it is similar to the first. On a bipartisan basis, this House and, indeed, this Congress, come together to support the men and women who risk their lives to defend us. The world is getting more dangerous, and, unfortunately—the fault of both parties in both the executive and legislative branches of government—we cut our military too much. We are seeing the effects of that through declining readiness, through increasing accidents, and a whole variety of things where the fruits of that neglect is becoming more apparent.

But I think it is crucial, as we begin to rebuild and repair our military, that we not let other agendas, other issues, impair our ability to do so. I am concerned, for example, that some Republic-icans say: Oh, yeah, I will increase funding for defense, as long as you can cut that money in other parts of the budget.

I am concerned when Democrats say: Oh, I am for increasing defense, as long as you increase other parts of the budget.

As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, motions to instruct are, of course, non-binding. I think, in this case, the better vote to “no.” There are pro-visions dealing with this in both the House and the Senate bill. I hope that we can come to a reasonable conclusion on these provisions and the whole bill. But the goal is to defend the country and to support the men and women who serve. We can never be distracted from that goal.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The Speaker: All time is used up.

The Speaker: The motion to instruct was agreed to; the bill was ordered to the Committee on Appropriations; and the motions to recommit and to suspend were laid on the table.

The motion to instruct was agreed to; the bill was ordered to the Committee on Appropriations; and the motions to recommit and to suspend were laid on the table.

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:

The motion to instruct on H.R. 2810; The motion to permit closed conference meetings on H.R. 2810, if offered; The motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 568; and The motion to recommit on S. 585; and Passage of S. 585, if ordered.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2810, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The Speaker pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 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, offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. Langevin), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Speaker: The question is on the motion to instruct.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 184, nays 237, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 564]

YEAS—184

Adams
Aguilar
Amaro
Barger
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyar
Bezisepkis
Bouma
Brocker (CA)
Brownley (CA)
Browning (NY)
Burgos
Bustos
Butlerfield
Capuano
Carone
Cardenas
Carter (IN)
Casar
Castor (FL)
Casper (WY)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
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Mr. THORNBERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, first, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Rhode Island. As he said, we make every effort to ensure that the support for the men and women who serve in the military is on a bipartisan basis. The gentleman from Rhode Island is a key leader on a number of those issues, whether it is cyber, directed energy, and a host of others.

I appreciate the help of the Members on both sides of the aisle who have spoken. That bipartisan support is what helped lead us to pass the House version of this bill by the biggest majority in 8 years. That does not mean we agree on everything, obviously, but when it comes to supporting the military, their interests are first, and I think we need to keep it that way.

The subject of this motion to instruct is a long-running program designed to support safety programs. Whiles votes on this have gone on the floor and in committee over the years, it has never been a particularly controversial program, even though the gentleman from Rhode Island has consistently been against it from the start. The point is that in both the House and the Senate bills this year, there are provisions dealing with these programs. We come to some resolution every year, and for 55 straight years the conference report has gotten signed into law.

I would like to correct one point, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe that the Army is opposed to this program. As a matter of fact, both Mr. Rogers and I have talked to the Army about this, and they have not expressed in any sense that they are opposed to it. They were waiting to see what direction they are given, and they are happy to go implement that.

Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, our country has been buffeted by a number of tragedies: hurricanes; of course, wildfires going on now in the West. And the horrible, horrific murders in Las Vegas are much on our minds, as are the victims and the whole communities.

It is important to take time and to learn what that investigation yields so that we can, hopefully, prevent it from happening in the future. I just want to point out that there is nothing that these provisions stay or go, that is going to have any effect on an event like we just saw in Las Vegas. As a matter of fact, in the history of this program, I know of no single instance where one of these weapons that have been disposed of for gun safety programs has been used improperly. As a matter of fact, most of these weapons go up on a mantle somewhere. They are collectors items. So it would be inappropriate, in my opinion, to try to tie that horrible tragedy in Las Vegas to others, to these particular programs.

That leads me to the last point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, and
Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. KIND, Mrs. HARTZLER, Messrs. HOLLINGSWORTH, ROHRABACHER, DENHAM, DENT, and COSTELLO of Pennsylvania changed their vote from ‘yea’ to ‘nay.’ Messrs. GENE GREEN of Texas and LOEBSACK changed their vote from ‘nay’ to ‘yea.’

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO CLOSE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE MEETINGS ON H.R. 2910, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, I move that the meetings of the conference between the House and the Senate on H.R. 2910 may be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information may be discussed, provided that any sitting Member of Congress shall be entitled to attend any meeting of the conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, the motion is not debatable, and the yeas and nays are ordered.