

Spanberger	Thompson (MS)	Walberg
Spartz	Thompson (PA)	Waltz
Stansbury	Tiffany	Wasserman
Stanton	Timmons	Schultz
Stauber	Titus	Weber (TX)
Steel	Tonko	Webster (FL)
Stefanik	Torres (CA)	Wenstrup
Steil	Torres (NY)	Westerman
Steube	Trahan	Wexton
Stevens	Trone	Wild
Strickland	Turner	Williams (GA)
Strong	Valadao	Williams (NY)
Suozzi	Van Drew	Williams (TX)
Swalwell	Van Duyne	Wilson (SC)
Sykes	Van Orden	Wittman
Takano	Vargas	Womack
Tenney	Vasquez	Yakym
Thanedar	Veasey	Zinke
Thompson (CA)	Wagner	

NAYS—44

Balint	Garcia (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez
Beyer	Garcia (TX)	Omar
Bonamici	Garcia, Robert	Pingree
Bowman	Green, Al (TX)	Pocan
Bush	Huffman	Porter
Carson	Jackson (IL)	Pressley
Caspar	Jacobs	Ramirez
Chu	Jayapal	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Tlaib
Davis (IL)	Kamlager-Dove	Tokuda
DeSaulnier	Lee (CA)	Underwood
Dingell	Lee (PA)	Velázquez
Escobar	Massie	Waters
Foushee	McGovern	Watson Coleman
Frost	Moore (WI)	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Dean (PA)

NOT VOTING—9

Caraveo	Gomez	Luetkemeyer
Cárdenas	Granger	Payne
Castro (TX)	Grijalva	Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1656

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast my vote for Roll Call Votes Nos. 124 through 134. Had I been present, I would have voted: "Nay" on Roll Call Vote No. 124, Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 1149; "No" on Roll Call Vote No. 125, H. Res. 1149; "Yea" on Roll Call Vote No. 126, H.R. 6245; "Yea" on Roll Call Vote No. 127, H.R. 6015; "Yea" on Roll Call Vote No. 128, H.R. 5917; "Yea" on Roll Call Vote No. 129, H.R. 4681; "Yea" on Roll Call Vote No. 130, H.R. 6603; "Yea" on Roll Call Vote No. 131, H.R. 5826; "Yea" on Roll Call Vote No. 132, H.R. 3033; "Yea" on Roll Call Vote No. 133, H. Res. 288; and "Yea" on Roll Call Vote No. 134, H. Res. 883.

IRAN COUNTERTERRORISM ACT OF 2023

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1149, I call up the bill (H.R. 6323) to modify the availability of certain waiver authorities with respect to sanctions imposed with respect to the financial sector of 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 (Mr. BERGMAN). Pursuant to House Resolu-

tion 1149, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6323

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 Counterterrorism Act of 2023".

SEC. 2. MODIFICATION OF WAIVER AUTHORITIES WITH RESPECT TO SANCTIONS IMPOSED WITH RESPECT TO THE FINANCIAL SECTOR OF IRAN.

(a) FY 2013 NDAA.—Section 1247 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (22 U.S.C. 8806) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (f)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "determines that such a waiver" and inserting the following: "determines that—

"(i) the Government of Iran has ceased to provide support for acts of international terrorism; or

"(ii) such a waiver"; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting "before issuing a waiver pursuant to subparagraph (A)(ii)," before "submits".

(2) By adding at the end the following:

"(g) PERIOD FOR REVIEW BY CONGRESS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—During the period of 30 calendar days beginning on the date on which the President submits a report under subsection (f)(1)(B), the appropriate congressional committees should, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review the report.

"(2) EXCEPTION.—The period for congressional review under paragraph (1) of a report required to be submitted under subsection (f)(1)(B) shall be 60 calendar days if the report is submitted on or after July 10 and on or before September 7 in any calendar year.

"(3) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING INITIAL CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PERIOD.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the period for congressional review provided for under paragraph (1) of a report submitted under subsection (f)(1)(B) proposing a waiver of the imposition of sanctions under subsection (a), including any additional period for such review as applicable under the exception provided in paragraph (2), the President may not issue the waiver unless a joint resolution of approval with respect to that waiver is enacted in accordance with subsection (h).

"(4) EFFECT OF ENACTMENT OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a joint resolution of disapproval relating to a report submitted under subsection (f)(1)(B) proposing an action described in subsection (f)(1)(A)(ii) is enacted in accordance with subsection (h), the President may not issue the waiver.

"(h) JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF DISAPPROVAL OR APPROVAL DEFINED.—In this subsection:

"(1) JOINT RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL.—The term 'joint resolution of approval' means only a joint resolution of either House of Congress—

"(A) the title of which is as follows: 'A joint resolution approving the President's proposal to issue a waiver relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to Iran.'; and

"(B) the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is the following: 'Congress approves of the issuance of a waiver relating to the application of sanctions imposed with respect to Iran proposed by the President in the report submitted to Congress under section 1247(f)(1)(B) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 on _____ relating to _____', with the first blank space being filled with the appropriate date and the

second blank space being filled with a short description of the proposed waiver.

"(2) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—The term 'joint resolution of disapproval' means only a joint resolution of either House of Congress—

"(A) the title of which is as follows: 'A joint resolution disapproving the President's proposal to issue a waiver relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to Iran.'; and

"(B) the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is the following: 'Congress disapproves of the issuance of a waiver relating to the application of sanctions imposed with respect to Iran proposed by the President in the report submitted to Congress under section 1247(f)(1)(B) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 on _____ relating to _____', with the first blank space being filled with the appropriate date and the second blank space being filled with a short description of the proposed action.

"(3) INTRODUCTION.—During the period of 30 calendar days provided for under subsection (g)(1), including any additional period as applicable under the exception provided in subsection (g)(2), a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval may be introduced—

"(A) in the House of Representatives, by the majority leader or the minority leader; and

"(B) in the Senate, by the majority leader (or the majority leader's designee) or the minority leader (or the minority leader's designee).

"(4) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—If a committee of the House of Representatives to which a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval has been referred has not reported the joint resolution within 10 calendar days after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution.

"(5) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

"(A) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—A joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval introduced in the Senate shall be referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

"(B) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If the committee to which a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval was referred has not reported the joint resolution within 10 calendar days after the date of referral of the joint resolution, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

"(C) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time after the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs reports a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval to the Senate or has been discharged from consideration of such a joint resolution (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order.

"(D) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval shall be decided without debate.

"(E) CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGES.—Debate in the Senate of any veto message with respect to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval, including all debatable motions and appeals in connection with the joint resolution, shall be limited to 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

"(6) RULES RELATING TO SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

“(A) TREATMENT OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION IN HOUSE.—In the House of Representatives, the following procedures shall apply to a joint resolution of approval or a joint resolution of disapproval received from the Senate (unless the House has already passed a joint resolution relating to the same proposed action):

“(i) The joint resolution shall be referred to the Committee on Financial Services.

“(ii) If a committee to which a joint resolution has been referred has not reported the joint resolution within 2 calendar days after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution.

“(iii) Beginning on the third legislative day after each committee to which a joint resolution has been referred reports the joint resolution to the House or has been discharged from further consideration thereof, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on the joint resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

“(iv) The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the sponsor of the joint resolution (or a designee) and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

“(B) TREATMENT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION IN SENATE.—

“(i) If, before the passage by the Senate of a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval, the Senate receives an identical joint resolution from the House of Representatives, the following procedures shall apply:

“(I) That joint resolution shall not be referred to a committee.

“(II) With respect to that joint resolution—

“(aa) the procedure in the Senate shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the House of Representatives; but

“(bb) the vote on passage shall be on the joint resolution from the House of Representatives.

“(ii) If, following passage of a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval in the Senate, the Senate receives an identical joint resolution from the House of Representatives, that joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate Senate calendar.

“(iii) If a joint resolution of approval or a joint resolution of disapproval is received from the House, and no companion joint resolution has been introduced in the Senate, the Senate procedures under this subsection shall apply to the House joint resolution.

“(C) APPLICATION TO REVENUE MEASURES.—The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply in the House of Representatives to a joint resolution of approval or joint resolution of disapproval that is a revenue measure.

“(7) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This subsection is enacted by Congress—

“(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, and supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

“(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.”.

(b) FY 2012 NDAA.—Section 1245(d)(5) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal

Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a(d)(5)) is amended as follows:

(1) In subparagraph (A), by striking “determines that such a waiver” and inserting the following: “determines that—

“(i) the Government of Iran has ceased to provide support for acts of international terrorism; or

“(ii) such a waiver”.

(2) In subparagraph (B), by inserting “before issuing a waiver pursuant to subparagraph (A)(ii),” before “submits”.

(3) By adding at the end the following:

“The provisions relating to period for review by Congress described in subsections (g) and (h) of section 1247 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (22 U.S.C. 8806) shall apply with respect to a report submitted under subparagraph (B) proposing a waiver of the imposition of sanctions under paragraph (1) in the same manner and to the same extent as such provisions apply with respect to a report submitted under subsection (f)(1)(B) of such section 1247 proposing a waiver of the imposition of sanctions under subsection (a) of such section.”.

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

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, we witnessed Iran's unprecedented attack on our greatest ally and the lone democracy in the Middle East, Israel.

Tehran struck our friends in Israel with a swarm of missiles and drone attacks launched from Iranian soil. Thankfully, most of the attack was intercepted by Israeli defense systems with the support from the mighty U.S. military and other partners in the region and across the world.

This assault was just the latest sign that the ayatollahs seek to destroy Israel from all sides.

In addition to this direct attack, Iran has sought to encircle our Israeli allies through its support of Hamas and Hezbollah.

Hamas' terrorist strike last October on innocent Israeli civilians was a wake-up call for many around the world. It underscores the brutality of the Iranian proxies.

In response to this aggression, my friend and colleague from California (Mrs. KIM) authored the bill we are considering today, H.R. 6323, the Iran Counterterrorism Act. This legislation will provide Congress a stronger role in any future sanctions relief for Iran.

Under current law, the U.S. imposes so-called secondary sanctions against foreign banks that deal with Iran, restricting the ayatollahs' access to hard currency. At the same time, the President enjoys certain waiver authorities that he can invoke for national security purposes.

For example, last September, while Hamas was preparing to wage war against Israel, the Biden administration issued a waiver that allowed for \$6 billion in Iranian funds to be unfrozen.

However, this is not a Democratic or Republican issue we are bringing forward here. Administrations from both parties have used waivers in the past.

Additionally, Congress routinely enacts waiver authorities so the executive branch can use discretion in order to convince bad actors to change their behavior.

The issue when it comes to Iran is the status quo is simply unsustainable. Congresswoman KIM's bill recognizes this.

The regime in Tehran is so hostile, and the threat it poses to Israel and American interests are so high that lawmakers need a greater say when waivers are granted to the ayatollahs' access to the global financial system.

This bill before us ensures U.S. sanctions against Iran can only be waived if Iran has ceased support for international terrorism.

If the administration cannot certify that Iran is no longer financing terrorism, the bill also provides Congress with a chance to review any national security interest waivers of these sanctions.

When H.R. 6323 was passed by the Financial Services Committee, it received bipartisan support because Members are no longer comfortable delegating blanket waiver authorities that benefit Iran.

Tehran's continued aggression, from its efforts to destroy Israel, to its pursuit of nuclear weapons, to its export of drone technologies to Russia, demonstrates that our waiver policies need closer scrutiny.

Congresswoman KIM's legislation draws on a similar congressional review process already in place for Russian sanctions. This review was established under legislation from 2017 that passed both the House and the Senate with near unanimous support.

I am hopeful that our Democratic colleagues will take the threat posed by Iran as seriously as they did Russia when Congress enacted that law.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, Mrs. KIM's bill retains the sanctions exemptions we already have in place for humanitarian assistance to ordinary Iranians. Our challenge is with the regime in Iran, not the Iranian people. Her bill focuses on targeting Tehran's ability to finance terrorism, not on punishing innocent Iranian civilians.

This bill also is about ensuring that waivers benefiting the Iranian Government receive an appropriate vetting in Congress. After the attacks inflicted on

our Israeli allies and friends over the past 7 months, surely, we can all support this commonsense measure.

I thank Mrs. KIM for her work on this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, at the Rules Committee yesterday, the sponsor of this bill, Mrs. KIM, said that we would need to pass this bill in order to send a strong message to Iran that its unprecedented attack over the weekend was unacceptable.

I agree that the attack was unacceptable. It is wholly unclear how this bill, in any way, sends any such message. The bill would do nothing to deter another act by Iran. Instead, it would make it harder for the President to respond to emergency situations, including humanitarian crises.

Under current law, a President has the authority to waive sanctions only if they determine that such a waiver is vital to the national security of the United States and submits a report to Congress providing justification for the waiver. The authority also limits a President to a waiver period of 180 days, and they must comply with the same requirements in order to renew the waiver.

This is an authority that has been in place for decades and has been used effectively by Republican and Democratic Presidents to protect our national security. It is designed to allow the President to be nimble in response to situations that threaten our national security.

This bill would hamstring this limited waiver authority by prohibiting the President from moving forward with a waiver until a waiting period of up to 70 days have passed.

Let me repeat: It would prohibit the President from moving forward with a waiver until a waiting period of up to 70 days has passed.

During this waiting period, American hostages could be languishing in a foreign prison, victims of a major catastrophe could be suffering, or tensions between American allies and adversaries could be escalating to result in a war.

While any number of major threats to our national security are unfolding, this bill would impose an unreasonable waiting period during which the President would be required to jump through hoops as Congress holds hearings, receives briefings, and requests further information. This is an untenable way to handle emergency situations.

Further, by hamstringing our ability to respond quickly, this bill could very well create a rift between us and our allies abroad who are relying on us to support them in critical moments.

□ 1715

Let's be clear: The current law already provides for transparency on any

waivers by requiring reports to Congress explaining the rationale for any waivers. Congress already has every right to do robust oversight by holding hearings, receiving briefings, and requesting further information to better understand the justification for any waivers. We don't need this bill to allow us to do that.

The difference in this bill is that the President is subjected to a long waiting period, during which untold damage could be inflicted on the United States, our relationships with our allies, and our standing on the international stage.

After decades of a shadow war between Israel and Iran, and months of combat between Israel and Hamas that has resulted in thousands of civilian casualties, this weekend's attack by Iran has brought us even closer to the precipice of an all-out war in the region.

This is not the time to be tying the hands of our President to respond to emergencies, and this is not the time to be risking a rift in our international relationships with allies.

Moreover, limiting our ability to facilitate the funding to provide humanitarian relief for people in need, as this bill would do, is simply shameful. It degrades basic American values supporting the life and dignity of all people.

At the Rules Committee hearing yesterday, the bill's sponsor also claimed that the Biden administration had weakened sanctions on Iran and that this bill was designed to make it harder for the President to do so in the future, but the Biden administration's Iran sanctions program is the most extensive set of comprehensive sanctions against any country.

In fact, the Biden administration has ramped up pressure on Iran since the Trump administration by imposing sanctions on hundreds of additional individuals and entities for activity related to Iran, including the illicit sale of Iranian oil.

The Biden administration also successfully seized a tanker carrying Iranian oil, which was "the first-ever criminal resolution involving a company that violated sanctions by facilitating the illicit sale and transport of Iranian oil," according to the Department of Justice.

In fact, some of the examples that Republicans have cited for sanctions waivers that Biden has implemented were merely renewals of waivers that were initiated under the Trump administration. National security interest waivers, including those that facilitate humanitarian exceptions to sanctions, have long had bipartisan support, including under the Trump administration.

This is just another example of the double standard that Republicans use to fuel their political talking points. They are desperately trying to find a way to blame the Biden administration for Iran's latest attack when there is

simply no real basis to make that connection.

Republicans are also applying a double standard to Ukraine and Israel. They are jumping to support our ally Israel and punish Iran, but they have been holding up badly needed funding for Ukraine, thereby emboldening our shared enemy, Russia.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6323 will do nothing to stop or even deter Iran from attacking Israel again, nor will it end the humanitarian disaster and war in Gaza or help any of our allies under attack by authoritarian regimes. This bill does nothing to help Ukraine or provide Taiwan with any assurance that we have their back. Instead, this bill will have America sitting on its hands while any number of threats to our own national security unfold.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill and affirm that America will continue to be a beacon of hope for people around the world.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. KIM), a member of the Financial Services Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of my bipartisan bill, H.R. 6323, the Iran Counterterrorism Act.

Israel is confronting a critical moment as it fights for its right to exist. Iran and its proxies continue to attack our greatest ally in the Middle East and the lone democracy in the region.

As a key financial supporter of Hamas, Iran has sought to indirectly wage war against our Israeli allies. This was demonstrated by Hamas' barbaric attack on October 7.

Now, Iran's hostility has become direct. Last weekend, Iran attacked Israel with drones and missiles launched from Iranian soil. This shows how the ayatollahs are seeking to open up another front as Israel fights for survival.

Iran's aggression underlines the need for greater congressional oversight when the executive branch waives U.S. sanctions on Tehran. That is the focus of H.R. 6323.

Under current law, the United States imposes secondary sanctions against foreign financial institutions that do business with blacklisted Iranians. However, using the law's waiver authority, President Biden eased some of these sanctions last September.

Just as Hamas was preparing its assault, the Biden administration greenlit the transfer of \$6 billion in Iranian funds in exchange for the release of five American hostages. The waiver did nothing to deter Iran from its continued attempts to destroy Israel.

H.R. 6323 does not affect past waivers, but it will help ensure that waiver authority cannot be abused. This bill would require Iran to end its support

for international terrorism before another waiver could be invoked.

If Iran continues to fund terror and the White House seeks a sanctions waiver, this legislation will give the Congress a period to review that action. It will also give Congress an opportunity to reject a misguided waiver. That is common sense.

This bill does not discriminate between Republican and Democratic administrations. Any President who wishes to facilitate Iran's access to the global financial system will have to notify Congress 30 days in advance, so contrary to the ranking member's assertion, this is a reasonable measure that puts on guardrails.

Right now, the President has to notify Congress 15 days before waiving the sanctions. With this bill, we are extending that to 30 days and 60 days if we are in an August recess.

The review period will allow Congress to examine the merits of the waiver and pass a joint resolution of disapproval under expedited procedures, which would prevent the waiver from taking effect. Alternatively, Congress can choose to support a waiver or not to act at all. In both of those cases, the waiver would go forward.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said yesterday that they will not be supporting because they don't trust Congress to act. I will emphasize that if there is inaction from Congress, the President will be able to proceed with that waiver.

Additionally, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that this bill does nothing to counter Iran and its growing aggressiveness. Well, I have to disagree with those of my colleagues who say that. Certain actions by the administration have paved the way for Iran to not fear the consequences of its actions.

H.R. 6323 does not prejudge future waivers. It simply gives Members a say before Tehran can get its hands on any additional funds.

This congressional review process is taken from an existing law targeting Russia, the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, which passed the House in 2017 by a vote of 419-3. We can all agree that Tehran deserves as much scrutiny as Moscow.

I will finish with this. Nothing in H.R. 6323 affects existing sanctions exemptions for food, medicine, and medical devices. These are blanket exemptions that Congress has already built into the sanctions laws that we are discussing today, and nothing in this legislation would change that.

The Financial Services Committee passed this legislation in November in a bipartisan vote of 30-19. I am confident that it will receive support from Members on both sides of the aisle if it is considered on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans, to take action to confront Iran, stand with our greatest ally, Israel, and support H.R. 6323.

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

Mr. Speaker, if my GOP colleagues want to combat terrorism finance, the way to do that is not through convoluted congressional waiting periods and lengthy proposal processes, tying the President's hands. Rather, I have a solid, bipartisan bill to propose, one which passed our Financial Services Committee markup with a unanimous vote of 50-0. That bill, my bill, is the Stopping Illicit Oil Shipments Act of 2023, H.R. 6365.

The bill would target Iran's oil shipments and the Iranian ghost fleet, which is one of the biggest sources of funds for the terrorist Iranian regime. Iran and Russia both use this tactic to circumvent U.S. and allied sanctions. In fact, it is estimated that 2 million barrels of oil are transported daily on these ghost ships.

If Republicans were serious about countering Iran and Russia, they could have brought this bill to the floor with these other provisions, a bill that passed markup with the same bills considered this week.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

□ 1730

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the full Financial Services Committee for yielding, and I thank the chairman of the full committee as well for giving me the opportunity to raise concerns and to say that we all stand with our ally Israel and the horrors of waking up and being targeted by 300 drones and being absolutely struck by this terrorist attack.

I just came from a meeting with an Iranian-American diaspora organization working for a free democratic Iran who were stunned by Israel being attacked by 300 drones. This bill has consequences which I think are extremely important and worth looking at by our constituents and our community, which is what I wish to do.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the Iran Counterterrorism Act would require the President to obtain a congressional resolution of approval before waiving certain sanctions on Iran. This would cause us to have greater deliberation with the President.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring concerns but to recognize that this is an important step that we need to digest and discuss in order to make the right decision to safeguard the people in the region but also the free, democracy-wanting people of Iran.

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

In September of this year, the Biden administration negotiated an exchange with Iran for the release of five American citizens detained by Iran. In exchange, the Biden administration agreed to not block the transfer of the Trump-approved \$6 billion in Iranian assets that were the proceeds of Iranian oil purchased by South Korea.

Under the agreement, the funds would be transferred from a restricted account in South Korea to a restricted account in Qatar, where funds would be used exclusively for the purchase of humanitarian goods for Iranian citizens. The transfer did not authorize disbursement of funds, and the sanctioned Government of Iran has not and will not see a penny of that money.

Moreover, Treasury has stated that the U.S. and Qatar have agreed to effectively block the funds for the foreseeable future. Contrary to Republican claims, it is not accurate to tie this \$6 billion to Hamas' attack on October 7 because that attack was being planned for multiple years, likely beginning under the Trump administration.

Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, we received notice that the majority would be moving several Financial Services bills the very next day. This has put Members and staff in the difficult position of assessing and understanding multiple complex bills in a matter of hours in order to cast an informed vote.

The justification for jamming these bills through so quickly is allegedly to respond to Iran's attack on Israel over the weekend. Instead of taking the time to work in a bipartisan manner on bills that would actually increase pressure on Iran, Republicans are politicizing this moment, pointing the finger at the Biden administration, and rushing to pass bills like this one that don't actually provide any real solutions.

In response to Iran's latest attacks, they are just desperately trying to prove that they are doing something instead of taking the time to do something meaningful that actually has a chance to pass the Senate also.

Democrats and Republicans agree that we should be doing everything possible to crack down on Iranian leaders and terrorists. Instead of debating legislation that will accomplish this shared goal, we are here debating legislation that will only make it harder for us to respond quickly to crises.

Put simply, this bill would endanger our own national security and degrade our international standing. For these reasons, I oppose this bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just underscore a few points here. This bill was reported out of committee in November and was publicly available to Members. We reported this bill out

with bipartisan votes coming out of committee. My expectation here on the House floor is we would likewise have a bipartisan vote, number one.

Number two, this is applying the same standard to the Iranian regime that we have applied to the Russian regime, which says if you are going to waive sanctions, we have got to have a say here in Congress. We have to know what you are doing and why.

Now, that was the standard for my Democratic colleagues for a Republican administration, but now my Democratic colleagues don't have that same standard for a Democratic administration, which I think is more partisan than it is in the national interest.

Additionally, it is not just a question of the administration. It is a question of our relationship and our approach to Iran.

Are we going to take Russia more seriously than Iran? I don't think that is in our national interest. I don't think that is in the interest of international stability.

There are a number of things that I raise here that I think are important

parts of the debate. This is a bipartisan approach to waivers which is a good standard whether it is a Democratic administration or a Republican administration, whether or not Republicans or Democrats run the House or the Senate. It says to Iran that we are going to treat them similarly to how we treat the Russian regime.

We have got to stand against the aggression of Tehran and its efforts to destroy Israel, its pursuit of nuclear weapons, and its export of drone technology to Russia. We should stand against that. This week we are making a statement that we do stand against that.

This Congress is making bold statements this week, and I predict we will make more bold statements this week.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this bill, and 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, 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. MCHENRY. 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 17, 2024, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first quarter of 2024, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, are as follows:

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO PANAMA, COLOMBIA, AND PERU, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 23 AND FEB. 28, 2024

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Vern Buchanan	02/25	02/26	Colombia		450.82		(³)				450.82
Hon. Dina Titus	02/25	02/26	Colombia		450.82		(³)				450.82
Hon. Diana DeGette	02/25	02/26	Colombia		450.82		(³)				450.82
Hon. Adrian Smith	02/25	02/26	Colombia		450.82		(³)				450.82
Hon. Tim Walberg	02/25	02/26	Colombia		450.82		(³)				450.82
Hon. Dan Kildee	02/25	02/26	Colombia		450.82		(³)				450.82
Hon. Neal Dunn	02/25	02/26	Colombia		450.82		(³)				450.82
Hon. Kevin Hern	02/25	02/26	Colombia		450.82		(³)				450.82
Hon. Carlos Gimenez	02/25	02/26	Colombia		450.82		(³)				450.82
Derek Luyten	02/25	02/26	Colombia		438.68		(³)				438.68
Leslie Reagan	02/25	02/26	Colombia		438.68		(³)				438.68
Sean Brady	02/25	02/26	Colombia		438.68		(³)				438.68
Mitchell Moonier	02/25	02/26	Colombia		438.68		(³)				438.68
Courtney Butcher	02/25	02/26	Colombia		438.68		(³)				438.68
Committee total					6,250.78						6,250.78

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

HON. VERN BUCHANAN, Mar. 11, 2024.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GABON, THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO, AND ANGOLA, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 17 AND FEB. 27, 2024

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Julissa Walsh	2/17	2/27	GBN/DRC/AO		2,148.68		15,463.48				17,612.16
Jake Parker	2/17	2/27	GBN/DRC/AO		2,148.68		15,438.48				17,587.16
Jake Gilluly	2/17	2/27	GBN/DRC/AO		2,148.68		15,438.48				17,587.16
James Cunningham	2/17	2/27	GBN/DRC/AO		2,148.68		15,438.48				17,587.16
Linda Zhang	2/17	2/27	GBN/DRC/AO		2,148.68		16,138.48				18,287.16
Committee total					10,743.40		77,917.40				88,660.80

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MIKE JOHNSON, Apr. 5, 2024.