

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

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

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

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON BENGHAZI

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

HANFORD LAND TRANSFER

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

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

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

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

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 449

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

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

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

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 0915

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

A couple of points about these bills:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 0930

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

will vote for, and we should do it today.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 0945

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1000

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to

clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3611) to reauthorize and reform the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 529]

YEAS—237

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

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

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

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

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

Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky

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

Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)

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

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

NOT VOTING—17

□ 1039

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

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

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

Stated for:

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

Stated against:

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 181, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 530]

AYES—241

NAYS—180

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NOES—181

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

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

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

NOT VOTING—12

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

□ 1049

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

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

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

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

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF IRANIAN TERRORISM ACT

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

H.R. 3457

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Justice for Victims of Iranian Terrorism Act”.

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

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

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

(b) ACTIONS DESCRIBED.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) that relates to a claim—

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

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

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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