

74,000 square miles, an area where countless numbers of dangerous criminals fled into Indian territory to escape prosecution.

Home to Judge Parker's courthouse, Fort Smith became the center of law and order in the Western United States throughout much of the late 19th century.

Charles Portis' 1968 novel "True Grit" first introduced Fort Smith, Arkansas, to many Americans and its role in the history of the U.S. Marshals Service. An Arkansan born and raised in El Dorado, Arkansas, in my congressional district, Charles Portis later saw his novel turned into the 1969 movie starring Arkansas native and recording artist, singer Glen Campbell, and John Wayne as U.S. Marshal Rooster Cogburn; and more recently, the 2010 remake of the movie featuring Jeff Bridges in the same role.

The importance of Fort Smith, Arkansas, to the U.S. Marshals Service is in part why the city will also be home to the U.S. Marshals museum, to be funded partly by sales from the U.S. Marshals Service 225th Anniversary Commemorative Coin. When finished, the U.S. Marshals museum will be a world class national museum with over 20,000 square feet helping to share the history and legacy of the U.S. Marshals Service.

Most importantly, it will serve as a memorial for all of those within the U.S. Marshals Service who gave their lives in service to our country.

Today more than 4,000 U.S. Marshals, deputy marshals, and criminal investigators make up the modern U.S. Marshals Service, carrying out many of the duties first assigned to them more than two centuries ago.

Our U.S. Marshals and deputy marshals protect the Federal judicial system, apprehend Federal fugitives, seize property, house and transport Federal prisoners, and operate the witness security program. They continue to risk their lives to preserve and protect law and order, the very basic tenet of our American democracy and, yes, our way of life.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, which will not add a single dime to the deficit, will allow our Nation to recognize, honor, and thank the sacrifices that so many U.S. marshals and deputy marshals have made to this country over the past 225 years. It will also generate revenue from the U.S. Marshals Service 225th anniversary Commemorative Coin sales to help build a museum in their honor in Fort Smith, Arkansas, so that this generation and the generations that follow will know the truly American story of the U.S. Marshals Service.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to join my colleague from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) in offering up a bipartisan bill, and I'm asking you to join me in voting for H.R. 886, the United States Marshals Service 225th Anniversary Commemorative Coin Act. Again I'd like to thank the gentleman from Ar-

kansas, Mr. WOMACK, for his steadfast leadership and hard work to see this day become a reality.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, as we close, it is important for us to remember the history of our great country. And by celebrating the 225th anniversary of the United States Marshals Service, that's exactly what we're doing. By creating this museum for the preservation and the maintenance and the display of artifacts and documents—and it is important—the money, the first \$5 million in surcharge proceeds, will do just that.

But the money that's additionally raised will be utilized for great purposes. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children will be beneficiaries, and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association Foundation will be beneficiaries, and the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund will be beneficiaries. And they would have to raise matching funds for a coin that is sold. These coins are for sale.

So we will be able to commemorate the United States Marshals and the service that they have rendered to this country, and in addition thereto be able to support three much-needed organizations for individuals who really need the support of those three organizations.

So I ask all of my colleagues to join us on H.R. 886, the United States Marshals Service 225th Anniversary Commemorative Coin Act, and vote "aye."

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 886, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1940

DRUG TRAFFICKING SAFE HARBOR ELIMINATION ACT OF 2011

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 313) to amend the Controlled Substances Act to clarify that persons who enter into a conspiracy within the United States to possess or traffic illegal controlled substances outside the United States, or engage in conduct within the United States to aid or abet drug trafficking outside the United States, may be criminally prosecuted in the United States, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 313

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 "Drug Trafficking Safe Harbor Elimination Act of 2011".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT TO CLARIFY CONSPIRACIES CONDUCTED WITHIN THE UNITED STATES MAY BE CRIMINALLY PROSECUTED IN THE UNITED STATES.

Section 406 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 846) is amended by—

(1) inserting "(a)" before "Any"; and

(2) inserting at the end the following:

"(b) Whoever, within the United States, conspires with one or more persons, or aids or abets one or more persons, regardless of where such other persons are located, to engage in conduct at any place outside the United States that would constitute a violation of this title, other than a violation of section 404(a), if committed within the United States, shall be subject to the same penalties that would apply to such conduct if it were to occur within the United States."

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 313, as amended, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 313, the Drug Trafficking Safe Harbor Elimination Act of 2011, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and me, closes a loophole in Federal law.

Drug traffickers are currently exempt from prosecution in the United States when they conspire to traffic drugs outside of the United States. This bill clarifies Congress' intent that the drug trafficking conspiracy statute should be given extraterritorial application. A Federal criminal case demonstrates how the loophole is being exploited.

In 1998 two individuals conspired with members of a large Colombian drug trafficking organization and a Saudi Arabian prince. The goal of the conspiracy was to traffic 2,000 kilograms of cocaine, worth over \$100 million, from South America to Europe. Several meetings among the co-conspirators occurred in Miami, Florida, and elsewhere around the world. Specifically while in Miami, they planned in detail to purchase the cocaine in Colombia and ship it to Europe for distribution.

The prince used his royal jet under the cover of diplomatic immunity to transport the cocaine from Venezuela to Paris, France. Although part of the cocaine was seized by law enforcement authorities in France and Spain, about 1,000 kilograms of cocaine were distributed and sold in the Netherlands, Italy, and elsewhere in Europe.

In 2005 two of the conspirators were convicted of drug trafficking and conspiracy in the Federal district court in Florida, and each was sentenced to over 20 years in prison. However, in 2007 the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit vacated their convictions. The court reasoned that there is no violation of Federal law when, absent congressional intent, the object of the conspiracy is to possess and distribute controlled substances outside of the United States. This is true even though meetings and negotiations to further the crime occurred on U.S. soil.

Crime is usually a territorial issue, specific to the place where the crime occurs. However, drug trafficking is inherently global in nature now more than ever. In fact, two other provisions of the Controlled Substances Act are already explicitly extraterritorial as they relate to narcoterrorism, terrorism financed through drug trafficking and the foreign manufacture of drugs for importation into the United States. The primary anti-money laundering statute used in drug trafficking cases is also extraterritorial.

Three years ago, Congress enacted the Federal Maritime Drug Law Enforcement Act in response to the increase in use of vessels to traffic drugs around the world. Congress gave this law express extraterritorial effect.

Congress stated "that trafficking in controlled substances aboard vessels is a serious international problem and is universally condemned. Moreover, such trafficking presents a specific threat to the security and societal well-being of the United States."

The United States is a signatory to two major international drug-control treaties. Of the 194 countries in the world today, 184 are parties to the 1961 Convention on Narcotic Drugs, which acts as the foundation for most of the world's drug trafficking laws. Drug trafficking is a global problem, universally condemned by law-abiding nations.

Some argue that a person should not be subject to the new conspiracy offense created by this bill unless his conduct is expressly illegal in every country where the drug trafficking occurs. Such a requirement is rarely, if ever, imposed on extraterritorial statutes.

In fact, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are proponents of a number of extraterritorial laws that contain no requirement that the conduct be illegal in the country where it occurs. Such crimes include genocide, the recruitment or use of child soldiers, or the use of semi-submersible submarines.

These laws are significantly broader than the bill before us today because

they do not require any illegal conduct to occur inside the United States. H.R. 313, however, does require that the conspiracy to traffic drugs take place here in the U.S. This legislation is narrowly tailored to reach drug trafficking conspiracies that occur on U.S. soil, but which promote the global distribution of drugs. To require the government to prove that the crime violated foreign law would also render this law essentially ineffective.

Drugs are not simply manufactured in one country and sold in another. Drug shipments make several stops along the way to their final destinations. For instance, cocaine is manufactured and processed in Colombia. It will likely be shipped by ground to Venezuela. It may then be put in a shipping container, transit several Caribbean islands, and then be sent to Africa or Europe. It could be off-loaded in Spain, divided up into smaller, but substantial, shipments and wind up in a dozen European countries. The proceeds from this multi-million-dollar shipment will make their way through the banking systems of a dozen other countries before being delivered to Colombia.

The government should not be required to prove that each of these acts violated each country's laws to prove that the traffickers plotted their conspiracies inside the U.S.

This bill, as amended in the Judiciary Committee with unanimous bipartisan support, excludes conspiracies to possess drugs. This legislation aims to eliminate the safe harbor for drug traffickers and distributors whose primary motive is financial gain. If we do not pass this bill, we continue to invite drug traffickers to plan their schemes within our borders.

The United States should not provide a safe haven for the world's drug traffickers to plot their international drug trafficking operations. This common-sense bill prevents drug traffickers from benefiting from their legal exemption from prosecution, and it tells drug traffickers not to plot their illegal activities in the U.S. If they do, they will be brought to justice.

I do want to thank Mr. SCHIFF again for sponsoring this legislation with me, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-
MITTEE ON ENERGY AND COM-
MERCE,

Washington, DC, October 26, 2011.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: I am writing concerning H.R. 313, the "Drug Trafficking Safe Harbor Elimination Act of 2011," which was ordered to be reported out of your Committee on October 6, 2011. I wanted to notify you that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will forgo action on H.R. 313 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

This is being done with the understanding that the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving any of its jurisdiction, and the Committee will not in any way be prejudiced with respect to the appointment

of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding, and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 313 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-
MITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,

Washington, DC, October 26, 2011.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, House Committee on Energy and
Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 313, the "Drug Trafficking Safe Harbor Elimination Act of 2011," which was reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary on October 6, 2011. This bill was also referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

I am most appreciative of your decision to discharge the Committee on Energy and Commerce from consideration of H.R. 313 so that it may move expeditiously to the House floor. I agree that while you are waiving formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in the bill. In addition, if a conference is necessary on this bill, I will support any request to have the Committee on Energy and Commerce represented.

Finally, I would be pleased to include our exchange of letters in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of this bill.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 313, a bill that does not make us any safer. In our zealotness to make drug laws as tough as possible, we are now considering an expansion of Federal criminal law to conspiracies to engage in drug activity that occur completely out of the United States.

The reason this bill has been introduced, as the gentleman from Texas has pointed out, is at least partly due to the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals decision in 2007 in the Lopez-Vanegas case. The court overturned the conviction of two people who formed an agreement in the United States to transport cocaine from Venezuela to France. The court ruled that current law only applies to conspiracies to distribute drugs in which some of the activity occurs in the United States. Under this bill, some of the conspiracies could be prosecuted even if the drug activity that is the subject of the conspiracy is not illegal where the transaction is going to take place.

For example, the use and the production and the distribution of marijuana for medicinal purposes are all legal in a number of countries, including Canada. Canadians and other citizens involved in legal medical marijuana programs in their countries could face

Federal prosecution if they visit the United States and engage in agreements here in the United States or advance or finance their businesses in Canada. They could be discussing legal transactions in Canada, but the activity is illegal in the United States.

So the agreement in the United States under this bill would constitute an illegal conspiracy, and it would be subject to all of the criminal penalties for drug transactions. In fact, someone would be better off just going to Canada and engaging in the legal drug activity rather than simply making arrangements for the activity by discussing it in the United States.

□ 1950

Unfortunately, the committee failed to adopt an amendment to exclude discussions of activity that may be illegal in the United States but would be legal everywhere that the transaction is to take place.

Now, if one believes that we do have an interest in covering some of these conspiracies under United States law, we should at least confine the law to cover large-scale trafficking. Unfortunately, the committee failed to adopt an amendment to do that, so even small transactions get caught up by this bill, transactions that are legal where they are occurring. And when they get caught up in discussing transactions that are legal where they take place, they're subject to draconian mandatory minimum sentences.

I would note that it is an unfortunate fact that, under our criminal law, we rely too much on mandatory minimums. This bill would subject even more people to them.

Mandatory minimum sentences have been extensively studied, and the conclusions on all of those studies show that the mandatory minimums are unjust; they cause prison overcrowding and are a waste of taxpayers' money. The Federal prison population is currently over 210,000 inmates, nearly a fivefold increase in just a few decades; and that explosion in population is due, to a large extent, to mandatory minimums.

Mandatory minimums do not account for the individual circumstances of the crime or the defendant. The judicial counsel has warned us that, if a mandatory minimum sentence is appropriate, it can be imposed without a mandatory minimum. But with the mandatory minimum, if it violates common sense, it has to be imposed anyway.

In the past few years, numerous high-profile conservative leaders have expressed opposition to mandatory minimum sentencing laws. Some of those conservative expressions came from the Americans for Tax Reform president, Grover Norquist; the American Civil Rights Institute president, Ward Connerly; National Rifle Association president, David Keene; and Justice Fellowship president, Pat Nolan, all of whom have called mandatory sentences into question.

This bill is seemingly an effort to leave no stone unturned in prohibiting any drug transaction from occurring

anywhere, even if it doesn't impact the United States. There may be some parts of the bill that are worthwhile. It covers, of course, multimillion-dollar international drug conspiracies, but it also covers small transactions. And to the extent that people will be subject to long mandatory minimums for doing something that is legal, for talking about something that is legal where it is to take place, this bill makes no sense and should be defeated.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to close; so I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding. I am pleased to join with my friend, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, in supporting this bipartisan bill. Chairman SMITH has been a leader on this issue, and we worked together on it in a prior Congress.

This bill targets a narrow loophole in the Controlled Substances Act which has been exploited by drug traffickers, and the case that particularly brings home this problem is the case that the chairman mentioned.

In 1998 two individuals conspired with Colombian drug cartels to traffic 2,000 kilos of cocaine from South America to Europe. They met in Miami to work out the details of this \$100 million transaction. In 2005, following an extensive Federal investigation, they were convicted of drug trafficking and conspiracy and were sentenced to around 24 years in prison, each.

However, in 2007 the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals overturned these convictions. The court found that the way Congress had worded the conspiracy portion of the Controlled Substances Act meant that the conspiracy had to involve trafficking drugs to or from the United States, a condition that was not satisfied in that case. The result of the court's finding is that, in the United States, a drug trafficker can plan and coordinate the shipment of millions of dollars of drugs between our friends and allies yet be beyond the reach of our Nation's laws.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is clearly wrong and not the intent of Congress in passing the Controlled Substances Act. H.R. 313 would close that loophole. In doing so, it doesn't break new ground. Many criminal laws currently on our books have extra territorial reach, including some portions of the Controlled Substances Act itself.

Drug trafficking, by its very nature, is a global problem, and the laws and treaties that fight it must take that into consideration. When we look at the damage the drug cartels have inflicted in countries like Colombia and Mexico, not to mention the devastation their trade causes in the United States, the case for this bill becomes quite clear.

The bill is narrowly crafted to apply only to those who conspire to traffic or

distribute narcotics. And with the adoption of the manager's amendment in the Judiciary Committee, it was narrowed further to address concerns that conspiracy charges could apply to only those who sought to possess narcotics overseas. The bill will not open anyone to prosecution for simply discussing the possession of narcotics overseas. It deals only with commerce, not simply speech—the trafficking and distribution of drugs.

Once again, I want to thank Chairman SMITH for his leadership on this important bill, and I urge that we pass the measure.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for the time. I also want to thank the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, for the way he runs his committee. He is an outstanding chairman and a gentleman.

And I appreciate the fact that in this bill, on which the gentleman from Virginia has given much of the argument that I, otherwise, would have made about its failings, that Mr. SMITH did accept an amendment to take the possession charges out of it. So possession of drugs is not in it, and that was an improvement.

But, nevertheless, one of the amendments that we did discuss in committee that still bothers me is that the activities could have been entirely legal in the country where they took place. Amsterdam or Holland—Holland is the country which I was thinking of—the Netherlands. And we discussed it in committee. Mr. SCOTT mentioned medical marijuana being legal in Canada as well as in Israel. But a lot of drugs are legal and transactions in Holland. And if two Americans talked on the phone about going to Holland and buying some marijuana and maybe trading it with somebody else in Holland where it would be legal, it would be a violation of the law in the United States based on this particular statute. And that's what's called an overly broad law, when it captures conduct that it really isn't intended to do.

I don't think—and I hope that the people who voted for this didn't intend for it to criminalize speech when the actions in the country where the act took place were legal. I hope they wouldn't have been thinking that. And on the Judiciary Committee, in particular, we should be very, very circumscribed in what we pass because we're taking people's liberty from them. And "liberty" is one of the words inscribed up here, I think, in front of the panel. It is one of the things America holds so dear.

This Thursday, we are going to be celebrating the 220th passage of the Bill of Rights. And the Bill of Rights gives people the freedom of speech and

quite a few freedoms from government oppression and government activities.

To suggest that this is a loophole, I think, is a mistake. I think it was not intended by this Congress to criminalize behavior, particularly behavior that was legal in the country where it took place.

In the situation that the gentleman from Texas describes, where some people got together in Miami to discuss drugs from Colombia that were flown from Venezuela to France and purchased in the Netherlands, Italy, and elsewhere, I don't think that they were in Miami because they thought that was a loophole. I think they were in Miami because they liked Miami. And why wouldn't you? Miami is a great place. They weren't there because it was a loophole. They just happened to be there. And I don't think anybody foresaw that as being illegal conduct. They could have discussed that in Paris or in Caracas or anywhere else. They didn't facilitate the crime, per se. What they did was illegal in all those different countries, and they could have been prosecuted there.

I would submit to you, also, that this Nation and this world almost came to its knees because of derivatives and financial instruments created here in the United States, created here—not just talked about on Wall Street. But it had a global effect because those derivatives affected banks in Europe and all around the world. And as we almost came to our knees because of the criminal activities of people making lots of money with greed, Gekko greed, other people around the world suffered as well economically. But we're not rushing here to criminalize talks between people in Washington and Wall Street and people in Paris about derivatives, about subprime loans, about ways to make money at the expense of poor people and possibly bring the world to its knees economically; that, we're not discussing. But we are discussing the possibility of putting people in jail for going to Amsterdam and talking about buying some marijuana.

Something smells foul, and that's why I oppose the bill.

□ 2000

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just finally, we can cover the international drug conspiracies with a reasonably drawn bill. Unfortunately, this bill not only covers the international drug conspiracies, but also, as the gentleman from Tennessee has pointed out, those who are ensnared by doing things that are legal where they occur, but if you agree to do it in the United States, it is all of a sudden a drug conspiracy that'll subject you to all kinds of mandatory minimums.

I would hope that we would defeat this bill, start from scratch and draw a bill that covers what ought to be covered and leaves out what ought not be covered. Agreeing to go to Canada or

go to Amsterdam to do something which is legal ought not be a criminal conspiracy in the United States.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I hope we will defeat the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me try again to address some of the concerns of two of my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee. I want to re-emphasize that extraterritorial laws do not require that the conduct be illegal in foreign countries.

Congress has enacted numerous laws with extraterritorial effect. Our decision to do so rarely, if ever, hinges on whether the conduct is also criminalized in the foreign country.

Once again, terrorism, drug-related money laundering, genocide, child soldiers—these are all extraterritorial offenses that do not require that the conduct also be against the law in a foreign country.

Moreover, most extraterritorial statutes don't even require that the criminal engage in any illegal conduct inside the United States either. If they engage in terrorism or money laundering or genocide in a foreign country and simply come into the U.S., they can be prosecuted.

The issue of conduct being criminal in a foreign country is not addressed in extraterritorial laws but in extradition treaties.

Also, extradition treaties do not require that conduct be illegal in foreign countries. Before the U.S. can extradite anyone for violation of U.S. law, it must first establish "dual criminality" as required by most extradition treaties.

Dual criminality is the principle that a crime in one country has to be a crime in a country extraditing you.

If a drug trafficker engages in a conspiracy here in the U.S., but is later apprehended in a foreign country, the government will have to establish that dual criminality to extradite him back to the U.S.

The extradition laws and treaties among the countries of the world properly provide for this. This principle is rightly excluded from this legislation because it already exists in Federal law.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to also emphasize that the Obama administration clearly supports this legislation. The Department of Justice supported similar legislation in the last Congress, and the Department of Justice stands by its position, as expressed in the 2010 views letters, and supports this legislation tonight.

I urge my colleagues to support this very strong bipartisan piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 313, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRAN THREAT REDUCTION ACT OF 2011

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1905) to strengthen Iran sanctions laws for the purpose of compelling Iran to abandon its pursuit of nuclear weapons and other threatening activities, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1905

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Iran Threat Reduction Act of 2011".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Findings.
- Sec. 3. Statement of policy.

TITLE I—IRAN ENERGY SANCTIONS

- Sec. 101. Findings.
- Sec. 102. Sense of Congress.
- Sec. 103. Declaration of policy.
- Sec. 104. Multilateral regime.
- Sec. 105. Imposition of sanctions.
- Sec. 106. Description of sanctions.
- Sec. 107. Advisory opinions.
- Sec. 108. Termination of sanctions.
- Sec. 109. Duration of sanctions.
- Sec. 110. Reports required.
- Sec. 111. Determinations not reviewable.
- Sec. 112. Definitions.
- Sec. 113. Effective date.
- Sec. 114. Repeal.

TITLE II—IRAN FREEDOM SUPPORT

- Sec. 201. Codification of sanctions.
- Sec. 202. Liability of parent companies for violations of sanctions by foreign subsidiaries.
- Sec. 203. Declaration of Congress regarding United States policy toward Iran.
- Sec. 204. Assistance to support democracy in Iran.
- Sec. 205. Imposition of sanctions on certain persons who are responsible for or complicit in human rights abuses committed against citizens of Iran or their family members after the June 12, 2009, elections in Iran.
- Sec. 206. Clarification of sensitive technologies for purposes of procurement ban.
- Sec. 207. Comprehensive strategy to promote internet freedom and access to information in Iran.

TITLE III—IRAN REGIME AND IRAN'S ISLAMIC REVOLUTIONARY GUARD CORPS ACCOUNTABILITY

- Sec. 301. Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps.
- Sec. 302. Additional export sanctions against Iran.
- Sec. 303. Sanctions against affiliates of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps.
- Sec. 304. Measures against foreign persons or entities supporting Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps.
- Sec. 305. Special measures against foreign countries supporting Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps.