

in projects that rely on clean water. S.J. Res. 22 is not an act of good governance. If the President were presented with S.J. Res. 22, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

There is broad opposition to this disapproval resolution from the conservation, consumer, science, and recreational sports communities including: Clean Water Action, Earthjustice, Greenpeace, League of Conservation Voters, Natural Resources Defense Council, Sierra Club, Southern Environmental Law Center, Consortium of Aquatic Science Societies, American Fly Fishing Trade Association, International Federation of Fly Fishers, Backcountry Hunters & Anglers, The Izaak Walton League, National Wildlife Federation, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, and Trout Unlimited.

I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 583, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

IRAN TERROR FINANCE TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 583, I call up the bill (H.R. 3662) to enhance congressional oversight over the administration of sanctions against certain Iranian terrorism financiers, 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 583, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3662

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 "Iran Terror Finance Transparency Act".

SEC. 2. CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR REMOVAL OF FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS, INCLUDING IRANIAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS, FROM THE LIST OF SPECIALLY DESIGNATED NATIONALS AND BLOCKED PERSONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—On or after July 19, 2015, the President may not remove a foreign financial institution, including an Iranian finan-

cial institution, described in subsection (b) from the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Asset Control of the Department of the Treasury unless and until the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a certification described in subsection (c) with respect to the foreign financial institution.

(b) COVERED INSTITUTIONS.—A foreign financial institution, including an Iranian financial institution, described in this subsection is a foreign financial institution listed in Attachment 3 or Attachment 4 to Annex II of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

(c) CERTIFICATION.—The President may remove a foreign financial institution, including an Iranian financial institution, described in subsection (b) from the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Asset Control of the Department of the Treasury if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a certification that the foreign financial institution—

(1) has not knowingly, directly or indirectly, facilitated a significant transaction or transactions or provided significant financial services for or on behalf of—

(A) Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps or any of its agents or affiliates whose property or interests in property are blocked pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(B) a foreign terrorist organization for or on behalf of a person whose property or interests in property have been blocked pursuant to Executive Order 13224 (66 Fed. Reg. 49079; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism); and

(C) a person whose property or interests in property are blocked pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act in connection with Iran's proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction, or to further Iran's development of ballistic missiles and destabilizing types and amounts of conventional weapons; and

(2) no longer knowingly engages in illicit or deceptive financial transactions or other activities.

(d) FORM.—A certification described in subsection (c) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term "foreign financial institution" has the meaning given such term in section 1010.605 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) FOREIGN TERRORIST ORGANIZATION.—The term "foreign terrorist organization" means any organization designated by the Secretary of State as a foreign terrorist organization in accordance with section 219(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189(a)).

(3) IRANIAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term "Iranian financial institution" has the meaning given the term in section 104A(d)(3) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513b(d)(3)).

SEC. 3. CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR REMOVAL OF CERTAIN FOREIGN PERSONS FROM THE LIST OF SPECIALLY DESIGNATED NATIONALS AND BLOCKED PERSONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—On or after July 19, 2015, the President may not remove a foreign person described in subsection (b) from the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Asset Control of the Department of the

Treasury until the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a certification described in subsection (c) with respect to the foreign person.

(b) COVERED PERSONS AND ENTITIES.—A foreign person described in this subsection is a foreign person listed in Attachment 3 or Attachment 4 to Annex II of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

(c) CERTIFICATION.—The President may remove a foreign person described in subsection (b) from the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Asset Control of the Department of the Treasury if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a certification that the foreign person—

(1) has not knowingly assisted in, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or financial or other services to or in support of terrorism or a terrorist organization; and

(2) has not knowingly engaged in significant activities or transactions that have materially contributed to the Government of Iran's proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or their means of delivery (including missiles capable of delivering such weapons), including any efforts to manufacture, acquire, possess, develop, transport, transfer, or use such item.

(d) FORM.—A certification described in subsection (c) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term "foreign person"—

(A) means—

(i) an individual who is not a United States person;

(ii) a corporation, partnership, or other nongovernmental entity which is not a United States person; or

(iii) any representative, agent or instrumentality of, or an individual working on behalf of a foreign government; but

(B) does not include a foreign financial institution, including an Iranian financial institution, described in section 2(b).

(2) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term "United States person" means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

SEC. 4. CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR REMOVAL OF DESIGNATION OF IRAN AS A JURISDICTION OF PRIMARY MONEY LAUNDERING CONCERN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President may not remove the designation of Iran as a jurisdiction of primary money laundering concern pursuant to section 5318A of title 31, United States Code, unless the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a certification described in subsection (b) with respect to Iran.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—The President may remove the designation of Iran as a jurisdiction of primary money laundering concern if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a certification that the Government of Iran is no longer engaged in support for terrorism, pursuit of weapons of mass destruction, and any illicit and deceptive financial activities.

(c) FORM.—The certification described in subsection (b) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

SEC. 5. APPLICABILITY OF CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF CERTAIN AGENCY RULE-MAKING RELATING TO IRAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any rule to amend or otherwise alter a covered regulatory provision as defined in subsection (c) that is published on or after the date of the enactment of this Act shall be deemed to be a rule or major rule (as the case may be) for purposes of chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, and shall be subject to all applicable requirements of chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the head of the applicable department or agency of the Federal Government shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the operation of the licensing system under each covered regulatory provision as defined in subsection (c) for the preceding 2-year period, including—

(1) the number and types of licenses applied for;

(2) the number and types of licenses approved;

(3) a summary of each license approved;

(4) a summary of transactions conducted pursuant to a general license;

(5) the average amount of time elapsed from the date of filing of a license application until the date of its approval;

(6) the extent to which the licensing procedures were effectively implemented; and

(7) a description of comments received from interested parties about the extent to which the licensing procedures were effective, after the applicable department or agency holds a public 30-day comment period.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “covered regulatory provision” means any provision of part 535, 560, 561, or 1060 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as such part was in effect on June 1, 2015.

SEC. 6. PROHIBITIONS AND CONDITIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN ACCOUNTS HELD BY FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

Section 104(c)(2)(A)(ii) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513(c)(2)(A)(ii)) is amended by adding at the end before the semicolon the following: “, including Hezbollah, Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, and any affiliates or successors thereof”.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” has the meaning given the term in section 14(2) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(2) JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION.—The term “Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action” means the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna 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, and transmitted by the President to Congress on July 19, 2015, pursuant to section 135(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–17; 129 Stat. 201).

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. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to submit any 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. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to recognize Congressman RUSSELL for his work on this legislation, the Iran Terror Finance Transparency Act. I think we should all reflect on the reason for this resolution, one of the reasons, and that is that, since the Obama administration sealed the nuclear deal with Iran, Iran has been on a bit of a tear. It has accelerated its missile program at the request of President Rouhani. It has taken an additional American hostage. It has stepped up the slaughter in Syria.

Days after that agreement was finalized, you had Iranian rockets firing 1,500 yards off the U.S. aircraft carrier *Truman*. And just yesterday, Iran detained 10 U.S. sailors, which was not appreciated, especially coming on the aftermath of firing those rockets near the *Truman*.

Now, we are all relieved to learn this morning that the sailors have been released. Yet, in what could be a matter of days, Iran will cash in with \$100 billion-plus in sanctions relief of money which is now in escrow. And I am sure it has occurred to many of us that if Iran behaves this way now, in a few days, when it gets its hands on this bankroll, especially given the fact that that money is going to the IRGC, not to the Iranian people, what other actions are we going to see from the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps?

We had a story this weekend, front page, in the weekend edition of *The Wall Street Journal*, and the headline of that story is “Nuclear Deal Fuels Iran’s Hard-Liners.” Iran’s hard-liners will be the biggest winner out of this.

The Revolutionary Guards, the same radical forces that held these 10 U.S. sailors, that force and their proxies control many of the industries that will benefit from the influx of hard currency and new investment. Whether it is energy or construction, they control it. This ICBM program, they control it.

□ 1030

Just as many of us warned prior to this deal about the appetite for enforcement, once this deal gets underway, there is no pushback from the administration on this. Since the nuclear deal, Iran has tested two ballistic missiles. Now, that is in violation of the U.N. Security Council resolution. This administration’s response was to an-

nounce and then abandon new sanctions within a very short timeframe, apparently to not offend the Supreme Leader, to not risk its flawed nuclear deal.

When it comes to Iran, we need a policy of more backbone, not more backing down, because it was not supposed to be this way with this deal. In announcing the nuclear deal, President Obama claimed that American sanctions on Iran for its support of terrorism, its human rights abuses, and its ballistic missile program will continue to be fully enforced. Those were the President’s words, and just after that, with Secretary Kerry’s argument testifying before the Foreign Affairs Committee.

This legislation is a first step in holding the administration to these commitments. Under the bill, before the President can lift sanctions on a particular person or bank or company to implement the nuclear deal, he must certify that their removal is related to Iran’s nuclear program alone. That is who we were told would be getting the sanctions relief—not those tied to terrorism, not those tied to Iran’s ballistic missile or other illicit weapons programs that were under sanction from the U.N. resolutions.

When the Treasury Department sanctioned Bank Melli in 2007, it noted that the institution had provided banking services to the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps and the Quds Force. The Quds Force is in charge of assassinations outside of Iran. As we all know, the Revolutionary Guards have committed acts of terrorism and committed those missile tests that we just recently saw. Why, then, is this bank set to receive sanctions relief in the coming days?

Bank Sepah, one of Iran’s largest banks, will be another big winner of sanctions relief in the coming days. When that bank was designated, and that was January of 2007, then-Treasury Under Secretary Stuart Levey noted with this argument: “Bank Sepah is the financial linchpin of Iran’s missile procurement network.”

What we have to think about here is there is one reason—one reason—why a state develops ICBMs. It is to deliver a nuclear payload. It is to deliver a weapon. So, he says it is the financial linchpin and “has actively assisted Iran’s pursuit of missiles capable of carrying weapons of mass destruction.”

Indeed, Iran’s ballistic missile program is advancing under President Rouhani. He just called for the program to be accelerated. That is what we have in the face of this agreement. We should not be letting this bank off the ropes, opening it for business from Europe to Asia.

To be clear, those Iranian banks and individuals not supporting terrorism and not supporting ICBMs can be delisted—that was what was originally represented to this Congress—but not those threatening our national security, and not those making threats to

us while the Ayatollah is saying “death to America,” “death to Israel.”

That is what this legislation does, and it is the policy that the administration explained to this House.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,

Washington, DC, January 8, 2016.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing concerning H.R. 757, the North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act of 2015, and H.R. 3662, the Iran Terror Finance Transparency Act, both of which were referred to the Committee on Financial Services in addition to your Committee.

As a result of your having consulted with the Committee on Financial Services concerning provisions of the bills that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to discharge our Committee from further consideration of the bills so that they may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor. The Committee on Financial Services takes this action with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing consideration of H.R. 757 and H.R. 3662 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 757 and H.R. 3662 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in your Committee's report to accompany the legislation and in the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, January 8, 2016.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, House Committee on Financial Serv-
ices, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 3662, the Iran Terror Finance Transparency Act, and for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of that bill.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 3662 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with your Committee as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this measure.

First, I do want to thank my good friend, Chairman ED ROYCE. It is not very often we find ourselves on different sides of foreign affairs issues, which is a credit to the way he runs our committee; but in this case, in my view, this bill isn't the right fit or the right approach.

We should go back to the drawing board, rather than ramming through a partisan measure that will never become law. We should go through our normal process of drafting legislation in a bipartisan way with input from both sides, rather than advancing something that was put together without a single Democrat having any input whatsoever. As a result, this bill does not have a single Democratic co-sponsor.

If we are going to pass legislation like this, it only works if we do it in a bipartisan way—as Americans—not as Democrats or Republicans. We should come back here with a bipartisan bill that can actually move forward, just as we have done again and again and again on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

The question here is not whether Iran is a good player. Iran is a bad player. In fact, it is a terrible player. It is important that we do act on the challenge of Iran. Like Chairman ROYCE, I oppose the Iran deal, but our side lost the debate. The deal is in place. Now we need to make sure that Iran is living up to its commitments under that deal, that every word of the deal is enforced, that we crack down on Iran's other bad behavior, and that we take steps to shore up the security of Israel and our other allies in the region. That is the kind of bill I want to support, and we can do it together.

This bill doesn't address any of the issues. Instead, this bill would establish an impossible standard for the President. The bill says that, in order to remove a person or a company from the nuclear sanctions list, the President would have to certify that the person or company never, at any point, engaged in sanctionable behavior, including support for Iran's weapons of mass destruction programs. Well, if they had never engaged in sanctionable behavior, why would they be on the sanctions list in the first place? It just doesn't make sense, Mr. Speaker.

Now, this could be a drafting flaw or it could be just about embarrassing the President, but it would make it impossible for the United States to meet its obligations under the JCPOA. That worries me because, rather than holding Iran's feet to the fire and strengthening oversight, we seem to be going down the same path we have taken with the Affordable Care Act. Sixty-two times we voted to repeal it. A couple of months ago, we had a vote which essentially repeals the JCPOA, and now we are doing it a second time. Will

we do it 60 more times? It is a waste of all of our time. Let's put our heads together and come up with a bipartisan bill that really works.

Now, 62 times to vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act; my opinion is, those were symbolic votes because we knew the President would never repeal his own bill. Today, this is a symbolic vote because we know the President is never going to sink his own agreement. My constituents don't want symbolic votes, Mr. Speaker. They want results. Symbolic votes won't help us crack down on Iran's support for terrorism or their other dangerous behavior.

Again, I am confident that we can work in a bipartisan way to craft legislation. We have done it again and again and again on the Foreign Affairs Committee. Just look at the Iran sanctions bill that Chairman ROYCE and I wrote in 2013. It passed unanimously out of the Foreign Affairs Committee—unanimously. And we have people who believe in their politics from the right to the left and everywhere in between, but it was unanimous because we did it in a bipartisan way and it made sense. It came to the floor, and it passed by a vote of 400–8. That is the kind of thing we should be doing now on this very serious issue.

So if we are serious about this issue, that is the approach we need to take. I am confident that in the days ahead, I will be working with Chairman ROYCE and all of our Members to bring forward good, bipartisan legislation, but this bill is the wrong way to go.

I don't impugn anybody's motives. I know people worked hard on this. But this is just simply, in my opinion, the wrong way to go. So, Mr. Speaker, I will vote against it, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL), the author of this legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, 19 August 2015, and I quote the President of the United States:

I made sure that the United States reserved its right to maintain and enforce existing sanctions and even to deploy new sanctions to address those continuing concerns, which we fully intend to do when circumstances warrant.

It is imperative that we take steps to deal with Iran's destabilizing activities and support for terrorism. This involves continued enforcement of international and United States law, including sanctions related to Iran's nonnuclear activities.

I am quoting the President:

We will maintain powerful sanctions targeting Iran's support for groups such as Hezbollah, its destabilizing role in Yemen, its backing of the Assad regime, its missile program, and its human rights abuses at home.

This was in direct response, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman who is saying that he is not for upholding these things today. We had many in a bipartisan fashion who voted against this agreement. The President has stated clearly that, under the terms of the

Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, he would not interfere with the terrorist list, that he would not interfere with the human rights list.

But the simple fact is—and I have read every single word of the joint agreement—there are hundreds of people in Annex II on that sanctions list. Among them are more than 50 that are on the terrorist list and the human rights list as violators. The President said that they will not be lifted off, and yet there they are. That is what this bill does.

It is interesting that last week—and I quote a letter by our esteemed colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker—and here is the letter that they sent to the President of the United States reinforcing why this bill is such a good idea:

Iran's destabilizing behavior in the region and continued support for terrorism represent an unacceptable threat to our closest allies as well as our own national security. As the international community prepares for implementation of the joint agreement, Iran must understand that violating international laws, treaties, and agreements will have serious consequences. We call on the administration—this is their words, Mr. Speaker—to immediately announce new, U.S. sanctions against individuals and entities involved in Iran's ballistic missile program to ensure Iran is held accountable for its actions.

I continue to quote this letter:

Inaction from the United States would send the misguided message that, in the wake of the joint agreement, the international community has lost the willingness to hold the Iranian regime accountable for its support for terrorism and other offensive actions throughout the region—including Syria, Yemen, Lebanon, and the Gaza Strip. This behavior—including ballistic missile tests, as the chairman spoke about—poses a direct threat to American national security interests and those of our allies.

Mr. Speaker, this was signed by Representative LOWEY; our esteemed colleague that is at the podium now on the other side of the aisle, Mr. ENGEL; the leader of the Democratic National Committee for Congress, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ; and our esteemed colleagues Mr. SIRES, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. NADLER.

Do you know what? We agree with them. We agree totally with them that these sanctions should be upheld, that the law is the law, and that the 2010 Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act is still the law. That is what this bill does.

There have been claims that it was not done in a bipartisan fashion, and I find this somewhat puzzling because I personally talked to Mr. ENGEL about this bill. I went item by item through it and what its content was. I reached out to the Democratic leadership in August. I have been working this bill since July. So, yes, we can do it in a bipartisan fashion.

I regret, because I am a freshman and only have fought on three continents and have a foreign affairs and national

security background, that I am not on the Foreign Affairs Committee. But that doesn't denote, Mr. Speaker, a lack of understanding of the way the world works and what the threat is in the United States of America when we have made a law that says that, if you are a terrorist or a human rights violator, we are not going to allow you to have sanctions relief under the JCPOA. The President said that that is what he is going to do. Democrats and Republicans have said that is what they will uphold. That is what this bill does, and yet we see, puzzlingly, opposition to these very things.

Here is what the bill is: Annex II of the joint agreement lifts sanctions for hundreds of individuals for nuclear proliferation or human rights violation or terrorist violation. More than 50 of these individuals and entities have been identified on the joint agreement for sanctions relief. This simply requires that, before those are delisted, the President certify why. It doesn't say they can never come off. Read section 4. It is pretty clear. It says that the President must certify justification on why that is the case.

What this bill is not: a knee-jerk reaction, a partisan ploy that is quickly crafted due to recent events. We have been working for months on this.

The bill was crafted without major efforts—not true, as I have proven this morning. This is upholding the law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we have the discussion. I know my colleagues feel deeply about this. I know that they also would like to see this continued. Let's pass this bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), my friend and colleague. He is a very valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

□ 1045

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the ranking member, Mr. ENGEL, for his leadership today.

I deeply appreciate the bipartisan way that he and Chairman ROYCE have run our committee when it comes to the goal that we all share of preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. I am also grateful for the commitment that my friend Mr. RUSSELL has made to this same issue and to his service to our country.

This legislation, unfortunately, doesn't advance this goal that we share, nor does it prevent Iran's other provocative, illegal, and destabilizing regional activities.

I opposed the nuclear deal. I have been clear about my concerns with the deal itself and with what Iran might try to do with billions of dollars in sanctions relief. I have also been clear about my frustration that the ballistic missile tests undertaken by Iran in violation of U.S. and international law have not yet resulted in sanctions either by the United Nations Security Council or by the administration.

Given the dangerous behavior that we have seen out of Iran in the past months and weeks with respect to its illicit ballistic missile program and its continued funding of Hezbollah in Syria, we should be working together to put forward legislation that strengthens the enforcement of the JCPOA and prevents Iran from continuing its sponsorship of terror, its illegal missile development, and its gross human rights violations. This bill, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, doesn't do any of those things.

Some of my colleagues claim the bill will prevent entities from getting sanctions relief under the deal that have ties to terrorism or WMD proliferation. I expressed directly to the administration that they need to ensure that any entity that is subject to sanctions relief under the nuclear deal be carefully investigated and resanctioned if they are found to be engaging in support for terrorism or human rights abuses, but this bill doesn't do that.

Instead, it requires certification that the 400 entities named in the JCPOA have never engaged in activities related to terrorism or the development of weapons of mass destruction. This standard will result in the administration devoting significant time and resources to a certification that can never be met, while also preventing—importantly preventing—implementation of the JCPOA. Instead of devoting the necessary resources to sanctioning individuals and entities that support terrorism and violate human rights—dangerous activities that were never part of the nuclear deal—it devotes enormous resources to a process that won't accomplish that. Iran must pay the price for its continued bad behavior.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today adds several of Iran's terrorist proxies to the banking provisions of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act, one of our most important sanctions laws. Of course we want to stop banks from facilitating transactions to these terrorist organizations; but, unfortunately, some of our European friends attempt to distinguish between the military and political wings of terrorist groups. They shouldn't. There is no distinction. I have spoken out against this policy.

Nevertheless, because of this discrepancy, by naming these specific terrorist groups in CISADA, this bill has the potential to cut off European banks from the U.S. financial system. Now is the time, Mr. Speaker, for us to be working with our allies to craft the toughest international sanctions to crack down on Iran's dangerous activities.

Mr. Speaker, whether you supported this deal or not, as Mr. ENGEL said, it is going forward.

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

Mr. ENGEL. I yield the gentleman from Florida an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank my friend.

We should be looking for bipartisan ways to ensure that it is enforced with vigor and with the most stringent verification and compliance. If a violation occurs or if Iran continues to engage in illegal activities that were never a part of this nuclear deal, we must ensure that we have the tools to enact punishing new sanctions, hopefully, with the support of our international partners, but certainly with the full, bipartisan support of the United States Congress.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak about Iran on the floor of the U.S. House without making clear that every one of us—435 Members of the House of Representatives—stand united in our commitment to bringing home from Iran Jason Rezaian, Amir Hekmati, Saeed Abedini, Siamak Namazi, and, my constituent, Bob Levinson. They sit in Iran, but we look forward to welcoming them home.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time and for his work on this legislation.

I do want to comment that the ranking member, Mr. ENGEL, I value his wisdom on the issue of Iran, and especially in defense of Israel. We happen to disagree on this specific legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the nuclear agreement that the administration made with Iran was still a bad deal for America. As a former judge down in Texas, I know that when the bad guys do bad things, you don't reward bad conduct.

At a time when the administration needs to be strong and firm, it seems to be showing wobbly knees on this deal. Now we are left with a deal where the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism is only a few small steps away from a nuclear bomb. The administration's continued leniency with Iran is conceding even more than what is required in the deal. The administration is making this bad deal even worse.

The President promised the American people that this bad deal still allows nonnuclear-related sanctions on Iran. Good for the President. Great promise.

Iran, not to the shock of any of us, has violated some of the rules that they are to abide by. They violated two U.N. resolutions restricting ballistic missile tests last month.

The Treasury Department told Congress it would levy new sanctions on Iran, primarily financial sanctions. That would support the President's promise to America. But at the last minute, the State Department got involved and said, whoa, no sanctions, not so fast—and no sanctions. More shaky knees, Mr. Speaker.

Why does the administration waffle on calling Iran out for violations? America's national security interests seem to take a backseat to confronting Iran politically.

I support H.R. 3662. This is an important bill to ensure the President can't lift sanctions on those institutions and individuals who are involved in terrorism. Remember, Mr. Speaker, Iran is still the number one world state sponsor of terrorism, and they are continuing their mischief throughout the world. We don't need to make it easier for Iran's terrorist proxies to get even more money than the \$150 billion that they are getting in the deal.

With this bill, the President must prove to Congress that a person or entity has not given financial or materiel support to a terrorist organization before removing them from the sanctions list. Sounds logical to me, Mr. Speaker.

Sanctions unrelated to the nuclear deal must remain in place. The national security of the United States is at stake.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), my friend and colleague, and a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague.

I rise in strong opposition to this deeply misguided legislation.

Reports from international experts, nuclear watchdogs, and representatives of our international coalition make clear that Iran is on its way to fully dismantling its nuclear weapons program. Breakout times at this moment have already been tripled and quadrupled.

We need to understand, just because the JCPOA does not deal with all of Iran's abuses doesn't mean that we shouldn't solve the nuclear issue. We have already had that debate. Iran is still a state sponsor of terrorism, and the proposed expansion of its ballistic missile program is particularly troubling. These issues must be addressed.

But a nuclear-armed Iran would only make these abuses more dangerous, and it would be wildly foolish to suggest that we must forego our only real opportunity to keep a nuclear weapon out of the regime's hands just because these ancillary issues remain. This bill would do exactly that. It would scuttle the JCPOA, the result of years of international negotiation and diplomacy in cooperation with our international partners. Absent the nuclear agreement, Iran could resume its nuclear program without international oversight, could go back to that 3-month breakout time, and, by the way, continue the state sponsorship of terrorism, continue its human rights abuses, and continue its ballistic missile expansion.

In short, this bill would snatch the feet from the jaws of victory as the dismantling of Iran's nuclear program proceeds. It would be reckless in the extreme, and I strongly urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), a member of the Com-

mittee on Ways and Means, and the co-sponsor of this bill.

Mr. ROSKAM. Thank you, Chairman ROYCE, for your leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Mr. RUSSELL's initiative.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, there was a murmur throughout the room here when the President was giving the State of the Union message. I am paraphrasing, but when he made the assertion that essentially the United States is perceived well around the world and, in fact, better than ever before, there was an audible sense of outcry. People were really concerned about that assertion. Then the President went on to make his point.

I think it is an admonition for us all to recognize, as Judge POE said a couple of moments ago, there is a wobbliness in this administration. In other words, how many provocations are the Iranians able to move forward and the administration is inert? How many provocations can the Iranians push and the administration remains with no action?

I will tell you something. This is just off the news. Reuters is reporting that the Major General Hassan Firouzabadi, the head of the Iranian Armed Forces, says that the naval incident that is being reconciled today, that this should be a lesson to whom? To troublemakers in Congress—troublemakers in Congress—who oppose Iranian aggression.

I think Mr. RUSSELL's approach here is very commonsense. It says those who have been complicit in sponsoring terror in the past ought not be getting the benefit of the sanctions regime being raised; they don't get the benefit of participating in that. This has to be certified clearly, according to Mr. RUSSELL's language, and it makes all the sense in the world.

The notion that somehow the administration is incapable of doing this I don't find persuasive. I think we need an administration that can make these certifications, that does make these certifications, and if they can't, then these terror financiers ought not be getting the benefit of sanctions relief.

I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), a very valued member of our committee and ranking member on the Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I voted for every sanctions bill on Iran that has come to this floor—I helped draft many of them—and I am ready to help draft, work on, and vote for sanctions bills on Iran because Iran continues its behavior in the area of missiles, and terrorism, and keeps seizing American hostages. I am ready to work on and support legislation to impose sanctions on Iran even if it is opposed by the administration. After all, almost every sanctions bill passed by this Congress was opposed either by the George W.

Bush administration or this administration.

We need a good process to draft good legislation that will do what President Obama told us we would do, and that is use sanctions to deal with Iran's non-nuclear wrongdoing. But we need a good process that will get us good legislation. Unfortunately, this is a bill that is the product of a bad process, a flawed process, and the bill itself is flawed.

Let's look at the process.

Almost 100 cosponsors, but all of them from one party. No Democrat on the Foreign Affairs Committee was invited to help draft the legislation or even invited to cosponsor it. Now this bill comes to the floor under a closed rule, a rule that prevents us from offering amendments that will deal with the flaws in the bill. There are at least two such flaws.

The first is that the bill deprives the President of the authority to delist 489 entities. It locks those entities onto the SDN list, but it leaves out 269 other entities, creating two classes of entities: one which must stay on the list under almost any circumstance I can think of, the other which the President can remove. And there is no particular reason for the 269 entities to be treated differently than the 489. All of them have been involved in supporting Iran's proliferation and terrorist efforts.

□ 1100

Second, this bill creates too high a standard for the President to be able to remove an entity. He has to certify that it has never at any time in history engaged in even the most trivial transaction with a whole list of terrorist entities. We need a better drafting of that portion of the bill that deals with delisting entities, perhaps entities that have changed their behavior for well over a decade.

I look forward to a bipartisan process and to, hopefully, an open rule. We see that reflected in the fact that I have introduced legislation, as just an example, that would impose additional sanctions on Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps and that is sponsored by the chairman of our committee and by the immediate past chairman of our committee.

I know our committee can work in a bipartisan way to create better legislation than that which is before us, and we need additional sanctions on Iran drafted carefully because Iran has engaged in a missile test in violation of U.N. Security Council resolutions, because Iran's support for terrorism and Assad is responsible for the deaths of tens and tens of thousands—hundreds of thousands—of people in Syria and Yemen and because Iran used to hold four, but now holds five, American hostages. Fortunately, it does not hold our U.S. Navy sailors, but it holds five American civilians.

It is consistent with American policy and with this administration's policy. They negotiated a nuclear deal. They

kept it only on the nuclear issue not because America has conceded and has accepted and has given Iran carte blanche to engage in terrorism and hostage-taking, but because the President's policy was that we would deal with these issues separately. It is time for us to deal with these issues separately through well-drafted, bipartisan legislation.

I am confident that, in the weeks to come, the administration will use its existing power to sanction additional entities as a result of Iran's illegal missile test, and I am confident that our committee will craft bipartisan legislation that will do what we know we need to do to deal with Iran's wrongdoing outside the nuclear area.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. TROTT. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3662.

When President Obama announced the nuclear agreement, he promised that sanctions against Iran's support of terrorism, human rights abuses, and its ballistic missile program would continue to be enforced. All this bill does is require the President to keep his word.

If the bill passes, the President won't be able to give Hezbollah, Hamas, and other terrorist groups billions of dollars. They will not be able to use billions of dollars to continue testing long-range missiles in violation of U.N. resolutions.

Who can disagree with this goal? The President probably disagrees.

Some suggest that, if the bill reaches his desk, he will veto it. All we in Congress can do is to try and remind the President about his promises surrounding this deal.

This might also be a good time to remind the President about Iran's behavior over the past 2 months. They convicted and imprisoned one of our journalists. They detained another American. They released five al Qaeda prisoners. They have not released the four Americans they have been holding for years. They have tested their ballistic missiles. They fired a missile that came close to one of our naval vessels. And in the last 24 hours, they held 10 American sailors.

It may well be true that neither Iran's behavior nor this bill will cause the President to realize he made a mistake in trusting Iran. I will rely on historians for that.

It is unfortunate that this debate and this bill are necessary to remind the President that we expect him to keep his promise, his promise to withhold billions of dollars in sanctions relief that Iran will otherwise use to spread terror and will use to develop ballistic missiles that are aimed at our shores.

Ranking Member ENGEL may be correct in that our actions today are symbolic, but we troublemakers in Con-

gress have no choice. Whenever possible, we must try to remind the President that he cannot do a good deal with a bad guy.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3662.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE). The gentleman from New York has 14½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce's Subcommittee on the Environment and the Economy.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. I appreciate the chairman's leadership. The gentleman knows how hard I work in supporting freedom and of my opposition to totalitarian regimes.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we passed H.R. 757, the North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act. Unfortunately, I missed that vote—that happens here sometimes—and the gentleman knows how I fully support it.

Again today we address a problem with a rogue regime: Iran. I voted against the flawed Iranian deal. Iran still holds a marine veteran, a contractor, an American pastor, and a Washington Post reporter. They have tested two ballistic missiles. Sanctions should not be waived by the U.S. That is why I support this bill.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART), a member of the Committee on Appropriations and of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in my work on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I have spent an awful lot of my time on these types of issues. I think there is much we can say about this bill, but at the end of the day, it comes down to two fundamental questions. They are really quite simple.

The first is: Do you believe that the President will hold Iran accountable?

In an interview yesterday, I challenged the other person to show me the President's foreign policy success because I believe in this administration there has been 7 years of foreign policy failure, from China, to Russia, to Afghanistan, to Syria. The list is long. We have to ask: Do we trust the President to implement policies that keep the world more or less safe?

The second question is just as simple: Do we trust Iran?

I asked Secretary Kerry to show me a single example of Iran working with us or with our allies in any positive fashion. They are, as has been said

here, the world's greatest sponsor of terrorism.

Recently they broke U.N. agreements not to test ballistic missiles. They have held our soldiers. From Hezbollah, to Hamas, to Syria, they foster terror and darkness everywhere they go. Do we trust Iran? Very simply, the answer is no, which is why this bill is so important.

It helps us to hold Iran accountable. It helps us to hold their proxies accountable. It removes the incentives for them to continue to expand their power and their policies and their goals, which are counter to U.S. and Western goals throughout the world.

That is why I support this bill. I urge my colleagues to do as well.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from New York for his kindness. I acknowledge the chairman of this committee for his courtesies in debating this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I think it is important for all of us to acknowledge the safe return of our United States sailors and to recognize that the United States was persistent and determined and, as well, made no apology and that the Iran Government moved quickly to return them.

Let it be very clear that our sailors did nothing wrong. Obviously, when other sailors are in trouble, let me thank those who remain, as our heroes do. They leave no person, in essence, behind. So I am very grateful, and I know their families are grateful that they are safe.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a distinctive point from where we are today. Everyone knows that Iran is a bad actor. Some of us on this floor voted for the Iran non-nuclear agreement while others did not. But I believe that we do ourselves harm when we continue to renegotiate or to re-vote, as we have continued to do 62 times with regard to ObamaCare.

This legislation would restrict the President's ability to lift sanctions on Iranian entities, thereby preventing the U.S. from carrying out its commitment under the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed in Vienna, Austria, on July 14, 2015.

Specifically, the bill would require the President to certify that the delisted entity has not knowingly facilitated a significant financial transaction or has provided significant financial services to the IRGC or to terrorist affiliates.

This, of course, would be a very difficult and hindering aspect of the President's responsibilities in his role as the Commander in Chief. It would specifically prevent the delisting of 400 banks, companies, and individuals that are engaged in Iran's nuclear program, particularly the Central Bank.

Section 2 would require the President to certify to Congress that any entity from the Office of Foreign Assets Con-

trol sanctions list has not ever knowingly facilitated a significant financial transaction.

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

Mr. ENGEL. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this legislation impedes, prohibits, and stops the President and the next President, as our representative of the face of America internationally and who has the responsibility, from enforcing this agreement. It was done primarily to stop Iran's nuclear efforts.

I, too, as one who has supported this legislation, believes that sanctions should be increased and that we should respond to Iran's ballistic missile episode, but there are ways to do that by strengthening the sanctions, not by tying the hands of the Commander in Chief—the President of the United States—and not by renegotiating this on the floor of the House to the extent that we have, in essence, giving the President no latitude with which to negotiate.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this legislation because it is not legislation that enhances our place. It takes away from the President's authority, and it makes it very difficult to interact with Iran. Let me be very clear: Iran has its troubles, and it is a bad actor, but I will tell you there are better ways to handle this situation.

I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3662, the Iran Terror Finance Transparency Act.

We are here again wasting valuable time on measures we know have no real chance of survival beyond these debates.

I strongly oppose this futile measure to block all efforts to enforce the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA).

H.R. 3662, would prevent the U.S. from implementing the JCPOA by tying the Administration's ability to fulfill U.S. commitments under this long negotiated deal to unrelated, non-nuclear issues.

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 3662, the Iran Terror Finance Transparency Act, which would prevent the United States from implementing the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) by tying the Administration's ability to fulfill U.S. commitments under the deal to unrelated, non-nuclear issues.

This bill includes provisions that connect the United States' JCPOA commitment to provide sanctions relief by delisting certain Iran-related individuals and entities, including banks, to non-nuclear issues outside of the scope of the JCPOA.

Certain provisions would effectively preclude delisting of individuals or entities on Implementation Day of the JCPOA—the day on which the International Atomic Energy Agency verifies that Iran has completed key nuclear-related steps that significantly dismantle and constrain its nuclear program—based on activity that may have taken place and ended long before Implementation Day and involving persons or activity that will no longer be sanctioned post-Implementation Day.

By preventing the United States from fulfilling its JCPOA commitments, H.R. 3662 could result in the collapse of a comprehensive diplomatic arrangement that peacefully and verifiably prevents Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

Such a collapse would remove the unprecedented constraints on Iran's nuclear program that we achieved in the JCPOA, lead to the unraveling of the international sanctions regime against Iran, and deal a devastating blow to America's credibility as a leader of international diplomacy.

This would have ripple effects, jeopardizing the hard work of sustaining a unified coalition to combat Iran's destabilizing activities in the region, calling into question the effectiveness of our sanctions regime and our ability to lead the world on nuclear non-proliferation.

The Administration has consistently made clear that the purpose of the nuclear negotiations, and ultimately the JCPOA—was to address one issue only: the international community's concerns over Iran's nuclear program and to verifiably prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

The JCPOA is the critical mechanism through which the United States was able to garner international support for our sanctions and achieve a diplomatic resolution.

As we address our concerns with Iran's nuclear program through implementation of the JCPOA, the Administration remains clear-eyed and shares the deep concerns of the Congress and the American people about Iran's support for terrorism.

Powerful sanctions targeting Iran's support for terrorism, its ballistic missile activities, its human rights abuses, and its destabilizing activities in the region remain in effect.

Anyone worldwide who transacts with or supports individuals or entities sanctioned in connection with Iran's support for terrorism or development of WMD and their means of delivery, including missiles—or who does the same with any Iranian individual or entity who remains on Treasury's Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons List, puts themselves at risk of being sanctioned.

Up until this point, Iran has been meeting all commitments under the JCPOA—any impediments to the United States ability to uphold its commitments jeopardizes the security of our nation.

The President has made it clear that he will veto any legislation that prevents the successful implementation of the JCPOA.

According to the Statement on Administrative Policy, if presented with H.R. 3662, the President will VETO this bill.

Let's just take a quick look back at some of the President's foreign policy achievements:

The capture and neutralization of Osama Bin Laden which brought an end to a nearly decade long manhunt.

The withdrawal of U.S. forces from Iraq which helped to bring an end to a costly war, helping our country save billions of dollars in U.S. taxpayer funds.

The current Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, which has been instrumental in deterring and stemming Iran's nuclear ambitions and enabling security in the global society.

The repealing of Don't Ask, Don't Tell, an aspersion on the personal private matters of those who have dedicated their lives to protecting our nation.

Signing into law the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), an important treaty

that showcases how the U.S. leads by example by signing a treaty that requires both the United States and Russia to reduce their nuclear warhead arsenals to 1,550 each, a 30 percent reduction from the 2002 Treaty of Moscow and a 74 percent reduction from the 1991 START treaty.

Neutralization of al Qaeda propagandist and foreign fighter recruiter Anwar Al Awlaki, one of the main leaders in the Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP).

Indeed, under President Obama's leadership, our country's military aid to Israel has increased remarkably with the eye towards deepening and expanding U.S./Israeli relations—an important aspect of our nation's foreign policy and geopolitical efforts to promote peace in the region.

Not to mention historical deals on the environment vis a vis Cop 21, organizing over 200 nations on strategies to protect the environment and proposed trade deals that will organize and facilitate the United States stamp on the Asian economy.

This president's foreign policy achievements in promoting the security of our nation are irrefutable.

Any serious legislation addressing Iran should be done as it has been done up until now, in a bipartisan way.

H.R. 3662 is an entirely partisan bill that excluded the participation of all Democratic Members in drafting this measure or supporting it.

This bill is fundamentally flawed and I urge all Members to vote against it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE), who is the cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. LANCE. I thank Chairman ROYCE and Mr. RUSSELL for their tremendous leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3662, the Iran Terror Finance Transparency Act.

The detention and interrogation of 10 American sailors near the Strait of Hormuz is the latest in a significant list of Iranian acts of aggression against American interests since President Obama signed the Iran nuclear agreement in October. Thank God our sailors have been released. They never should have been detained.

In recent weeks, we have witnessed two reported long-range ballistic missile launches, the revelation by Iran of a new underground missile depot, the firing of rockets near U.S. Navy ships in the Strait of Hormuz, and the Tehran government continuing to hold American hostages. These provocations and the lack of response from the White House have merely emboldened Iran to increase its aggression. Iran believes it can act against American interests with impunity.

I urge my colleagues to support the underlying legislation and to stop the lifting of sanctions on Iran that would provide billions of dollars in economic relief.

Let's send a clear message that Iran's aggression against the United States and its allies will not go unchallenged by Congress. History will judge our actions on this issue as history will judge

the President and the administration on their actions on this issue. Let history be the judge. Let's support H.R. 3662.

□ 1115

Mr. ENGEL. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL), author of this legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this bill.

There have been a lot of accusations about what is in this bill and the content. The fact of the matter is, what is being quoted is simply not in the bill.

It says that it would deprive the President of the authority to make decisions. That is simply not the case. Page 2, line 20; page 5, line 17; page 7, line 7: "The President may lift"—spelled out—if he meets the certification criteria. What is that criteria? That they are no longer conducting activity and they have justification for that relief.

Where this language "never at any time" is being quoted, Mr. Speaker, by my esteemed and caring colleagues on this issue—I know how they feel about this issue personally, and I commend them for it because we are on common ground here—but they are quoting something that is simply not in the bill. When they say "never at any time," that is simply not there.

The President may lift the sanctions. What we are calling for is a certification as to why. If he comes in and makes the case—look, this bank has corrected its behavior, general Soleimani has had some epiphany and he is no longer a terrorist—then, fine, we can have that certification, and the President does that.

Talking about several of them and that there was no bipartisan effort, every single speaker that has said that there was not a bipartisan effort I have personally been in contact with—personally—talking on this particular issue. So that is simply not the case. I am kind of hurt by that because I reached out to all of them, and I didn't deny any of them a chance for amendment, for dialogue, or discussion. I do think that we have much common ground to go on here.

I think it is also important that it says that it doesn't advance goals. It is upholding the law. The law, which is the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions and Divestment Act of 2010, says that if there are people on terror and human rights list, that they shouldn't come off without certification. We agree. That is why we are saying we have to have the similar certification for those that overlap on the joint agreement. That is why we have identified them.

The hundreds of others that were mentioned by the opponents of this measure, Mr. Speaker, they weren't on those lists. That is why they are not there. They weren't targeted for this. Only those that are on the terror and

human rights or nuclear proliferation with missiles list, if they are there, then that is why they have been targeted.

This isn't apparently about the merit of the measure or how we feel about the national security of the United States. It has now become an issue about process. Well, I guess that experience doesn't matter. It is about process. We need to do what is right for the country, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Let me first clear up, I think, what is a misperception. There are roughly 700 Iranian entities on our sanctions list. Of those, only 200 are removed from sanctions and those are those who were involved in the nuclear program. It is not true that the JCPOA removed sanctions on entities that are engaged in terrorism or proliferation or human rights violations. This is black and white in the JCPOA.

Entity by entity, we know exactly who will be removed. None of them are involved in terrorism or other malign behavior. We know who will be removed. There is a list in the annex. I have it right here, every company that will be removed, and none of them are removed for terrorism or other malign behavior. So I want to make that very, very clear.

Let me say that I think everyone on both sides has good intentions, and I think that we don't disagree about Iran. The question here is not whether Iran is a bad player or a good player. I don't trust the Iranians. I voted against the deal, and I don't believe anything the government says. That is not the question here.

The question is, how do you combat it in a unified way? We are not interested in embarrassing the President, certainly not on this side of the aisle. We are not interested in playing gotcha with the President either. We want to have a bill that has input from both sides so we can accomplish what both of us say we want to accomplish, and that is to hold Iran's feet to the fire.

I want to make sure that the JCPOA—again, which I did not support, but again it is the law—that Iran is complying with everything it is supposed to be doing. And that is where our efforts should be, to make sure that they do that, and then to also make sure that our allies like Israel have the kind of help that they need to maintain their qualitative military edge and to have another memorandum of understanding with the United States that supports Israel. This is what we should be concentrating on, not embarrassing the President or playing gotcha. That doesn't do anything.

Mr. RUSSELL, the gentleman from Oklahoma, did come up to me and ask me if I would cosponsor the bill, but that was after it was already drafted, having no input into the bill. So that is not really a way of being collaborative, if you really want to be collaborative.

I appreciate what the gentleman from Oklahoma says. I don't doubt his sincerity, and he obviously worked very hard on this bill, but many of us have difficulties with it.

We don't have difficulties with the end goal, with what we want to accomplish. We have difficulties by the way this is done. This seems, again, more to us like embarrassing the President, calling him names, than really putting our heads together in a collaborative way and really doing something that will hold Iran's feet to the fire.

So I believe in the old adage that politics should stop at the water's edge when we are talking about foreign affairs. That is why I love the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Our Nation's security and our interests abroad are too important to let partisan politics get in the way. Ninety-nine times out of 100, the Foreign Affairs Committee operates in that spirit, and this bill is an exception to that. I think the lack of input from both sides of the aisle, the lack of time the Foreign Affairs Committee didn't spend working on it, is reflected in the final product. I am not pointing a finger at anybody. Again, I think Mr. RUSSELL is sincere about this. I think we want the same thing.

This bill is deeply flawed. It would force the President to meet an impossible standard on an issue where Congress had already spoken. That is no way to advance our interests abroad. That is no way to hold Iran accountable.

So let's vote down this bill, go back to the drawing board, and come back with bipartisan legislation that would actually help us achieve our aims. I urge a "no" vote.

Again, the question here is not whether Iran can be trusted. They cannot. Iran is a bad player. Three people on this side of the aisle who spoke against this bill voted against the JCPOA. So it is not a matter of just trying to rubberstamp what the administration wants or anything like that. No, we don't think that this bill goes in the right direction. We don't want to embarrass the President. We want to work with the President to make sure that Iran's feet are held to the fire.

Again, we had the vote on the Iran deal. I voted no, my friends on that side of the aisle voted no, but we lost. So let's not repeat what we have done with the Affordable Care Act, 62 times again and again and again playing gotcha with the President.

Let's do something that really works. Let's put our heads together to make it work. We can take parts of this bill and put it together into a bipartisan bill. I am not opposed to that. But we have got to do it together. Politics need to stop at the water's edge.

So let's now work together to ensure that Iran is complying with the JCPOA. That would be a positive step forward. Let's hold their feet to the fire. Let's make sure they do what they are supposed to do, because I don't

trust them anymore than anybody on that side of the aisle.

So I urge a "no" vote. Let's go back to the drawing board. Let's do what the Foreign Affairs Committee is known for doing for the past 3 years under the leadership of Chairman ROYCE and myself. We believe that we are the most bipartisan committee in the Congress. We believe that is the way foreign policy should be created, and I know we can do better. Again, I don't impugn anyone's motives. Let's all put our heads together and let's come up with a bill that we can pass and be proud of.

I urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate all the Members who have engaged in this debate. As Ranking Member ENGEL noted, this is not usually the place we find ourselves. What we have seen from Iran over the last few months is that the Iranian threat isn't going away. So we will have to keep working together to address the Iranian threat, and I look forward to that continuing collaboration.

As the Iran nuclear agreement gets set for implementation, some 500 specific individuals and companies and several banks are set to get relief for their ties to the nuclear program. This bill simply asks the President to ensure that those receiving this reprieve are not involved in Iran's support for terrorism, nor are they involved in the missile development program that Iran continues to push for intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Soon, maybe in a matter of days, Iran will get access to over \$100 billion in frozen oil assets, and this is not going to go to the Iranians on the street. This is not going to go to small business in Iran, to those that despise their government. It is going to go to the regime. It is going to go to the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps.

The reason it would work that way is because that is the entity that nationalized these businesses years ago, after 1979. They are the ones that right now control approximately a quarter of the entire economy, including the major businesses, such as, for example, energy or construction.

If we look at what the U.S. Department of Treasury says about this, they labeled the IRGC as the "most powerful economic actor" in the country. So this entity has deep reach into those critical sectors of the economic infrastructure, as the Treasury Department tells us. The IRGC's largest business is its construction arm, which controls 800 affiliated companies and billions of dollars in assets.

These activities, in turn—and here is the problem, here is the nexus of the problem—fund Iran's ballistic missile program. What we had hoped for was, of course, to temper the appetite of the regime to move forward with that ICBM program. Instead what we see is a huge step-up several weeks ago as the President of Iran announced this huge step-up.

Now we see these ICBMs that are being launched and tested. We also see the military activities, the regional aggression, the call for the overthrow of the governments in Yemen, which they actually carried out in Bahrain, and in Saudi Arabia. This is a huge problem because the IRGC are doing this.

Now, during our hearings, Members expressed concerns that there would be no pushback from the administration when it comes to Iran's aggressive behavior. This has, unfortunately, proven correct.

The response to two ballistic missile tests? The administration proposed a few modest sanctions. We were all notified about that. What happened? As soon as Iran pushed back, what happened? The administration pulled them back.

The Iranian President, Hassan Rouhani, ordered his Defense Ministry to accelerate its missile program just weeks after the Obama administration joined with his diplomatic partners to sweep Iran's past illicit nuclear weapons activities under the rug. Again, countries pursue ICBMs for one reason: to deliver a nuclear warhead.

I ask for an "aye" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today, I will vote against H.R. 3662—the most recent attempt to undermine the Iran nuclear agreement. This legislation would explicitly prevent the United States from implementing its obligations under the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA).

We are all concerned about the prospects of a nuclear-armed Iran, given its history and nebulous relationship with the United States. This is why I have consistently supported a diplomatic solution with other world powers, as sanctions do not work when applied by the U.S. alone. The JCPOA is our best path forward to enforce a non-nuclear future for Iran, particularly as we have countries, including China and Russia, join with us.

We're going to need to be diligent. Iran does have a number of internal conflicts and bad actors. The clerics and some members of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard are destructive components within a country whose people have long suffered from the effects of sanctions. There is no indication that destroying this agreement would put us in a better position to prevent Iran from revitalizing its nuclear program. If the agreement falls apart, we can always sanction later. In the meantime, we ought to continue to give diplomacy a chance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 583, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and a result was announced. The vote was subsequently vacated by order of the House, and pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and by order of the House, further proceedings on the question of passage of the bill were postponed to January 26, 2016.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 44. We are at war. My top priority is to keep our families safe. We must hold Iran accountable for financing terrorism. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13th, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, I was unavoidably detained and

missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 13, 2016, I regret that I was otherwise detained and unable to cast a vote on rollcall vote No. 44, on passage of H.R. 3662, the Iran Terror Finance Transparency Act. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, I was unavoidably detained in a constituent meeting. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, I was meeting with constituents and was detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and was not present for one rollcall vote on Wednesday, January 13, 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted in this manner: Rollcall Vote Number 44—H.R. 3662—“no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote number 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained due to traffic delay. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage

of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 22) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the definition of “waters of the United States” under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 253, nays 166, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

YEAS—253

Abraham	Emmer (MN)	Kline
Aderholt	Farenthold	Labrador
Allen	Fincher	LaHood
Amash	Fitzpatrick	LaMalfa
Amodel	Fleischmann	Lamborn
Babin	Fleming	Lance
Barletta	Flores	Latta
Barr	Forbes	LoBiondo
Barton	Fortenberry	Long
Benishek	Fox	Loudermilk
Bilirakis	Franks (AZ)	Love
Bishop (MI)	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Bishop (UT)	Garamendi	Luetkemeyer
Black	Garrett	Lummis
Blackburn	Gibbs	MacArthur
Blum	Gibson	Marchant
Bost	Gohmert	Marino
Boustany	Goodlatte	Masse
Brady (TX)	Gosar	McCarthy
Brat	Gowdy	McCaul
Bridenstine	Graham	McClintock
Brooks (AL)	Granger	McHenry
Brooks (IN)	Graves (GA)	McKinley
Buchanan	Graves (LA)	McMorris
Buck	Graves (MO)	Rodgers
Bucshon	Griffith	McSally
Burgess	Grothman	Meadows
Byrne	Guinta	Meehan
Calvert	Guthrie	Messer
Carter (GA)	Hanna	Mica
Carter (TX)	Hardy	Miller (FL)
Chabot	Harper	Miller (MI)
Chaffetz	Harris	Moolenaar
Clawson (FL)	Hartzler	Mooney (WV)
Coffman	Heck (NV)	Mullin
Cole	Hensarling	Mulvaney
Collins (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Murphy (PA)
Collins (NY)	Hice, Jody B.	Neugebauer
Comstock	Hill	Newhouse
Conaway	Holding	Noem
Cook	Hudson	Nugent
Cooper	Huelskamp	Nunes
Costa	Huizenga (MI)	Olson
Costello (PA)	Hultgren	Palmer
Cramer	Hunter	Paulsen
Crawford	Hurd (TX)	Pearce
Crenshaw	Hurt (VA)	Perry
Cuellar	Issa	Peterson
Culberson	Jenkins (KS)	Pittenger
Curbelo (FL)	Jenkins (WV)	Pitts
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)
Denham	Johnson, Sam	Poliquin
Dent	Jolly	Pompeo
DeSantis	Jones	Posey
DesJarlais	Jordan	Price, Tom
Diaz-Balart	Joyce	Ratcliffe
Dold	Katko	Reed
Donovan	Kelly (MS)	Reichert
Duffy	Kelly (PA)	Renacci
Duncan (SC)	King (IA)	Ribble
Duncan (TN)	King (NY)	Rice (SC)
Elmers (NC)	Kinzinger (IL)	Rigell