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. CROWLEY. 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

MODERNIZING GOVERNMENT TECHNOLOGY ACT OF 2016

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6004) to modernize Government information technology, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6004

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 ''Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2016'' or the ''MGT Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The Federal Government spends nearly 75 percent of its annual information technology funding on operating and maintaining existing, legacy information technology systems. These systems can pose operational risks, including rising costs and inability to meet mission requirements. These systems also pose security risks, including the inability to use current security best practices, such as data encryption and multi-factor authentication, making these systems particularly vulnerable to malicious cyber activity.

(2) In 2015, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) designated Improving the Management of IT Acquisitions and Operations to its biannual High Risk List and identified as a particular concern the increasing level of information technology spending on Operations and Maintenance making less funding available for development or modernization. The GAO also found the Government has spent billions on failed and poorly performing IT investments due to a lack of effective oversight.

(3) The Federal Government must modernize Federal IT systems to mitigate existing operational and security risks.

(4) The efficiencies, cost savings, and greater computing power, offered by modern-

ized solutions, such as cloud computing, have the potential to—

(A) eliminate inappropriate duplication and reduce costs;

(B) address the critical need for cyber security by design; and

(C) move the Federal Government into a broad, digital-services delivery model that will transform the Federal Government's ability to meet mission requirements and deliver services to the American people.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are the following:

(1) Assist the Federal Government in modernized Federal information technology to mitigate current operational and security risks.

(2) Incentivize cost savings in Federal information technology through modernization.

(3) Accelerate the acquisition and deployment of modernized information technology solutions, such as cloud computing, by addressing impediments in the areas of funding, development, and acquisition practices.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF AGENCY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION AND WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS.

(a) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEM MODERNIZATION AND WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in each covered agency an information technology system modernization and working capital fund (in this section referred to as the ''IT working capital fund'') for necessary expenses for the agency described in paragraph (3).

(2) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—Amounts may be deposited into an IT working capital fund as follows:

(A) Reprogramming of funds, including reprogramming of any funds available on the date of the enactment of this Act for the operation and maintenance of legacy information technology systems, in compliance with any applicable reprogramming law or guidelines of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(B) Transfer of funds, including transfer of any funds available on the date of the enactment of this Act for the operation and maintenance of legacy information technology systems, but only if transfer authority is specifically provided for by law.

(C) Amounts made available through discretionary appropriations.

(3) USE OF FUNDS.—An IT working capital fund established under paragraph (1) may be used, subject to the availability of appropriations, only for the following:

(A) To improve, retire, or replace existing information technology systems to improve efficiency and effectiveness.

(B) To transition to cloud computing and innovative platforms and technologies.

(C) To assist and support covered agency efforts to provide adequate, risk-based, and cost-effective information technology capabilities that address evolving threats to information security.

(D) Reimbursement of funds transferred from the Information Technology Modernization Fund established under section 4, with the approval of the agency Chief Information Officer.

(4) EXISTING FUNDS.—An IT working capital fund may not be used to supplant funds provided for the operation and maintenance of any system already within an appropriation for the covered agency at the time of establishment of the IT working capital fund.

(5) REPROGRAMMING AND TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—The head of each covered agency shall prioritize funds within the IT working capital fund to be used initially for cost savings activities approved by the covered agency Chief Information Officer, in consultation

with the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government. The head of each covered agency may—

(A) reprogram any amounts saved as a direct result of such activities for deposit into the applicable IT working capital fund, consistent with paragraph (2)(A); and

(B) transfer any amounts saved as a direct result of such activities for deposit into the applicable IT working capital fund, consistent with paragraph (2)(B).

(6) RETURN OF FUNDS.—Any funds deposited into an IT working capital fund shall be available for obligation for 3 years after the date of such deposit.

(7) AGENCY CIO RESPONSIBILITIES.—In evaluating projects to be funded from the IT working capital fund, the covered agency Chief Information Officer shall consider, to the extent applicable, guidance established pursuant to section 4(a)(1) to evaluate applications for funding from the Information Technology Modernization Fund that include factors such as a strong business case, technical design, procurement strategy (including adequate use of incremental software development practices), and program management.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 6 months thereafter, the head of each covered agency shall submit to the Director the following, with respect to the IT working capital fund for that covered agency:

(A) A list of each information technology investment funded with estimated cost and completion date for each such investment.

(B) A summary by fiscal year of the obligations, expenditures, and unused balances.

(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Director shall make the information required pursuant to paragraph (1) publicly available on a website.

(c) COVERED AGENCY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''covered agency'' means each agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MODERNIZATION FUND AND BOARD.

(a) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MODERNIZATION FUND.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury an Information Technology Modernization Fund (in this section referred to as the ''Fund'') for technology related activities, to improve information technology, to enhance cybersecurity across the Federal Government, and to be administered in accordance with guidance established by the Director of the Office of Management of Budget.

(2) ADMINISTRATION OF FUND.—The Administrator of General Services, in consultation with the Chief Information Officers Council and with the concurrence of the Director, shall administer the Fund in accordance with this subsection.

(3) USE OF FUNDS.—The Administrator of General Services shall, in accordance with the recommendations of the Information Technology Modernization Board established under subsection (b), use amounts in the Fund for the following purposes:

(A) To transfer such amounts, to remain available until expended, to the head of an agency to improve, retire, or replace existing information technology systems to enhance cybersecurity and improve efficiency and effectiveness.

(B) For the development, operation, and procurement of information technology products, services, and acquisition vehicles for use by agencies to improve Government-wide efficiency and cybersecurity in accordance with the requirements of the agencies.

(C) To provide services or work performed in support of the activities described under subparagraph (A) or (B).

(4) CREDITS; AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—

(A) CREDITS.—In addition to any funds otherwise appropriated, the Fund shall be credited with all reimbursements, advances, or refunds or recoveries relating to information technology or services provided through the Fund.

(B) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts deposited, credited, or otherwise made available to the Fund shall be available, as provided in appropriations Acts, until expended for the purposes described in paragraph (3).

(5) REIMBURSEMENT.—

(A) PAYMENT BY AGENCY.—For a product or service developed under paragraph (3), the head of an agency that uses such product or service shall pay an amount fixed by the Administrator of General Services in accordance with this subsection.

(B) REIMBURSEMENT BY AGENCY.—The head of an agency shall reimburse the Fund for any transfer made under paragraph (3)(A) in accordance with the terms established in the written agreement described in paragraph (6). Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an agency may make a reimbursement required by this subparagraph from any appropriation available for information technology activities. An obligation to make a payment under an agreement described in paragraph (6) in a future fiscal year shall be recorded pursuant to section 1501 of title 31, United States Code, in the fiscal year in which the payment is due.

(C) PRICES FIXED BY ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES.—The Administrator of General Services, in consultation with the Director, shall establish amounts to be paid by an agency and terms of repayment for use of a product or service developed under paragraph (3) at levels sufficient to ensure the solvency of the Fund, including operating expenses. Before making any changes to the established amounts and terms of repayment, the Administrator of General Services shall conduct a review and obtain approval from the Director.

(D) FAILURE TO MAKE TIMELY REIMBURSEMENT.—The Administrator of General Services may obtain reimbursement by the issuance of transfer and counterwarrants, or other lawful transfer documents, supported by itemized bills, if payment is not made by an agency—

(i) within 90 days after the expiration of a repayment period described in the written agreement described in paragraph (6)(A); or

(ii) within 45 days after the expiration of the time period to make a payment under a payment schedule for a product or service developed under paragraph (3).

(6) WRITTEN AGREEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Before the transfer of funds to an agency under paragraph (3)(A), the Administrator of General Services (in consultation with the Director) and the head of the requisitioning agency shall enter into a written agreement documenting the purpose for which the funds will be used and the terms of repayment. An agreement made pursuant to this subparagraph shall be recorded as an obligation as provided in paragraph (5)(B).

(B) REQUIREMENT FOR USE OF INCREMENTAL DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES.—For any funds transferred to an agency under paragraph (3)(A), in the absence of compelling circumstances documented by the Administrator of General Services at the time of transfer, such funds shall be transferred only on an incremental basis, tied to metric-based development milestones achieved by the agency, to be described in the written agreement required pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(7) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall publish and maintain a list of each project funded by the Fund on a public website to be updated not less than quarterly, that includes a description of the project, project status (including any schedule delay and cost overruns), and financial expenditure data related to the project.

(b) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MODERNIZATION BOARD.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an Information Technology Modernization Board (in this section referred to as the ''Board'') which shall evaluate proposals submitted by agencies for funding authorized under the Fund.

(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The responsibilities of the Board are the following:

(A) Provide input to the Director for the development of processes for agencies to submit modernization proposals to the Board and to establish the criteria by which such proposals are evaluated, which shall include addressing the greatest security and operational risks, having the greatest Governmentwide impact, and having a high probability of success based on factors such as a strong business case, technical design, procurement strategy (including adequate use of incremental software development practices), and program management.

(B) Make recommendations to the Administrator of General Services to assist agencies in the further development and refinement of select submitted modernization proposals, based on an initial evaluation performed with the assistance of the Administrator of General Services.

(C) review and prioritize, with the assistance of the Administrator of General Services and the Director, modernization proposals based on criteria established pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(D) Identify, with the assistance of the Administrator of General Services, opportunities to improve or replace multiple information technology systems with a smaller number of information technology systems common to multiple agencies.

(E) Recommend the funding of modernization projects, in accordance with the uses described in subsection (a)(3), to the Administrator of General Services.

(F) Monitor, in consultation with the Administrator of General Services, progress and performance in executing approved projects and, if necessary, recommend the suspension or termination of funding for projects based on factors such as failure to meet the terms of the written agreement described in subsection (a)(6).

(G) Monitor operating costs of the Fund.

(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The Board shall consist of 8 voting members.

(4) CHAIR.—The Chair of the Board shall be the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government.

(5) PERMANENT MEMBERS.—The permanent members of the Board shall be the following:

(A) The Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government.

(B) A senior official from the General Services Administration, who shall be appointed by the Administrator of General Services.

(6) ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE BOARD.—

(A) APPOINTMENT.—The other members of the Board shall be appointed as follows:

(i) One employee of the National Institute of Standards and Technology of the Department of Commerce, appointed by the Secretary of Commerce.

(ii) One employee of the National Protection and Programs Directorate of the Department of Homeland Security, appointed by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(iii) One employee of the Department of Defense, appointed by the Secretary of Defense.

(iv) Three Federal employees primarily having technical expertise in information technology development, financial management, cybersecurity and privacy, and acquisition, appointed by the Director.

(B) TERM.—Each member of the Board described in paragraph (A) shall serve a term of one year, which shall be renewable up to three times, at the discretion of the appointing Secretary or Director, as applicable.

(7) PROHIBITION ON COMPENSATION.—Members of the Board may not receive additional pay, allowances, or benefits by reason of their service on the Board.

(8) STAFF.—Upon request of the Chair of the Board, the Director and the Administrator of General Services may detail, on a nonreimbursable basis, any of the personnel of the Office of Management and Budget or the General Services Administration (as the case may be) to the Board to assist it in carrying out its functions under this Act.

(c) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the responsibilities described in subsection (a), the Administrator of General Services shall support the activities of the Board and provide technical support to, and, with the concurrence of the Director, oversight of, agencies that receive transfers from the Fund.

(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The responsibilities of the Administrator of General Services are to—

(A) provide direct technical support in the form of personnel services or otherwise to agencies transferred amounts under subsection (a)(3)(A) and for products, services, and acquisition vehicles funded under subsection (a)(3)(B);

(B) assist the Board with the evaluation, prioritization, and development of agency modernization proposals;

(C) perform regular project oversight and monitoring of approved agency modernization projects, in consultation with the Board and the Director, to increase the likelihood of successful implementation and reduce waste; and

(D) provide the Director with information necessary to meet the requirements of subsection (a)(7).

(d) AGENCY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''agency'' has the meaning given that term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CLOUD COMPUTING.—The term ''cloud computing'' has the meaning given that term by the National Institute of Standards and Technology in NIST Special Publication 800–145 and any amendatory or superseding document thereto.

(2) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(3) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.—The term ''information technology'' has the meaning given that term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code.

(4) LEGACY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEM.—The term ''legacy information technology system'' means an outdated or obsolete system of information technology.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 6004, the Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2016. At the beginning of this month, we released an extensive report detailing how the Office of Personnel Management allowed the sensitive and personal information of over 22 million Americans to be stolen, thereby jeopardizing our national security for more than a generation of people.

The yearlong investigation produced many findings, including the identification of a pressing need for Federal agencies to modernize legacy IT in order to mitigate the cybersecurity threat inherent in unsupported end-of-life IT systems and application. We had too many old things on our network. In other words, a reliance on legacy IT can result in security vulnerabilities where old software or operating systems are no longer supported by vendors, and aging IT infrastructure becomes difficult and expensive to secure.

We saw this firsthand with the OPM data breach where sensitive information was stored on technology so old it was difficult, and in some cases impossible, to implement security best practices like data encryption.

OPM is not alone. It is common throughout the Federal Government for agencies to struggle with legacy IT. For example, the Department of Labor had to buy spare parts on eBay because they were no longer available from the original vendor. Consider another example that our committee learned about during a hearing that highlighted a GAO report on legacy IT.

We learned DOD's Strategic Automated Command and Control System is 50 years ago old and runs on a 1970s IBM Series One computer that uses an 8-inch floppy disk. By comparison, it would take 3.2 million floppy disks to equal the memory of one flash drive.

Numerous other agencies still use Windows 3.0, which was last supported by the vendor in 2001; Windows NT, which last supported in 2004; and Windows 95, which was last supported by the vendor in 2001. The recently issued OPM report demonstrates the security risk of such legacy IT and recommends Congress consider new tools to incentivize the transition from legacy to modernized IT solutions across the Federal Government.

I am happy to say this bipartisan bill follows up on that recommendation. The MGT Act builds on bills introduced by myself and Minority Whip STENY HOYER and ideas from Federal CIO Tony Scott based on his experience in the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, the MGT Act is a key first step in beginning to modernize the Federal Government's outdated and insecure IT infrastructure. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6004.

I would like to thank a number of folks that worked hard for the past few months to bring the best ideas forward in this one bill. I want to thank Chairman CHAFFETZ and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for their leadership on this issue. I want to thank my colleague, Mr. CONNOLLY, who was the lead Democratic cosponsor.

As I said before, key portions of Mr. HOYER's bill on the ITMF legislation were included into the MGT Act. Of course, I would like to thank my dear friend and ranking member of my subcommittee, Ms. ROBIN KELLY of Illinois, along with Mr. TED LIEU of California, and especially Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY. His Innovation Initiative is a key reason that we are able to talk about this significant piece of legislation today.

Again, I would like to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6004.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6004, the Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2016.

Let me also thank my good friend and coauthor of this bill, Mr. HURD of Texas, for his leadership in shepherding this bill through our committee and now on to the floor. Sometimes, deservedly, Congress gets dinged on for not being able to get anything done. But the fact of the matter is that, below the surface, lots of things can and do get done with leadership, collaboration, and partnership. Mr. HURD of Texas epitomizes that, and my hat is off to him for his contribution on this whole front of IT modernization and helping to bring the Federal Government into the 21st century when it comes to the use of technology.

Every day Federal agencies endure cyber attacks that have the potential to cause incalculable damage to national security and the privacy of all Americans. While the Federal Government does its best to protect our critical computer networks, our efforts are often stymied by the outdated legacy information technologies in Federal agencies. Agencies spend nearly 75 percent of their IT budgets simply trying to maintain these outdated systems. Let me repeat that: in an $82 billion program for IT acquisition procurement and management, 75 percent of that budget is not spent in updating the Federal Government in cutting-edge technologies. It is spent maintaining what we have got, and in some cases, those legacy systems go back 40 and 50 years.

I am proud to lead the Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2016 with Mr. HURD of Texas to help our cyber defenders protect our most important digital resources. When you are dealing with outmoded technology, legacy systems oftentimes can't be protected. They can't be encrypted, and that makes them terribly vulnerable—low hanging fruit to those who would do harm to our country and would compromise the data of millions of Americans.

This bill in front of us marries the IT Modernization Act and the MOVE IT Act by establishing a clear role for both of these pieces of legislation in this improvement process for Federal IT systems.

The MGT Act lays the foundation for the future of IT modernization funding in the Federal Government. This bipartisan legislation will provide a mechanism for agencies to get ahead of the curve and help reduce the fiscal challenges facing every agency chief information officer, or CIO. The MGT Act will authorize a significant upfront investment to retire those vulnerable large-scale legacy systems affecting multiple agencies.

Under the guidance of an Information Technology Modernization Board, agencies will be able now to request funds to facilitate those modernization efforts—something that would absolutely be the practice in the private sector, as I know my friend, Mr. HURD of Texas, knows. If approved, those funds will be repaid through savings realized by the implementation of the more modern IT systems. The bill places an emphasis on following the practice of private industry and moving toward cloud computing solutions.

The MGT Act will allow agencies to invest savings generated through the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act, or FITARA for short, and other reforms to make investments in cloud transition.

I was delighted to be a coauthor of the FITARA Act along with DARRELL ISSA of California.

The MGT Act will establish working capital funds that will allow those agencies to use savings from new, secure systems and to reinvest in themselves, including in the movement toward the cloud. This creates incentives for agencies to find those savings and reinvest internally in themselves, creating a virtuous cycle.

The Modernizing Government Technology Act is supported by industry experts and incorporates the same sort of mechanisms the private sector often uses to secure its networks.

It is important for agencies to know that Congress not only expects agencies to implement robust, modern cyber safeguards, but that it is here to help them confront these challenges. This reform has the potential to significantly speed up the Federal Government's move to the 21st century technologies.

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

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), my friend, pointed out, the GAO has identified that millions of taxpayer dollars can be saved through consolidating data centers and modernizing IT systems.

□ 1415

To date, agencies have closed over 3,000 data centers out of over 10,000, resulting in a savings of $2.8 billion.

This bill authorizes agency-level working capital funds, as well as a centralized IT modernization fund within Treasury and overseen by OMB. These funds will accelerate our transition to modernize IT systems and will save American taxpayers millions of dollars. In other words, welcome to the 21st century, Federal Government. It is about time you got here.

The Modernizing Government Technology Act does not appropriate any new money, but, instead, builds on the successes of FITARA, which Mr. CONNOLLY was instrumental in making happen. It also invests savings in retiring these data systems and accelerating our transition to the cloud.

Folks recognize that sometimes up here in Washington, D.C., it can be a circus, but there are times when folks working together can actually solve major problems. This is one example of being in a partisan part of our election cycle where people working together can solve a big problem and do it to make sure that we are using American taxpayer dollars wisely and eventually, hopefully, making sure they keep some of that at home.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank my good friend from Texas. He is always gracious and has always been a wonderful partner in this enterprise.

In closing, the United States Government must come into the 21st century. We owe it to the people we serve to protect the systems that operate within the 24 Federal agencies we are particularly concerned about.

We need to streamline management of IT assets; we need to make strategic and wise investments; we need to have a schedule of replacement for most of those legacy systems; and we need to encrypt and protect against cyber attacks for the sake of the American people. I think Mr. HURD and I share that as a critical mission not only for this Congress, but for the United States Government as a whole.

I am proud, again, to be an original coauthor and cosponsor of this legislation, working with Mr. HURD. I know we have other initiatives we are going to be working on as well.

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

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6004, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGE ON H.R. 1777, PRESIDENTIAL ALLOWANCE MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2016

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the order of the House of July 25, 2016, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the veto message and the bill, H.R. 1777, be postponed until the legislative day of December 9, 2016.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1625

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia) at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 879, by the yeas and nays;

Adoption of House Resolution 879, if ordered;

Passage of H.R. 5719, by the yeas and nays; and

Motions to suspend the rules on: H.R. 5320, H.R. 5946, H.R. 2285, H.R. 5523, H.R. 5625, S. 1550, H.R. 4419, and H.R. 5963, each by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5931, PROHIBITING FUTURE RANSOM PAYMENTS TO IRAN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 879) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5931) to provide for the prohibition on cash payments to the Government of Iran, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 175, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 542]

YEAS—236

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
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
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
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
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
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
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder