Kelly (PA)	Rooney (FL)	Hinojosa	Meeks	Takano
Lucas	Reed	Valadao	Conaway	Kilmer	Ros-Lehtinen	Honda	Meng	Thompson (CA)
Luetkemeyer	Renacci	Wagner	Cook	King (IA)	Roskam	Hoyer	Moore	Thompson (MS)
Lummis	Ribble	Walberg	Costa	King (NY)	Ross	Huelskamp	Moulton	Titus
MacArthur	Rice (SC)	Walden	Costello (PA)	Kinzinger (IL)	Rothfus	Huffman	Mulvaney	Tonko
Marchant	Rigell	Walker	Courtney	Kirkpatrick	Rouzer	Israel	Nadler	Torres
Marino	Roby	Walorski	Cramer	Kline	Royce	Jackson Lee	Napolitano	Tsongas
Massie	Roe (TN)	Walters, Mimi	Crawford	Knight	Ruiz	Jeffries	Nolan	Van Hollen
McCarthy	Rogers (AL)	Weber (TX)	Crenshaw	Kuster	Ruppersberger	Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Vargas
McCaul	Rogers (KY)	Webster (FL)	Cuellar	LaHood	Russell	Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell	Veasey
McClintock	Rohrabacher	Wenstrup	Curbelo (FL)	LaMalfa	Ryan (WI)	Jones	Payne	Vela
McHenry	Rokita	Westerman	DeVas, Rodney	Lamborn	Salmon	Kaptur	Pelosi	Velázquez
McKinley	Rooney (FL)	Westmoreland	Danley	Lance	Scalise	Keating	Pingree	Visclosky
McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield	Denham	Long	Schweikert	Kennedy	Pocan	Wasserman
Rodgers	Roskam	Williams	Dent	Loudermilk	Latta	Kildee	Polis	Schultz
McSally	Ross	Wilson (SC)	DeSantis	Love	Lipinski	Kind	Price (NC)	Waters, Maxine
Meadows	Rothfus	Wittman	DesJarlais	Lucas	LoBiondo	Labrador	Quigley	Watson Coleman
Meehan	Rouzer	Womack	Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Long	Larsen (WA)	Rangel	Welch
Messer	Royce	Woodall	Dold	Love	Loudermilk	Larson (CT)	Richmond	Wilson (FL)
Mica	Russell	Yoder	Donovan	Lucas	Love	Lawrence	Rohrabacher	Yarmuth
Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Yoho	Duckworth	Luetkemeyer	Lucas	Lee	Roybal-Allard	
Miller (MI)	Salmon	Young (AK)	Duffy	Lujan Grisham	Sinema			
Moolenaar	Sanford	Young (IA)	Duncan (SC)	(NM)	Smith (MO)			
Mooney (WV)	Scalise	Young (IN)	Elmers (NC)	Lummis	Smith (NE)			
Mullin	Schweikert	Zeldin	Emmer (MN)	MacArthur	Smith (NJ)			
Mulvaney	Scott, Austin	Zinke	Esty	Maloney, Sean	Smith (TX)			
Murphy (PA)	Sensenbrenner		Farenthold	Marchant	Stefanik			
			Fitzpatrick	Marino	Stewart			
			Fleischmann	McCarthy	Stivers			
			Fleming	McCaul	Stutzman			
			Flores	McClintock	Takai			
			Forbes	McHenry	Thompson (PA)			
			Fortenberry	McKinley	Thornberry			
			Foster	McMorris	Tiberi			
			Fox	Rodgers	Tipton			
			Franks (AZ)	McSally	Trott			
			Frelinghuysen	Meadows	Turner			
			Gabbard	Meehan	Upton			
			Garamendi	Messer	Valadao			
			Garrett	Mica	Wagner			
			Gibbs	Miller (FL)	Walberg			
			Gibson	Miller (MI)	Walden			
			Gohmert	Moolenaar	Walker			
			Goodlatte	Mooney (WV)	Walorski			
			Gosar	Mullin	Walters, Mimi			
			Gowdy	Murphy (FL)	Walz			
			Graham	Murphy (PA)	Weber (TX)			
			Granger	Neugebauer	Webster (FL)			
			Graves (GA)	Newhouse	Wenstrup			
			Graves (LA)	Noem	Westerman			
			Graves (MO)	Norcross	Westmoreland			
			Grothman	Nugent	Whitfield			
			Guinta	Nunes	Williams			
			Guthrie	O'Rourke	Wilson (SC)			
			Hanna	Olson	Wittman			
			Hardy	Palazzo	Womack			
			Harper	Palmer	Woodall			
			Harris	Paulsen	Yoder			
			Hartzler	Pearce	Yoho			
			Heck (NV)	Perry	Young (AK)			
			Heck (WA)	Peters	Young (IA)			
			Hensarling	Peterson	Young (IN)			
			Herrera Beutler	Pittenger	Zeldin			
					Zinke			

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	Benish	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)

Adams	Cárdenas
Amash	Carney
Bass	Carson (IN)
Beatty	Castor (FL)
Becerra	Castro (TX)
Beyer	Chu, Judy
Blumenauer	Cicilline
Bonamici	Clark (MA)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Clarke (NY)
Brady (PA)	Cleaver
Brown (FL)	Clyburn
Butterfield	Cohen
Capps	Connolly
Capuano	Conyers
	Cooper

NAYS—156

Crowley	Cummins
Davis (CA)	Davis, Danny
DeFazio	DeGette
DeLauro	DelBene
DeSaulnier	Deutch
Dingell	Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.	Duncan (TN)

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of 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, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 251, nays 173, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 533]

YEAS—251

Abraham	Ashford	Benish
Aderholt	Babin	Bilirakis
Allen	Barletta	Bishop (MI)
Amash	Barr	Bishop (UT)
Amodei	Barton	Black