



# Republican-led House Used 'Trickery' When Passing Military Spending Bill, Says Ron Paul

**House lawmakers slipped in \$89 billion into the 2016 National Defense Authorization Act for an emergency Overseas Contingency Operations war fund, but left out an amendment that would have allowed for a debate on ongoing military operations, the former Texas congressman wrote on the Ron Paul Institute for Peace and Prosperity website.**

By Taylor Tyler

May 20, 2015

Ron Paul says the Republican-led House of Representatives used "trickery" while passing the \$612 billion annual military spending bill on Friday.

House lawmakers slipped \$89 billion into the 2016 National Defense Authorization Act for an emergency Overseas Contingency Operations war fund, but left out an amendment that would have allowed for a debate on ongoing military operations, the [former Texas congressman wrote](#) on the Ron Paul Institute for Peace and Prosperity website.

The overseas fund is exempt from the sequestrations that went into effect in 2013, so Democrats weren't too happy that Republicans bypassed the across-the-board spending cuts to slip in billions for an unauthorized military conflict, [according to The New York Times](#).

"Such 'emergency' spending is not addressed in the growth caps placed on the military under the 2011 budget control act. It is a loophole filled by Congress with Fed-printed money," Paul explained.

Much of that \$89 billion will go to President Obama's war on the Islamic State group, which neither the House nor the Senate has debated or authorized.

"Although House leadership allowed 135 amendments to the defense bill - with many on minor issues like regulations on fire hoses - an effort by a small group of Representatives to introduce an amendment to debate the current U.S. war in Iraq and Syria was rejected," he said.

Rep. Adam Schiff, D-Calif., along with 28 other co-signers, urged Congress to perform its constitutional duty by debating and voting to authorize the use of military force against the Islamic State.

"We are deeply concerned that eight months into Operation Inherent Resolve, the House has taken no action on an Authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF) which would provide a clear legal justification for the actions against ISIL," the group said [in a letter](#) to Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio. "The most recent Legislative Memo released by the Majority Leader contains no suggestion that consideration of an AUMF on the floor is imminent. This dereliction of our constitutional duty causes great injury to the Congress, and threatens our role as a check on the president's power to make war."

Paul also mentions Obama's "unwise" decision to send hundreds of U.S. military trainers to the already unstable Ukraine region. "The military spending bill included \$300 million to directly arm the Ukrainian government even as Ukrainian leaders threaten to again attack the breakaway regions in the east," he says.

"Does Congress really think U.S.-supplied weapons killing ethnic Russians in eastern Ukraine is a good idea," Paul asks.

The spending bill would send more weapons to Iraq as well. "This time the House wants to send weapons directly to the Kurds in northern Iraq without the approval of the Iraqi government," Paul said. "Although these weapons are supposed to be used to fight ISIS, we know from too many prior examples that they often find their way into the hands of the very people we are fighting. Also, arming an ethnic group seeking to break away from Baghdad and form a new state is an unwise infringement of the sovereignty of Iraq. It is one thing to endorse the idea of secession as a way to reduce the possibility of violence, but it is quite something else to arm one side and implicitly back its demands."

Paul called out the "neocons" for continuing to claim that the military budget is shrinking under the Obama Administration, while the opposite is true, according to Paul. "As the CATO Institute pointed out recently, President George W. Bush's average defense budget was \$601 billion, while during the Obama administration the average has been \$687 billion. This bill is just another example of this unhealthy trend," he said.

Paul concluded: "Next year's military spending plan keeps the US on track toward destruction of its economy at home while provoking new resentment over US interventionism overseas. It is a recipe for disaster. Let's hope for either a presidential veto, or that on final passage Congress rejects this bad bill."

The bill passed 269 to 151 in a largely party line vote following a week of fighting over issues such as congressionally mandated spending caps and immigration.

Obama threatened to veto the legislation, which Defense Secretary Ashton B. Carter said last week was "clearly a road to nowhere."

