

to address urgent international threats and opportunities.

Moreover, the stipulations of this bill undermine the very purpose of sanctions which are intended as tools to bring nations like Iran to the negotiating table—not as a permanent punitive measure. But if they do something where they are disregarding, and we are not working together and are aggressive at that negotiating table, we also are letting them know that we are ready or what we have the capability of doing.

This bill hurts diplomacy. It hurts trying to make sure that we are driving others to the negotiating table. As General Mattis said, he doesn't have to buy more bullets. Let's fund the State Department. Let's promote and speak good will of diplomacy. It is the best way to move forward in a multilateral way with our allies.

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

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

I agree with some of the things my good friend has said. Diplomacy is extremely important. We deal with it on the committee all the time. It is called soft power. Then we have hard power. We sign off on foreign military weapons sales. Diplomacy at all costs needs to be tried, but when the diplomats fail, often we go to war or we have conflict.

The question before us is twofold. One, has Iran negotiated in good faith such that we would both waive or not enforce or let expire sanctions, many of them passed by Congress?

The second question is, are Article I authorities under the Constitution?

All we are simply asking for is when we pass a sanction—or the administration does so—that they notify Congress.

And I will tell you why this is important.

For months I tried to get Robert Malley, our special envoy to Iran, into the committee to testify on this Iran deal, but guess what? He refused to come testify. Why? Because we then find out he was under investigation by the FBI for potential violation of his security clearance.

This great Iran deal that they talk about has only brought Iran closer to a nuclear bomb, closer to weapons-grade uranium. They can go to 90 percent in days. If they get a nuclear warhead from Russia or North Korea, they have full capability, and they will become a nuclear state. We cannot let that happen.

They failed to declare nuclear sites in Iran. They kicked out investigators from the IAEA. Then in one of the most horrific displays of bad faith in negotiations, Mr. Speaker, do you know what they did? They launched a cyberattack on the IAEA to steal their documents related to their investigations on the very sites that the JCPOA was supposed to allow them in to examine. Then they blocked the inspectors from having access to these sites.

Now, I am all for negotiating. I am all for diplomacy. I don't think the Ayatollah is a good faith partner here, and I don't think he has our best interests at heart. They chant "death to America," and "death to Israel" and call us "Great Satan," and they call Israel "Little Satan." They are closer to a bomb than they have ever been.

All we are saying, Mr. Speaker, is before you waive sanctions that Congress passed, or not enforce sanctions, just let us know. I don't think that is a big deal. I mean, Malley wouldn't testify before Congress. We didn't know why because they were hiding it from us. They didn't want us to know about the FBI investigation until the press reported it. We found out from the press—not from the administration, but from the press.

Let's look at some of the sanctions that they let expire and they have waived, and you tell me if that makes sense. The sanctions on energy, exporting energy to China, the majority going to China; we are allowing this axis of evil—the Ayatollah, Putin, and China—to work together with Iran exporting energy.

Mr. Speaker, \$80 billion from China went into Iran to fund the very missiles and rockets and drones that we saw last Saturday night. It was the first attack from Iran into Israel in history.

Then they let the U.N. sanctions on exports to other countries for their missiles and drones to expire. Now, we have a bill to reinstate those sanctions. The very same drones and missiles were used to attack Israel last Saturday night, the very same drones and missiles that have been bought by Russia to kill Ukrainians. It is all interconnected. China is in this, the Ayatollah is in it, Putin is in it, and they are all profiting from Iran, who they provide technical expertise. Iran makes the stuff and the energy that they then buy from them to put the money in Iran to reign terror.

I think it only fair that the American people through their Representatives under Article I have the opportunity to even know when they are doing this and not operate behind a veil of secrecy. When a Republican President gets into office, what will the Democrats say then if they are hiding things on sanctions and investigations? I think we will hear the same argument that we are making on this side.

That is why this is not a partisan issue. This is about this institution under Article I. We have every right to know this, especially the sanctions that we pass in Congress. We always put a Presidential waiver in these things. Remember Nord Stream 2, we put a Presidential waiver. Nobody thought that a President would waive sanctions on a pipeline to put Europe in a state of dependency on Russian energy. Look how that one worked out. Did we know about it in advance? No. That didn't work out so well, did it?

Right after Afghanistan, guess what happens? Putin, the Russian Federation went into Ukraine. Chairman Xi is watching it. He is looking at Taiwan.

No. We have tried. We have tried acting in good faith with them. They are not acting in good faith with us, and the American people through its Representatives and the Congress, I say, have a right to know.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIMENEZ). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1149, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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 passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### RESCISSION OF CERTAIN WAIVERS AND LICENSES RELATING TO IRAN

Mr. SELF. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1149, I call up the bill (H.R. 5947) to provide for the rescission of certain waivers and licenses relating to Iran, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1149, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5947

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

#### SECTION 1. RESCISSION OF CERTAIN WAIVERS AND LICENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—On the date of enactment of this Act, the following measures shall be terminated:

(1) The waiver exercised on the pursuant to section 1245(d)(5) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 and sections 1244(i) and 1247(f) of the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 and transmitted to Congress on September 11, 2023, for the transfer of certain funds from the Republic of Korea to Qatar.

(2) Any general or specific license issued by the Office of Foreign Assets Control at the Department of the Treasury directly or indirectly related to the funds cited in paragraph (1).

(b) LIMITATION.—The President may not re-issue any new waiver or license described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) for the same or similar purposes.

#### SEC. 2. LIMITATION OF APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN LICENSES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President may not—

(1) exercise the waiver authority described in section 1245(d)(5) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 and sections 1244(i) and 1247(f) of the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 permitting the Government of Iran or any Iranian person access to any account established or maintained pursuant to or in accordance with section 1245(d)(4)(D)(ii)(II) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012; or

(2) issue a general or specific license, frequently asked question, or any other licensing action or guidance permitting the Government of Iran or any Iranian person access to or to benefit directly or indirectly from any account established pursuant to or in accordance with any account described in 1245(d)(4)(D)(ii)(II) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) each will control 30 minutes. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, we saw Iran unleash an unprecedented missile and drone attack on our ally Israel. Iran launched over 350 missiles and drones. We are incredibly fortunate that Israel, the United States, and other partners successfully intercepted 99 percent of those weapons. Had they not, the damage would have been catastrophic.

How did a regime that has been subject to international sanctions for decades have the resources to develop such advanced weaponry? The answer is that Iran is incredibly skilled at illicit finance, sanctions evasion, and exploiting every possible loophole to fund their malign activities.

Time and time again, we have allowed ourselves to accept the fiction that we can issue sanctions waivers that give Iran access to funds for limited use on allegedly humanitarian transactions without enabling the regime's malign activities.

We need to face facts. This is patently false.

Money is fungible, and the Iranian regime does not care about its people, as evidenced by their wide-scale human rights abuses and repression.

Under President Trump's maximum pressure campaign, Iran was starved for foreign reserve currency. This forced the Iranian regime to make hard choices.

With these waivers in effect, every dollar or euro that we provide the Ira-

nian regime, even if purportedly for purchases of agriculture equipment or other humanitarian uses, frees up another dollar or euro that Iran's regime will spend on missiles, drones, its nuclear program, or its terrorist proxies.

Beyond the question of money being fungible, Iran has a demonstrated track record of falsifying humanitarian purchases.

□ 1430

In fact, the Department of Justice has previously charged a bank for "facilitating transactions fraudulently designed to appear to be purchases of food and medicine by Iranian customers, in order to appear to fall within the so-called 'humanitarian exception' to certain sanctions against the Government of Iran, when in fact no purchases of food or medicine actually occurred."

Enough is enough. With this bill, H.R. 5947, we are eliminating the sanctions waivers tied to the \$6 billion in Iranian funds in restricted accounts in Qatar and tied to the \$10 billion Iran has received from Iraq in electricity payments. It is too dangerous to allow Iran continued access to these funds, even with the nominal restrictions on how they are used.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to revoke these sanctions waivers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5947. This legislation may be short, but it is equally shortsighted with considerable long-term consequences.

Let's start with the impact this would have on Iraq. This bill would rescind a waiver that currently allows Iraq to pay for electricity from Iran.

This waiver is what allows the Iraqi Government to keep the lights on. Without it, massive blackouts would leave millions without electricity and cause precipitous chaos. It would hamper the fragile stability that Iraq has achieved over the past several years.

I don't believe anyone in this body wants to see a return to Iraq of the past, where Iraqis from previous decades suffered from never-ending wars and repression like that of the Saddam Hussein era.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of this bill goes even further than that. It would harm and cause the Iraqi people terrible consequences. An Iraq without electricity serves no American interest and would do nothing to promote our, the United States', national security.

Let's not forget, ISIS emerged from a chaotic Iraq. ISIS, I will repeat, emerged from a chaotic Iraq—long-term consequences, shortsighted bill.

When ISIS emerged, the result was not just widespread disorder, destruction, and violence in the Middle East but the growth of a global terrorist movement that struck my home city and State of New York, Orlando, San

Bernardino, as well as Paris, Brussels, and Barcelona.

I agree that we absolutely need to help Iraq find alternative sources of energy besides Iran, but it is simply not true that Iran is filling its coffers with payments from Iraq. There is roughly \$10 billion in Iraqi payments for Iranian electricity being held in escrow. Only very small portions of the money have been transferred to an account in Oman, into which the United States has oversight. Iran can only access that account to purchase humanitarian goods, like food or medicine. None of the funds—zero, nada—are going to nefarious purposes.

Maybe we have a difference and some don't care about humanitarian causes, humanitarian aid, and things of that nature. I know my side of the aisle does.

Human life, innocent human life, is very important, and it is also how we show what our values are.

This bill would risk our ability to have oversight and control of the \$6 billion in Iranian funds we are monitoring in Qatar, and much more. This measure would have the opposite effect of what it intends to do, leading to less control of Iranian assets.

I am deeply concerned that this bill removes all flexibility from our current Iran sanctions program. The point of sanctions, again, is to bring Iran back to—as I have said over and over on the various bills we have seen today—the negotiating table.

Sanctions are not an end but a means to an end. A diplomatic path, I say again, is the best path, and this measure removes the flexibility necessary for that strategic objective and the utilization of diplomacy.

Let me also say a quick word about process. Yes, we need to respond to global events, and that is why I supported seven Iran-related measures on the floor just yesterday. While I disagree with some of the other bills on the floor today, at least those pieces of legislation received proper committee consideration.

Yes, we do, on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, practice what I believe is some diplomacy. My friend and chairman, MICHAEL MCCAUL, and I talk. We give a chance to trying to work it out first. Sometimes we do; sometimes we don't. These bills never gave us a chance to do that.

This bill did not follow that process. It has not been marked up by the Committee on Foreign Affairs or, for that matter, the Committee on Financial Services or, for that matter, the Committee on Ways and Means or, for that matter, the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, even though every single one received a referral on this bill—process.

Mr. Speaker, in my tenure as the former chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, now the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, this week is the first time ever that we are considering a bill under a rule that

had not gone through the committee process—not only in my time as a chair or ranking member, but almost an entire 25 years that I have been on the committee.

This is, I believe, a very unfortunate precedent that we are setting here. If we actually want to support—I know I do fully—our ally, Israel, what we should be doing is passing a bipartisan Senate national security aid bill that would send important funds to Israel so that they could defend themselves against Iranian aggression, as well as, of course, supporting our friends in Ukraine and Taiwan, and providing necessary humanitarian assistance.

I know we have been negotiating, which is okay. We know that, and we are going to try to figure out some of the things, from what I am hearing. What we should be doing, what really is necessary right now, given the needs of our allies, is just pass a bipartisan bill. Seventy Members of the Senate in a bipartisan way passed it. It is waiting for us to vote on it.

Many of us, I think at least over 300 of us, will agree that if that bill just had the light of day on the floor, because our Ukrainian friends are at a desperate end—they need assistance right now. What took place in the Middle East, the strikes against Israel, they need the money right now. Our Taiwanese friends need the money right now. The innocent individuals in Gaza, in Sudan, and around the world need the assistance right now.

If today, we put that bill on the floor and let Congress do its will, it would be on the desk of the President of the United States either later this evening or first thing tomorrow, signed into law, and our allies that we claim we care for would get the aid and assistance that they need now.

That is the bill we should have been debating in February. That is the bill we should have been debating in March. That is the bill we should be debating today, really, not this bill, which will have a far greater impact on innocent Iraqi civilians than any minuscule impact on Iran.

Mr. Speaker, I guess you know that I oppose this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

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

Mr. SELF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER), my colleague and friend, the author of this bill, and a member of the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Homeland Security.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, the theme that we are talking about right now is a complete overturning of a maximum pressure campaign on Iran from 2017 through the end of 2020.

In 2021, we began a new theme, and that theme was appeasement: appeasement of Iran; appeasement of its policies; an overturning of the JCPOA; a message to the world that: We trust

you, Iran, the largest state sponsor of terrorism on the globe. We don't think you are going to do anything.

That strategy has clearly not worked.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go back in time to September 11, 2023. Instead of mourning our Nation and standing firm against terrorism, the President of the United States took the anniversary of 9/11 as an opportunity to give Iran, the world's leading sponsor of terrorism, a \$6 billion present.

It is no coincidence that shortly following this foreign policy faux pas, the Iranian-backed terrorist group was emboldened to launch a barbaric attack against our democratic ally, Israel, murdering over 1,400 innocent civilians and abducting hundreds of hostages, some of whom still remain inside Gaza.

In the 6 months following those attacks on that fateful morning of October 7, Iran's proxies— Hamas, Hezbollah, Houthis, the Shia militia groups, and others—have continued carrying out terrorist attacks against Israel and the Middle East, culminating in Iran's direct and unprecedented attack this past weekend against Israel.

When it comes to foreign policy, the theme that I mentioned, a turning away from maximum pressure, a turning away from deterrence, a turning away from holding a hard line and toward appeasement, the President has gotten it wrong every single time.

□ 1445

In fact, on September 10, 2001, one day before the attacks on 9/11, then-Senator Joe Biden criticized President Bush's proposed missile defense system as dangerous and potentially disastrous and that it weakens us.

In reality, President Biden's decades-long strategy of appeasement is what weakens us. His choices have made our country less safe. They have resulted in the disastrous Afghanistan withdrawal. They have emboldened our adversaries to attack around the world.

When asked what his message to Iran was in the lead-up to a possible attack on Israel, that we knew about, the President simply said: "Don't."

Well, Mr. President, they did.

I agree with my colleague, the ranking member, that innocent human life is important. The disagreement at this point in time is that we have had 3-plus years of a strategy of appeasement that has not resulted in deterrence. It has weakened our interest, our allies, Israel and others, not just in the region but throughout the world.

I want to talk about electricity. Yes, Iraq needs electricity. The fact is that the waiver given by Secretary Pompeo at the end of the Trump administration was predicated on the theory that Iraq would reform its electricity system and this would not be needed for a long time. This was 4 years ago.

At what point is there accountability?

At what point after waiver and waiver and waiver given do we cut the dependency; do we reform the system; do we make sure that the Iraqi citizens have what they need?

This administration has taken the opposite approach.

When you look in the news just today, everyone around the world, all the major organizations, the major nation-states, are considering additional sanctions on Iran. They understand that appeasement doesn't work. The U.N., the G7, and even France have made the decision to enforce stronger sanctions with no waivers.

President Biden over 3 years ago made a decision to go from maximum pressure on Iran that resulted in unprecedented deterrence and peace to a strategy of appeasement.

The examples are many. Appeasement and weakness have led to chaos and aggression. In fact, every intelligence briefing, every national security pundit, every talking head on TV, every person who knows anything about this subject has said the same consistent theme for 3-plus years, that the threat from the Iranian regime toward the United States and our allies and partners and our interests has only increased. It culminated this weekend with an unprecedented drone attack.

We are so lucky, along with our brothers and sisters in arms, the U.S. military and our partners like the Jordanians and the Israelis, that the air defense systems worked, that these brave airmen and these brave air defense personnel were able to take out these drones and prevent not a single loss of life, to prevent the death of anyone inside Israel. It is unbelievable that that was able to happen.

The reason that we are doing this, I believe, is because the Founders of this country knew that there would be a time when checks and balances had to be issued, there would be a time when we had to have a check on the executive branch because they got it wrong.

This doesn't have to be a partisan exercise. In fact, I hope it is bipartisan. I hope that we can all join together and say we don't believe in appeasement, that that strategy has not worked. They have had 3½ years to see if it works, and it doesn't.

Now is the time to stand fast. Now is the time to come together and to check the executive branch and to pass legislation that prevents the rescission of these waivers that prevents the \$6 billion gift and other gifts from funding the Iranian war machine, the terror war machine that is sowing chaos across the Middle East and even broader than that region.

If we remember back to September 11, then we know this threat is real. Let's believe the Iranians when they have threatened us over the weekend. Let's believe their threats, but let's not cower to their threats. Let's stand strong. Let's show deterrence.

Not a single dollar should be allowed to go to the Iranian Government. Not a

single dollar should be allowed to go to the largest arbiter of terrorism on the planet.

I hope my colleagues across the aisle will join in regaining our Article I authority, will join in asserting American leadership around the globe, to send a strong message not just to Iran but to other would-be adversaries, that we are serious about defending freedom, that we are serious about defending Israel, our greatest ally in the Middle East.

My legislation permanently freezes all Iranian-sanctioned assets and prevents the President from using any waiver authority, including licenses and guidance and otherwise, to lift sanctions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand strong, to support this legislation, to pass H.R. 5947, to protect Israel, and to stop the Iranian war machine.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA).

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the neocon march into another war in the Middle East. It is the same chorus. This time it is Iran.

John Bolton, who blundered us into Iraq, now is calling for strikes on Iran all over CNN and cable news. Then you have Senator MARSHA BLACKBURN saying that we need retaliatory strikes into Iran. Who can forget Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM saying: Hit them hard. Blow them off the map.

This is foolishness. Let me be clear. The American people, Democrats or Republicans or Independents, do not want another war in the Middle East. They do not want us to make the same mistake we made in Iraq. They do not want trillions of our tax dollars going into foreign wars. Instead, they are demanding that we invest in jobs here at home, in childcare, and in healthcare in America.

I call today for the American people to stand up against the foreign policy blob and against the establishment and prevent them from getting us into another war in the Middle East.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

I strongly oppose this measure, which would remove all flexibility from our Iran sanctions program and thereby strike a fatal blow to our ability to conduct nuclear diplomacy with Iran.

Now, I have heard several times during the course of this debate about the failure of the JCPOA, of which at the time the IAEA had oversight, individuals were knowing what and where the nuclear material was. Most of it, as it has been said now, was moved out of the country.

The fact of the matter is, if I recall correctly, General Mattis, who was initially an opponent of the JCPOA, after seeing what it was doing and how it was functioning, became a proponent of the JCPOA. He said it publicly, that it

was a way through diplomacy to prevent Iran from having a nuclear weapon.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say with joy that the former President pulled us out of the JCPOA.

I ask: What was accomplished by pulling us out? Are we safer? Is that what it did? If we are safer by being pulled out, what are we talking about now? Are we in more danger?

Does Iran now have a greater opportunity to get a nuclear weapon? Do we know where the materials are now, since it was a good thing to pull out of the JCPOA, or do we know less? Do we have more access now, since we pulled out of the JCPOA, or do we have less? Why was this thing about pulling out of the JCPOA such a great thing?

I am more worried today about Iran getting a nuclear weapon than I was when we were in the JCPOA. I ask my colleagues: Were you more worried when we were in the JCPOA than you are right now?

I hear that you are worried right now about where Iran is with a nuclear weapon. Back then what we were talking about was diplomacy to try to prevent them from having a nuclear weapon. Are you telling me now, because we don't know, that we should just go to war?

There are choices to be made here. I think we were much better off using diplomacy, getting access to what was going on, watching them move nuclear material outside of the country, than just saying we are going to blow you up.

No oversight, nothing; no contact; no one looking in; no information other than that and they are free to do whatever the heck they want to do now. They are free to do it because they no longer have to be at the negotiating table.

Are we safer now or were we safer under the JCPOA?

Additionally, let me say this bill would have greater consequences across the entire Middle East, particularly in Iraq, which this bill would restrict from purchasing Iranian energy.

I will remind us again, let's not be shortsighted. With no energy, there is chaos in Iraq. What happened before? ISIS was created. Blackouts across Iraq would sow societal chaos in Iraq.

Does that help serve our national security objectives in the region? I don't think so.

If implemented, this bill would undermine the tenuous stability Iraq has worked to establish after decades of war. Are they perfect now? No. Four years is a short period of time when we are trying to do some major accomplishments here.

Importantly, this measure may also cost us our ability to do what we say we want to do, to monitor and control the Iranian funds in Qatar and elsewhere. Do we want to lose control, not have oversight of that either? Then you want this bill.

□ 1500

A smart sanctions policy has a purpose. It is not a blunt tool to wield in an effort to induce regime change. That does not work. It has never worked when it was used just to try to have regime change.

Our sanctions policies must be flexible and allow for United States national security objectives to be realized through thoughtful—and I will use this word one more time—thoughtful diplomacy.

A waiver is always necessary for that purpose.

Our Middle East national security objectives should be about providing Israel aid as part of our national security supplemental and providing humanitarian aid to starving individuals. That is what it should be about. That is what we should be voting on. That is what we should be debating on, not just today. We should have done it months ago.

It shouldn't be about cutting off Iraqis from electricity and creating chaos and the possible rise again of another terrorist group similar to ISIS that killed Americans and allies abroad.

This bill should be opposed. This bill is shortsighted. This bill doesn't accomplish what we needed to do and what we need to do. Let's vote it down.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Again, returning our attention to the consideration of the bill at hand, H.R. 5947, Congress granted these waiver authorities over a decade ago hoping that they could be used to help the Iranian people without compromising our national security.

What we have seen in the last 10 years is that Iran cannot be trusted. These waivers failed. The JCPOA itself granted access to at least \$50 billion to the primary sponsor of terrorism around the world.

Since then, we have seen some \$70 billion at least given to the Iranian regime by the Biden administration.

Iran continues its dangerous, deadly buildup of weapons and other capabilities. The Iranian people continue to suffer at the hands of the regime which uses evasive tactics to divert money that should be spent on their people to support other malign activities.

Again, Iran is the primary sponsor of terror around the world, and now our partners and allies all over the Middle East are also victims of Iran and its proxies.

We have a responsibility to the freedom loving people of the Middle East not to be funding their oppressors. We need to revoke these waivers, and we need to do it today.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1149, 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. SELF. 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.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALFORD) at 5 p.m.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, April 17, 2024.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 17, 2024, at 3:45 p.m.

That the Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 33.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KEVIN F. MCCUMBER,  
Acting Clerk.

## FOURTH AMENDMENT IS NOT FOR SALE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1149 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4639.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ELLZEY) kindly take the chair.

□ 1701

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4639) to amend section 2702 of title 18,

United States Code, to prevent law enforcement and intelligence agencies from obtaining subscriber or customer records in exchange for anything of value, to address communications and records in the possession of intermediary internet service providers, and for other purposes, with Mr. ELLZEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 118-464 offered by the gentleman of New York (Mr. LALOTA) had been postponed.

## AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. LALOTA

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3, printed in House Report 118-464, offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. LALOTA), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 246, answered “present” 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

AYES—176

Aguilar  
Allred  
Bacon  
Barr  
Barragán  
Bera  
Bergman  
Bice  
Bishop (GA)  
Boyle (PA)  
Brownley  
Budzinski  
Calvert  
Carbajal  
Carey  
Carson  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Cartwright  
Case  
Casten  
Castor (FL)  
Ciscomani  
Clark (MA)  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Cole  
Connolly  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Craig  
Crenshaw  
Crow  
Cuellar  
D'Esposito  
Davids (KS)  
Davis (NC)  
DeLauro  
Diaz-Balart  
Dunn (FL)  
Ellzey  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann

Fletcher  
Flood  
Frankel, Lois  
Franklin, Scott  
Gallagher  
Gallego  
Garbarino  
Gimenez  
Goldman (NY)  
Gomez  
Gonzales, Tony  
Gonzalez,  
Vicente  
Gottheimer  
Graves (MO)  
Harder (CA)  
Hayes  
Hill  
Himes  
Hinson  
Horsford  
Houchin  
Houlahan  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Jackson (NC)  
James  
Johnson (GA)  
Joyce (OH)  
Kaptur  
Kean (NJ)  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kiggans (VA)  
Kiley  
Kilmer  
Kim (CA)  
Kim (NJ)  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster  
LaHood  
LaLota  
Lamborn  
Landsman

Larson (CT)  
LaTurner  
Lawler  
Letlow  
Levin  
Lucas  
Lynch  
Malliotakis  
Maloy  
Manning  
McCaul  
McCollum  
McGarvey  
McHenry  
Meeks  
Menendez  
Molinaro  
Moore (UT)  
Moran  
Morelle  
Moskowitz  
Moylan  
Mrvan  
Murphy  
Neguse  
Newhouse  
Nickel  
Norcross  
Nunn (IA)  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Peltola  
Peters  
Petterson  
Plaskett  
Quigley  
Reschenthaler  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rouzer  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rutherford  
Ryan  
Salazar

Scalise  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrier  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Sorensen  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Stansbury  
Stanton  
Steel  
Stefanik

Stevens  
Strickland  
Suozi  
Swalwell  
Sykes  
Tenney  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Titus  
Torres (CA)  
Torres (NY)  
Trone  
Turner  
Valadao  
Van Orden

Vasquez  
Veasey  
Wagner  
Waltz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Wild  
Williams (NY)  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Zinke

## NOES—246

Adams  
Aderholt  
Alford  
Allen  
Amo  
Amodei  
Armstrong  
Arrington  
Auchincloss  
Babin  
Baird  
Balderson  
Balint  
Banks  
Bean (FL)  
Beatty  
Bentz  
Beyer  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (NC)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Boebert  
Bonamici  
Bost  
Bowman  
Brecheen  
Brown  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Burlison  
Bush  
Cammack  
Cárdenas  
Carl  
Carter (LA)  
Casar  
Chavez-DeRemer  
Cherfilus-  
McCormick  
Chu  
Clarke (NY)  
Cleaver  
Cline  
Cloud  
Clyde  
Collins  
Comer  
Crane  
Crawford  
Crockett  
Curtis  
Davidson  
Davis (IL)  
De La Cruz  
Dean (PA)  
DeGette  
DelBene  
Deluzio  
DeSaulnier  
DesJarlais  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donalds  
Duarte  
Duncan  
Edwards  
Emmer  
Escobar  
Eshoo  
Españat  
Estes  
Evans  
Ezell  
Fallon  
Feenstra  
Finstad  
Fischbach

Fitzgerald  
Foster  
Foushee  
Fox  
Frost  
Fry  
Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Garamendi  
García (IL)  
García (TX)  
García, Mike  
García, Robert  
Golden (ME)  
Good (VA)  
Gooden (TX)  
Gosar  
Graves (LA)  
Green (TN)  
Green, Al (TX)  
Greene (GA)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Hageman  
Harris  
Harshbarger  
Hern  
Higgins (LA)  
Hoyle (OR)  
Huffman  
Huizenga  
Hunt  
Issa  
Ivey  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson (TX)  
Jackson Lee  
Jacobs  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (PA)  
Kamlager-Dove  
Kelly (MS)  
Khanna  
Kildee  
LaMalfa  
Larsen (WA)  
Latta  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (FL)  
Lee (PA)  
Leger Fernandez  
Lesko  
Lieu  
Lofgren  
Loudermilk  
Luna  
Luttrell  
Mace  
Mann  
Massie  
Mast  
Matsui  
McBath  
McClain  
McClellan  
McClintock  
McCormick  
McGovern  
Meng  
Meuser  
Mfume  
Miller (IL)  
Miller (OH)  
Miller (WV)  
Miller-Meeks  
Mills  
Moolenaar  
Mooney  
Moore (AL)  
Moore (WI)  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nehls  
Norman  
Norton  
Oberholte  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Ogles  
Omar  
Owens  
Pallone  
Palmer  
Pascarell  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Perez  
Perry  
Pfluger  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Porter  
Posey  
Pressley  
Ramirez  
Raskin  
Rodgers (WA)  
Rose  
Rosendale  
Ross  
Roy  
Sablan  
Salinas  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Scholten  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Self  
Sessions  
Sewell  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker  
Spartz  
Stauber  
Steil  
Steube  
Strong  
Takano  
Thanedar  
Thompson (CA)  
Tiffany  
Timmons  
Tlaib  
Tokuda  
Tonko  
Trahan  
Underwood  
Van Drew  
Van Duyn  
Vargas  
Velázquez  
Walberg  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Weber (TX)