

**FULL COMMITTEE MARKUP OF H.R. 1690 AND
H.R. 589
DAY I AND DAY 2**

MARKUP

BEFORE THE

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

ONE HUNDRED EIGHTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

APRIL 26, 2023; DAY 1

APRIL 28, 2023; DAY 2

Serial No. 118–22

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs



Available: <http://www.foreignaffairs.house.gov/>, <http://docs.house.gov/>,
or <http://www.govinfo.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

52–236PDF

WASHINGTON : 2024

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

MICHAEL T. McCAUL, Texas, *Chairman*

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey	GREGORY MEEKS, New York, <i>Ranking Member</i>
JOE WILSON, South Carolina	BRAD SHERMAN, California
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania	GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia
DARRELL ISSA, California	WILLIAM KEATING, Massachusetts
ANN WAGNER, Missouri	DAVID CICILLINE, Rhode Island
BRIAN MAST, Florida	AMI BERA, California
KEN BUCK, Colorado	JOAQUIN CASTRO, Texas
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee	DINA TITUS, Nevada
MARK E. GREEN, Tennessee	TED LIEU, California
ANDY BARR, Kentucky	SUSAN WILD, Pennsylvania
RONNY JACKSON, Texas	DEAN PHILLIPS, Minnesota
YOUNG KIM, California	COLIN ALLRED, Texas
MARIA ELVIRA SALAZAR, Florida	ANDY KIM, New Jersey
BILL HUIZENGA, Michigan	SARA JACOBS, California
AUMUA AMATA COLEMAN RADEWAGEN, American Samoa	KATHY MANNING, North Carolina
FRENCH HILL, Arkansas	SHEILA CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Florida
WARREN DAVIDSON, Ohio	GREG STANTON, Arizona
JIM BAIRD, Indiana	MADELEINE DEAN, Pennsylvania
MICHAEL WALTZ, Florida	JARED MOSKOWITZ, Florida
THOMAS KEAN, Jr., New Jersey	JONATHAN JACKSON, Illinois
MICHAEL LAWLER, New York	SYDNEY KAMLAGER-DOVE, California
CORY MILLS, Florida	JIM COSTA, California
RICH MCCORMICK, Georgia	JASON CROW, Colorado
NATHANIEL MORAN, Texas	BRAD SCHNEIDER, Illinois
JOHN JAMES, Michigan	
KEITH SELF, Texas	

BRENDAN SHIELDS, *Staff Director*

SOPHIA LAFARGUE, *Staff Director*

C O N T E N T S

	Page
FULL COMMITTEE MARKUP OF H.R. 1690 AND H.R. 589	
DAY I	
BILLS, AMENDMENTS	
H.R. 589	2
Amendment offered by Mr. Mills	15
Amendment offered by Mr. Meeks	21
Amendment offered by Mr. Schneider	25
H. Res. 300	33
Bill H.R. 1690	41
Amendment offered by Mr. McCaul	49
Amendment offered by Mr. Castro	67
Amendment offered by Mr. Castro	70
Amendment offered by Mr. Castro	78
Amendment offered by Ms. Kamlager-Dove	84
Bill H. R. 2789	88
Amendment of Mr. Issa	99
APPENDIX	
Hearing Notice	103
Hearing Minutes	105
Hearing Attendance	106
STATEMENT FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED FROM REPRESENTATIVE	
CONNOLLY	
Statement for the record from Representative Connolly	107
VOTES SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD	
Votes submitted for the record	110
ADDITIONAL MATERIALS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD	
Materials submitted for the record from Representative Phillips	118
Materials submitted for the record from Representative Perry	119
Materials submitted for the record from Representative Schneider	126
FULL COMMITTEE MARKUP OF H.R. 1690 AND H.R. 589	
DAY 2	
Roll Call	143
MARKUP SUMMARY	
Markup summary	148

**FULL COMMITTEE MARKUP OF H.R. 1690 AND
H.R. 589
DAY I**

Wednesday, April 26, 2023

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:52 a.m., in room 210, House Visitor Center, Hon. Michael McCaul (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Mr. ISSA [presiding]. Good morning. A quorum being present, the Committee on Foreign Affairs will come to order.

The Committee is meeting today for consideration of H.R. 589, To impose sanctions on the Supreme Leader of Iran and President of Iran and their respective offices for human rights abuses and support for terrorism.

H.R. 330, Requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit, respectively, to the House of Representatives copies of all documents indicating any plans for current or future military assistance to Ukraine and documents indicating whether any United States Armed Forces, including special operations forces, are currently deployed in Ukraine.

Next, H.R. 1690, To authorize the Secretary to negotiate regional immigration agreements, and for other purposes.

Last, H.S. 2789, To direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy on efforts to strengthen subnational cooperation between the United States and Mexico, and for other purposes.

The ranking member being present, we will—I will not do my opening statement.

Pursuant to Committee Rule 4, the Chair may postpone any further proceedings on approval of any measure or matter or adopting of an amendment. Without objection, the Chair is authorized to declare a recess of the Committee any point. Without objection, all members will have 5 days to submit statements on and extraneous material into the record on today's business.

Pursuant to House Rule 1, I request that members have an opportunity to submit views for any Committee report that may be produced on or after today's measures, without objection, so ordered.

Pursuant to notice, I now call up H.R. 589, a bill to impose sanctions on the Supreme Leader of Iran the President of Iran and their respective offices for human rights abuses and support for terrorism.

[The Bill H.R. 589 follows:]

I

118TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 589

To impose sanctions on the Supreme Leader of Iran and the President of Iran and their respective offices for human rights abuses and support for terrorism.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 27, 2023

Mr. BANKS (for himself, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. WALTZ, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FALLON, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. GUEST, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. SWALWELL, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned

A BILL

To impose sanctions on the Supreme Leader of Iran and the President of Iran and their respective offices for human rights abuses and support for terrorism.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

1 **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

2 This Act may be cited as the “Mahsa Amini Human
3 rights and Security Accountability Act” or the “MAHSA
4 Act”.

5 **SEC. 2. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS ON IRAN'S SUPREME**
6 **LEADER'S OFFICE, ITS APPOINTEES, AND ANY**
7 **AFFILIATED PERSONS.**

8 (a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

9 (1) The Supreme Leader is an institution of the
10 Islamic Republic of Iran.

11 (2) The Supreme Leader holds ultimate author-
12 ity over Iran's judiciary and security apparatus, in-
13 cluding the Ministry of Intelligence and Security,
14 law enforcement forces under the Interior Ministry,
15 the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC), and
16 the Basij, a nationwide volunteer paramilitary group
17 subordinate to the IRGC, all of which have engaged
18 in human rights abuses in Iran. Additionally the
19 IRGC, a United States designated Foreign Terrorist
20 Organization, which reports to the Supreme Leader,
21 continues to perpetrate terrorism around the globe,
22 including attempts to kill and kidnap American citi-
23 zens on United States soil.

24 (3) The Supreme Leader appoints the head of
25 Iran's judiciary. International observers continue to
26 criticize the lack of independence of Iran's judicial

1 system and maintained that trials disregarded inter-
2 national standards of fairness.

3 (4) The revolutionary courts, created by Iran's
4 former Supreme Leader Ruhollah Khomeini, within
5 Iran's judiciary, are chiefly responsible for hearing
6 cases of political offenses, operate in parallel to
7 Iran's criminal justice system and routinely hold
8 grossly unfair trials without due process, handing
9 down predetermined verdicts and rubberstamping
10 executions for political purpose.

11 (5) The Iranian security and law enforcement
12 forces engage in serious human rights abuse at the
13 behest of the Supreme Leader.

14 (6) Iran's President, Ebrahim Raisi, sits at the
15 helm of the most sanctioned cabinet in Iranian his-
16 tory which includes internationally sanctioned rights
17 violators. Raisi has supported the recent crackdown
18 on protestors and is rights violator himself, having
19 served on a "death commission" in 1988 that led to
20 the execution of several thousand political prisoners
21 in Iran. He most recently served as the head of
22 Iran's judiciary, a position appointed by Iran's cur-
23 rent Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei, and may likely
24 be a potential candidate to replace Khamenei as
25 Iran's next Supreme Leader.

1 (7) On September 16th, 2022, 22-year-old
2 woman, Mahsa Amini, died in the detention of the
3 Morality Police after being beaten and detained for
4 allegedly transgressing discriminatory dress codes
5 for women. This tragic incident triggered wide-
6 spread, pro-women’s rights, pro-democracy protests
7 across all of Iran’s 31 provinces, calling for the end
8 to Iran’s theocratic regime.

9 (8) In the course of the protests, the Iranian
10 security forces’ violent crackdown includes mass ar-
11 rests, well documented beating of protestors, throt-
12 tling of the internet and telecommunications serv-
13 ices, and shooting protestors with live ammunition.
14 Five weeks into the protests, Iranian security forces
15 have reportedly killed hundreds of protestors and
16 other civilians, including women and children, and
17 wounded many more.

18 (9) Iran’s Supreme Leader is the leader of the
19 “Axis of Resistance”, which is a network of
20 Tehran’s terror proxy and partner militias material
21 supported by the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps
22 that targets the United States as well as its allies
23 and partners.

24 (b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Con-
25 gress that—

1 (1) the United States shall stand with and sup-
2 port the people of Iran in their demand for funda-
3 mental human rights; and

4 (2) the United States shall continue to hold the
5 Islamic Republic of Iran, particularly the Supreme
6 Leader and President, accountable for abuses of
7 human rights, corruption, and export of terrorism.

8 (c) IN GENERAL.—

9 (1) DETERMINATION REQUIRED.—Not later
10 than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this
11 Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall de-
12 termine whether the sanctions listed in paragraph
13 (2) apply with respect to each person and entity de-
14 scribed in subsection (d), and impose all applicable
15 such sanctions with respect to each such person and
16 entity.

17 (2) SANCTIONS LISTED.—The sanctions listed
18 in this paragraph are the following:

19 (A) Sanctions described in section 105(c)
20 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Account-
21 ability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C.
22 8514(c)).

23 (B) Sanctions applicable with respect to a
24 person pursuant to Executive Order 13553 (50
25 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property

1 of certain persons with respect to serious
2 human rights abuses by the Government of
3 Iran).

4 (C) Sanctions applicable with respect to a
5 person pursuant to Executive Order 13224 (50
6 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property
7 and prohibiting transactions with persons who
8 commit, threaten to commit, or support ter-
9 rorism).

10 (D) Sanctions applicable with respect to a
11 person pursuant to Executive Order 13818 (re-
12 lating to blocking the property of persons in-
13 volved in serious human rights abuse or corrup-
14 tion).

15 (E) Sanctions applicable with respect to a
16 person pursuant to Executive Order 13876 (re-
17 lating to imposing sanctions with respect to
18 Iran).

19 (F) Penalties and visa bans applicable with
20 respect to a person pursuant to section 7031(c)
21 of the Department of State, Foreign Oper-
22 ations, and Related Programs Appropriations
23 Act, 2021.

24 (d) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—The persons described in
25 this subsection are the following:

1 (1) The Supreme Leader of Iran and any offi-
2 cial in the Office of the Supreme Leader of Iran.

3 (2) The President of Iran and any official in
4 the Office of the President of Iran or the President's
5 cabinet, including cabinet ministers and executive
6 vice presidents.

7 (3) Any entity, including foundations and eco-
8 nomic conglomerates, overseen by the Office of the
9 Supreme Leader of Iran which is complicit in financ-
10 ing or resourcing of human rights abuses or support
11 for terrorism.

12 (4) Any official of any entity owned or con-
13 trolled by the Supreme Leader of Iran or the Office
14 of the Supreme Leader of Iran.

15 (5) Any person determined by the Secretary of
16 the Treasury, in consultation with or at the rec-
17 ommendation of the Secretary of State—

18 (A) to be a person appointed by the Su-
19 preme Leader of Iran, the Office of the Su-
20 preme Leader of Iran, the President of Iran, or
21 the Office of the President of Iran to a position
22 as a state official of Iran, or as the head of any
23 entity located in Iran or any entity located out-
24 side of Iran that is owned or controlled by one
25 or more entities in Iran;

1 (B) to have materially assisted, sponsored,
2 or provided financial, material, or technological
3 support for, or goods or services to or in sup-
4 port of any person whose property and interests
5 in property are blocked pursuant to this section;

6 (C) to be owned or controlled by, or to
7 have acted or purported to act for or on behalf
8 of, directly or indirectly any person whose prop-
9 erty and interests in property are blocked pur-
10 suant to this section; or

11 (D) to be a member of the board of direc-
12 tors or a senior executive officer of any person
13 whose property and interests in property are
14 blocked pursuant to this section.

15 (e) CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT.—

16 (1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after
17 receiving a request from the chairman and ranking
18 member of one of the appropriate congressional com-
19 mittees with respect to whether a person meets the
20 criteria of a person described in subsection (d)(5),
21 the President shall—

22 (A) determine if the person meets such cri-
23 teria; and

24 (B) submit a classified or unclassified re-
25 port to such chairman and ranking member

1 with respect to such determination that includes
2 a statement of whether or not the President im-
3 posed or intends to impose sanctions with re-
4 spect to the person pursuant to this section.

5 (2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMIT-
6 TEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “ap-
7 propriate congressional committces” means—

8 (A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of
9 the House of Representatives; and

10 (B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of
11 the Senate.

○

The CLERK. H.R. 589, a bill to impose sanctions on the Supreme Leader of Iran, the President of Iran, and their respective offices for human rights abuses and support for terrorism.

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives—

Mr. ISSA. Without objection, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with and the bill is considered as read and open for amendment at any point. Without objection, the McCaul Amendment in the nature of a substitute, No. 39, circulated to members in advance, shall be considered as read and will be treated as the original text for purposes of amendment.

I now recognize myself for a short statement.

This bipartisan bill, which I am proud to be a co-sponsor, deals with the outcome of September, when a 22-year-old woman was murdered at the hands of Iran's morality police. Her supposed crime was improperly covering her hair.

Her death sparked a vast popular protest movement, with civilians across the country chanting "Women, life, freedom," and other slogans protesting the regime's totalitarian control of every aspect of their life and their interpretation of what was moral and not.

The regime responded with a characteristic cruelty, cracking down on these peaceful protesters. Since September, hundreds have been murdered by Iran's security forces. Thousands more have been detained and trumped-up charges on many of them, especially women, have been subjected to torture and other cruel punishments.

There are now terrifying indications that the regime is involved in a deliberate poisoning of schoolgirls in Iran, with thousands of girls poisoned in the last few months.

Iran has also engaged in ongoing human rights violations against American citizens. Iran continues to hold at least three American citizens hostage, and Iran has engaged in assassination plots of American citizens on U.S. soil.

These and other attacks on American people and the Iran people cannot be unanswered. The bill is designed to force the Administration's hand, on a bipartisan basis, to assure that the United States is using all available to compel the regime to abandon these brutal—good day for this—brutal abuses by applying relevant sanctions.

This includes both laws passed by Congress and Executive Orders issued by this and previous presidents. The text we are considering today and the amendment that will be offered by Representative Mills will ensure the bill's functions effectively in both types of authorities, meaning both Executive Orders and statute.

The text also adds a robust reporting requirement on sanction determinations required under the bill, with a very strict limitations on what can be classified and not otherwise made available to this body and to the public. This will facilitate full transparency and accountability.

The Administration and future Administrations cannot hide behind nebulous rationales for secrecy and non-compliance. Congress and the American people deserve to know exactly what is being done and what they are doing to respond to these brutal human rights violations.

With that, I recognize the ranking member for his opening statement.

Mr. MEEKS. I support the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Mahsa Amini Human Rights and Security Accountability Act, or the MAHSA Act, is a bill that would require the President of the United States to determine whether high-ranking officials of the Islamic Republic regime in Iran should be listed under existing U.S. sanctions for human rights abuse and support of terrorism.

Every member on this committee understands the evil nature of Iran's Supreme Leader, a man who leads a corrupt, criminal theocracy that endangers the Iranian people, as well as the entire international community.

The Supreme Leader murders, tortures, and abuses his own people. He denies Iranian citizens freedom and democracy. He guides proxy forces meant to destabilize numerous regional countries.

He has threatened to wipe Israel off the map. And he is developing a nuclear program that has stockpiled enough highly enriched uranium for several nuclear warheads.

There must be costs associated with this behavior, and the United States is delivering those costs.

The Supreme Leader is currently sanctioned under E.O. 13876, which blocks the property of the Supreme Leader and his office, as well as persons determined to have provided material support to the Supreme Leader or his office. As of April 20, 2023, 112 persons have been designated for sanctions pursuant to this order: 75 entities, 36 individuals, and one vessel.

Some of these designations were made by the Trump Administration, and some have been made by the Biden Administration. Is entirely a bipartisan priority.

The Supreme Leader is fully cutoff from the American financial system and is not allowed to travel to the United States. He is also subject to secondary sanctions, which allow us to greatly expand our sanctions' reach.

Other prominent Iranian leaders currently under the strict American sanctions includes President Raisi, two of Iran's Vice Presidents, and seven cabinet ministers, to include the Ministers of Communication, Culture, Defense, Intelligence, Interior, and Petroleum.

As I mentioned just moments ago, companies and subsidiaries tied to the Supreme Leader in the sectors of energy, textiles, mining, chemicals, and financial services are all under strict sanctions as well.

I intend to vote for this legislation on committee to allow it to continue to progress to a conference with the Senate. But during that process, I want to make sure and certain that the legislative text will not harm this or any president's ability to adjust to any potential national security event vis a vis Iran.

I also hope we can streamline the reporting requirements to make them feasible for OFAC and the Treasury Department to deliver to Congress.

I also want to thank Chairman McCaul and his staff for working with us on this bill and to make sure that we are able to proceed

in a bipartisan manner. As always, I appreciate the cooperation and working together with the Chairman.

And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. I thank the ranking member. And with that, I will now recognize members under the 5-minute rules, alternating between the majority and minority. Is there anyone seeking recognition to discuss the bill further?

The gentlelady is recognized.

Ms. MANNING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Ranking Member Meeks for your leadership in working to pass this and other important measures——

Mr. ISSA. Could you pull the mic a little closer? It does not seem to be working well. See, you move in seniority and these good things happen.

Ms. MANNING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member Meeks for your leadership in working to pass this and other important measures.

The Iranian regime continues to threaten the fundamental human rights of its own citizens. Since the tragic death of 22-year-old Mahsa Amini in the custody of Iran's so-called morality police for allegedly wearing her head scarf incorrectly, thousands of Iranians have joined peaceful protests and demonstrations calling for their basic right and freedoms to be respected.

It has been sickening to witness the Iranian authorities' brutal crackdown on these peaceful protesters, including sentencing some protesters to death and carrying out public executions. That is why I was proud to co-sponsor HCon Res. 7, a bipartisan resolution introduced by Representative Tenney supporting the brave women and men risking their lives to protest in Iran.

I have also worked with Representatives Tom Kean and Bill Keating on a bipartisan effort urging the European Union to designate Iran's IRGC as a terrorist organization. I am glad that on Monday, the Biden Administration in coordination with the U.K. designated several senior Iranian officials and IRGC commanders for sanctions for violating human rights, further increasing pressure on the regime.

The bipartisan agreement on H.R. 589, the Mahsa Amini Human Rights and Security Accountability Act that the Committee is considering today, helps ensure that Iran's Supreme Leader and other senior officials face the strong sanctions regime that we have put in place.

I proudly stand with the people of Iran in sending a clear message that those responsible for violating human rights in Iran and exporting terrorism should be held accountable.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in continuing to support the Iranian people. Thank you, and I yield back.

Mr. ISSA. The gentlelady yields back. Is there anyone further seeking recognition?

There being no further discussion on the bill, the Committee will move to consideration of the amendments. Does any member wish to offer an amendment?

The gentleman, Mr. Mills, is recognized for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. MILLS. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I understand that there are constitutional concerns regarding——

Mr. ISSA. Pardon me. The—we have an amendment at the desk. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

[The Amendment offered by Mr. Mills follows:]

**AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE
NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE TO H.R. 589
OFFERED BY MR. MILLS OF FLORIDA**

Page 5, strike lines 4 through 7 and insert the following:

1 (B) impose applicable sanctions against
2 any foreign person determined to meet the cri-
3 teria for imposition of sanctions pursuant to
4 subparagraph (A) under the sanctions programs
5 and authorities listed in subparagraph (A) or
6 (F) of subsection (c)(2) and pursue applicable
7 sanctions against any foreign person deter-
8 mined to meet the criteria for imposition of
9 sanctions pursuant to subparagraph (A) under
10 the sanctions programs and authorities listed in
11 subparagraph (B), (C), (D), or (E) of sub-
12 section (c)(2); and



Mr. ISSA. Just give him an opportunity to distribute the amendment.

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 589 offered by Mr. Mills of Florida. Page 5—

Mr. ISSA. Without objection, further reading of the amendment will be dispensed with. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes to explain his amendment.

Mr. MILLS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chair, I understand that there are some constitutional concerns regarding separation of powers with the original forcing language of the bill as it was introduced, thereby being the President shall impose sanctions.

However, the ANS dilutes it to such an extent that the Administration or other Administrations could simply not enforce the bill as Congress intends it. My amendment resolves these issues by clarifying the technical language, restoring the strength of the bill while also ensuring any Administration unable to play legal gymnastics can avoid implementing the strengthened measure.

Specifically, my amendment divides the issue between how Administration implementation this bill provisions. Regarding the sanctioned statutes reference within the bill under which Congress can force the Administration to take actions, my amendment restores the “shall impose” language of the original bill.

However, recognizing that there are legal ramifications for applying this forcing language to executive orders, my amendment does maintain the “pursue sanctions” verbiage for those discretionary authorities.

As someone who has actually been the recipient with my team of Iranian Government aggressions, as I was blown up with EFP in 2006, I can assure that we most hold the terrorist Iranian regime accountable, and this is very personal to me.

This regime is responsible for brutally murdering countless men, women, and children, and supporting heinous acts of violence around the world. It is unconscionable to me that those responsible for these activities would be able to continue accessing financial and economic lifelines provided by the United States.

I am proud to be a co-sponsor of the MAHSA Act and a strong supporter. And while I am happy to recognize there are improvements that could be made to it, this is what markups are for, to have discussions and resolve any issues that the original bill may have had.

I am glad to see some of the changes that were made by the Chairman’s ANS, and I am thankful for his willingness to work with me to find a solution to this particular provision to retain the intent and the strength of this bill.

We must no longer allow the malign activities of this regime of the IRGC, of the Quds Force, and those who have actually resulted in the brutal murder of exactly who we’re protecting right now, which is Mahsa Amini.

I ask that everyone in this room join with me to ensure that we not only hold them accountable, but that we actually prevent such activities from going on in the future. This type of human rights violation cannot be something that we accept.

In America we claim that we are the shining beacon of freedom and liberty. But not supporting such an amendment or such a bill would really speak otherwise.

We also say both on the left and the right that we support women's rights. And the right for them to actually have the freedoms and the liberties to walk peacefully and conduct themselves in the manner in which they see fit, not to be ostracized, persecuted, brutally murdered, imprisoned, tortured, raped, and worse.

I ask that we all come together, not just to show the greatness of America and what we do here in the Foreign Affairs Committee, but to show what we stand for as Americans. Whether we are Republican, whether we are Democrat, whether we are Independents, we all believe in the freedoms and liberties that all should have.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. ISSA. Will the gentleman yield for just a moment? Will the gentleman yield to the Chair? I will not even ask for my own, thank you. I do not want to ask for my own time.

I want to just thank the gentleman for this thoughtful amendment, and for the fact that it really does clarify this bill in a good way, something we are all seeking and will continue to seek throughout the day.

So that is my entire statement in support of your good work. And with that, does any—thank the gentleman. Does anyone seek recognition? The ranking member is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Unfortunately, I have to oppose the Mills Amendment. You know, what we did, we worked together, and I thought we had an agreement with them. But since our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have sought to change the deal that we had negotiated.

The language in the Mills Amendment adds unnecessary rigidity to the text, so therefore I unfortunately must oppose it. The language in the Mills Amendment should clarify the imposition of sanctions is done in the manner and mechanisms as in the underlying statutes.

Contrary to fixing the legal gymnastics, the exclusion of the language which was suggested in negotiating will add confusion in its implementation. And therefore I have no choice but to oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MEEKS. Yes.

Mr. ISSA. Is there a secondary amendment that you could offer to help us bridge this gap? As you know, this a committee that almost always reaches consensus, and we would like to do that today.

Mr. MEEKS. Always ready to do that, I am always ready to have a dialog and a conversation to see if we can fix it, as we had been negotiating before.

Mr. ISSA. OK, then if it is appropriate, and I think it is, what I would like to do is we will not hold the vote on this amendment, and we will continue through the process so the staff can see if that can be done, if that is acceptable?

Mr. MEEKS. That is acceptable to me.

Mr. ISSA. OK, then—

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chair, may I clarify one point?

Mr. ISSA. Yes, of course you may. Well, with the chairman—or the ranking member's acquiescence of his time.

Mr. MEEKS. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. Yes, I want to clarify one thing, this myth about the amendment as now being more extreme than the original text of the bill.

The fact is this: the amendment simply clarifies the bill's intent and resolves constitutional concerns that some have raised with Congress forcing the Administration to take certain actions in relation to Executive Orders, which are discretionary authorities.

If anything, my amendment is nothing more than a technical correction that aligns the intended impact of the bill with the legally required verbiage to be effective. Statutes enacted by Congress and signed into law by the President are distinct from the implementation of Executive Orders.

What my amendment does is simply reflects that reality and clarifies the language of the bill to be in sync with that actual reality. It does not strengthen the bill to a point which is not unconstitutionally longer. It strengthens the bill to get to its original intent that we want, which is to help impose these sanctions, not pursue these sanctions.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. ISSA. Any further comment?

Mr. MEEKS. No, not really. I am just saying and that is why I will yield to try to talk, because I want to make sure that the amendment is clear about the discretion of the authority.

So I am willing to have a dialog and conversation and see if we can work this out. Because we are clearly united on the basics and on the original bill. But I am always ready to try to see if we can—

Mr. ISSA. Well, I know we worked well into the night and did not quite get there. Let me, if I could ask the gentleman would yield for a question.

As I understand it, the debate is primarily about the Executive Orders and how they would be treated. I think we all know that a president can issue a new Executive Order at any time. And a president can rescind an Executive Order at any time.

Do you think, as we go to the floor, if we could have report language that made it clear that that authority is not superseded by this bill, that in fact although we are codifying Executive Orders, we are not putting them in statute. And therefore, a president still has the authority to add a new Executive Order or take one away.

And as a middle ground, that would seem like it would affirm what is there in the history, but not prohibit the President's authority.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Would my friend yield for a question?

Mr. MEEKS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. CONNOLLY. So the language being proposed says shall oppose, but has a caveat to that, or as appropriate. Is that correct?

Mr. ISSA. I believe that's correct, Mr. Mills.

Mr. CONNOLLY. And that is what you referred to, Mr. Meeks, as sort of legal gymnastics. And I kind of appreciate the gentleman. I mean, I happen to believe we have the power to say shall. I do

not know, I think that is in the Constitution. But that is for lawyers to argue, I guess.

So I appreciate the willingness to negotiate, although I would note, would I not, Mr. Meeks, that we in fact have been negotiating language in this bill for 2 weeks, including right after 3 this morning?

Mr. MEEKS. You are correct.

Mr. ISSA. But we did have a good night's rest.

Mr. CONNOLLY. All right. Well, I am happy to join with you in trying to work out more. And I understand the hurdles the gentleman is trying to get over.

And the question I think is but is this language going to do it. Is this efficacious, or is this language trying to, you know, meet this hurdle sincerely in fact going to complicate things and make it more murky. And that is really, that is the question I think on our side of the aisle.

Mr. MEEKS. Absolutely.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Yes. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Would the gentleman offer—

Mr. ISSA. Well, I think now it is my time to say I will take my 5 minutes, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you so much, Mr. Connolly, I really appreciate as well as from Mr. Meeks for your willingness to work on this.

I will say, however, and I want to reference this, because I too want to make sure that we are not worrying about the gymnastics that is going to have pursue.

And that is why while there are debates about the Congress's constitutional authority to force executive branch to take certain actions based on authorities provided under the Executive Order, Congress does have the constitutional authority to force the executive branch to impose sanctions that fall under the purview of statutes.

For example, and this is to your point, sir, Section 105 of CAATSA required the President to impose sanctions on the IRGC. And the executive branch did exactly that. So there are no fight in court, there was no question about the constitutionality of that provision that was raised.

And while the original text of the bill caused some concerns about the constitutional separation of power, my amendment just clearly articulates the distinction between how Congress engages with the executive branch on statutes and Executive Orders, thereby preventing any questions about the bill's constitutionality.

And to your point, Mr. Connolly, I absolutely agree with you. This is a constitutional authority, and I appreciate you for bringing that up, thank you so much.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. ISSA. The gentleman yields back.

Mr. MORAN. Would the chair yield?

Mr. ISSA. I would further yield, yes.

Mr. MORAN. Just one moment's comment about this. I do appreciate the amendment and appreciate the discussion today. I just want to offer my support for this amendment and note that mes-

saging oftentimes is different than bill-drafting. It is a distinct two-way street sometimes. We got to choose one way or the other.

I appreciate Mr. Mills in the drafting of this amendment because I think the language is well-reasoned, carefully drafted, narrowly tailored to meet the end that it is intended to meet.

It ensures that the actual drafting of this bill strengthens the bill's intent, which is bringing more teeth to the enforcement measures contained in, it while preserving the constitutional doctrine of separation of powers, a balancing act that sometimes is hard to do.

So I support this amendment and just want to thank my colleague, Mr. Mills, for bringing it forward in a thoughtful manner. But we will see what happens when we get to the floor. But I do appreciate the amendment and I support it.

Thank you, yield back.

Mr. ISSA. I thank the gentleman. Before I yield back, this dialog has been helpful. I for one will pledge to the ranking member that we will, regardless of what we arrive and depart today with in the way of a base bill, that obviously we want to reach the language that was being worked on. I believe we are close.

If there is further need for either report language or technical changes, Mr. Mills, I assume that you are willing to continue to negotiate. Mr. Meeks, I know you are. So let's go through, let's get the bill out.

But as always, debate does not end with the bill as it leaves the Committee. That we do want to make sure there are technical changes if necessary that make this bill as good as it can and as clear as it can for an Administration that we know well can misinterpret that which we do not universally agree on.

So let's see if we can get there. Is there any further discussion? Seeing no further requests for time, the motion is on the Mills Amendment.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

I just want take a moment to make sure that I make it clear. The intention is to continue to negotiate to try to find the differences between what I think are the same goal Mr. Mills and Mr. Meeks have agreed to.

We are going to go ahead and have the recorded vote, with a recognition that regardless of how we vote here today, the goal will be to in fact have the intention that both sides have agreed to.

You know, in a perfect world, we would, you know, recess and do it. But I know that we do have four bills to get through today. And so I have been advised to go ahead and vote the Mills Amendment.

But I, like Mr. Mills, agree to continue to work in good faith. I think we can get there.

As I said, all those in favor, I heard ayes. All those opposed?

OK, in the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it. The ayes have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

Are there any further amendments at this time? Mr. Meeks?

Mr. MEEKS. I have an amendment at the desk.

[The Amendment offered by Mr. Meeks follows:]

G:\CMTE\FA\18\H589_AM3.XML

**AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE
NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE TO H.R. 589
OFFERED BY M__ . _____**

Page 9, line 4, strike “person” and insert “Iranian
person”.



Mr. ISSA. The ranking member is recognized for the purpose of his amendment, and the Clerk shall designate the amendment. Please distribute the amendment. The Clerk shall report the amendment.

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 589, offered by Mr. Meeks of New York. Page 9, line 4, strike person and—

Mr. ISSA. Without objection, further reading of the amendment is dispensed with, and the gentleman is recognize to explain his amendment for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have heard supporters of the bill emphasize that the bill is about making sure that the Supreme Leader, other Iranian leaders, and Iranian enablers are sanctioned.

My amendment is simple. It clarifies that the scope of the sanctions is limited to Iranians and does not extend to allies and partners around the globe.

The language in the current text is potentially over-broad and could capture people in companies around the globe. My amendment makes sure our focus is where it should be, on the Iranian leaders that suppress, impoverish, and commit human rights violations against their people and sponsor terror around the region and the world.

And that is simply what it does. And therefore I urge all of my colleagues to support my amendment. And I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. I thank the gentleman, the gentleman yields back.

The Chair must oppose this amendment for a simple reason. In its current form, it could exclude groups which some of whom are already sanctioned in other ways, such as Hezbollah, and others, the Syrian regime, that are in absolute lock-step with the Iranian Government.

Having said that, if there is any clarification on the bill, we want to make it clear that the President and the Administration does determine whether someone is that affiliate or in control.

So, hopefully every Administration would find that Hezbollah is clearly a partner of Iran, while other groups including allies, some of whom obviously do have relations with Iran, remain loyal allies. For example, our military base in Qatar is a country which does have diplomatic relations with Iran, does have Iranians in their country. But at the same time is a trusted base.

And I do see the point of the gentleman, I just cannot support it in its current form.

Mr. MEEKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ISSA. Of course I yield.

Mr. MEEKS. I just want to say that this amendment does not remove sanctions from anyone. So Hezbollah, sanctions are there. Those sanctions would continue. So it would not remove sanctions from anyone.

Mr. ISSA. And I totally agree with the gentleman that it does not remove those which we have sanctioned. But as the ranking member knows, we often find individuals who can be recognized as aligned with the regime, and at any time, it is unlikely that they will be able to essentially systematically sanction.

The bill in its current form essentially does not name new individuals or new countries, but rather simply says that if the Administration finds them to be an extension of Iran, then they are covered by the sanctions.

Which is, again, the Secretary of State, Department of Homeland Security, and others clearly have an ability to determine, for example, that the Emir of Qatar is not in league with Iran, but in fact represents an ally who supports us while being just as present in Syria, they are aligned with Iran. And I do appreciate that we have a number of sanctions on a number of countries, but it is not all-inclusive.

If report language—if this amendment fails and report language making it clear that it is not intended to expand or the like were to be added, it certainly would provide guidance to the Administration. In the chair's opinion, this really is something that should be extensively covered in report languages' guidance to the Administration, and I certainly wouldn't oppose that.

I yield back. Do any other members seek recognitions? If not—Mr. Mills is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Ranking Member Meeks, for your amendment.

While I do oppose this, I want to make sure that I explain why. Throughout my time, I can tell you that during the height in the reign of the Quds Force, Qasem Soleimani, there was multiple partnerships that had been forged. And many of these partnerships were things like that of Abu Mahdi al-Muhandis in Iraq under the Hashd al-Sha'bi and now under Qais al-Khazali.

But also the marriage of convenience that came about where a lot of people do not understand that the General Secretary of Hezbollah, Hassan Nazrallah, his own son has married the daughter of Qasem Soleimani, thereby ingratiating himself with the Iranian Ayatollah.

By utilizing the language to strike "person" and only insert "Iranian persons" would limit our ability with the key factions and the Iranian-backed militias that are actually conducting a lot of these things are going on.

And so we must recognize the fact that if we simply say "Iranian person," that would eliminate those like Abu Fadak al-Mohammadawi. That would eliminate things like the militias that are being launched by Ismail Ghaani. That would eliminate the ability for us to start taking a larger approach against Abu Fadak.

These are people who are committing the exact same atrocities, and in some extents even worse, that what we are actually try to prevent with the MAHSA Act.

And so it is for that reason that I agree with you, Mr. Chairman, that I have to oppose this so that we can ensure that all who are committing these atrocities are held accountable.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. ISSA. The gentleman yields back. Does anyone else seek recognition?

If not, there being no further discussion, the question now occurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman, Mr. Meeks, No. 3. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it, the noes have it.
And the amendment is not agreed to.

Are there any further amendments? I do not see—the gentleman
Mr. Schneider is recognized for purposes of offering his amendment.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. I have an amendment at the desk.
[The Amendment offered by Mr. Schneider follows:]

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

2 This Act may be cited as the “American Cooperation
3 with Our Neighbors Act”.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a strategy on efforts to strengthen subnational cooperation between the United States and Mexico for the purposes of—

(1) enhancing law enforcement cooperation and local, State, and Federal security forces cooperation at a subnational level for the purpose of curbing fentanyl trafficking and other synthetic opioids, including activities such as—

1 (A) bolstering technical assistance and co-
2 ordination for law enforcement agencies and
3 local, State, and Federal security forces;

4 (B) carrying out exchange programs for
5 the purposes of professional development; and

6 (C) enhancing data sharing, as appro-
7 priate;

8 (2) bolstering subnational dialogue and capacity
9 building between Federal and local governments,
10 civil society, faith-based organizations, and business
11 community leaders and integrating issues faced by
12 local communities, including with respect to traf-
13 ficking of fentanyl and other synthetic opioids; and
14 (3) strengthening capacity building and provide
15 resources for border towns and organizations within
16 those towns that attempt to meet the needs of local
17 communities.

18 (b) UPDATE.—Not later than 2 years after the date
19 of the submission of the strategy under subsection (a), the
20 President shall submit to the congressional committees
21 specified in subsection (a) an update containing an assess-
22 ment of the implementation and effectiveness of the strat-
23 egy, lessons learned from the past year with respect to
24 the strategy, and planned changes to the strategy.

1 (c) FORM.—The strategy under subsection (a), and
2 the update under subsection (b), shall be submitted in un-
3 classified form.

4 **SEC. 3. DEPARTMENT OF STATE REVIEW OF ACCESS TO FI-**
5 **NANCE IN CARICOM MEMBER STATES.**

6 (a) REVIEW.—The Secretary of State, in consultation
7 with the Secretary of Treasury, shall conduct a review to
8 determine any steps, balancing costs and benefits, that the
9 Secretaries could take to expand financial access to the
10 member states of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM),
11 including through a review of—

12 (1) sanctions enforcement laws and compliance
13 standards;

14 (2) reporting requirements pertaining to nar-
15 cotics trafficking and illicit finance thereof;

16 (3) possible expansion of embassies and con-
17 sulates in the region; and

18 (4) programming or lack thereof pertaining to
19 access to capital in the region.

20 (b) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to the ap-
21 propriate congressional committees a report on the find-
22 ings of the Secretary pertaining to the review under sub-
23 section (a).

G:\CMTE\FA\18\H2789_ANS.XML

4

1 (c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DE-
2 FINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congres-
3 sional committees” means—

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

7 (2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and
8 the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Af-
9 fairs of the Senate.



Mr. ISSA. The clerk shall distribute the amendment. The Clerk shall report the amendment.

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 589, offered by Mr. Schneider of Illinois. Page 4, after lines—

Mr. ISSA. Without objection, further reading of the amendment is dispensed with, and the gentleman, Mr. Schneider, is recognized to explain his amendment for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I support the MAHSA Act. I deplore what this regime does to its own people, to the people across the region, and the threat Iran and the regime is to our allies and to our own interests.

I have consistently worked across the aisle on such acts as the DEFEND Act, trying to address and prevent Iranian drones in the regions and going to Russia, supporting Israel's qualitative military edge, QME, and so much more.

But I also want to make sure that our friends, Iranian Americans, know that we are on your side. Democrats and Republicans alike and together abhor the Iranian regime and want to make sure we are doing everything we can to help the Iranian people, even if we do not always necessarily agree on the best way to do it.

And that is why I proposed this amendment. I am a co-sponsor of the MAHSA Act, and I want to make sure that all my constituents and all our country know that the Supreme Leader is already sanctioned. As the ranking member, I urge you to vote for this and support this amendment.

Mr. ISSA. The gentleman yields back. Who else seeks recognition? The gentleman Mr. Mills is recognized to—for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLS. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

While this amendment sounds great, it is always the devil is in the details. And essentially what this amendment says is that everyone who needs to be sanctioned is already sanctioned. And we know that that is actually false, and that there are many more who needs to be sanctioned.

This undermines the most fundamental message of the bill, which is that more needs to be done to hold the perpetrators of these atrocious human rights violations accountable. According to the talking points of my friends across the aisle, they are the party of human rights. Yet when it comes down to it, they have ground their teeth at bills such as this.

They tried to kill the Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act. They keep trying to kill or dilute these bills that actually do something about these heinous crimes, and not just talking points, but gives teeth. That actually enables us to be able to go forward and do something and not just look at it as a message bill that sounds great.

This amendment is no different, and I challenge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose this amendment for the sake in the lack of teeth that it would provide to the sanctions under the MAHSA Act.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. And I yield back.

Mr. ISSA. Does the gentleman yield? Did the gentleman yield to Mr. Schneider?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Thank you. First of all, as I said, I am a co-sponsor of this act. We support and know we need to apply more sanctions and constantly ratchet up the sanctions. Because any time you apply a sanction, whoever it sanctions is going to try to find ways and oftentimes successfully find ways to get around it.

The intent of this, as the author I can tell you, is to say these people are already sanctioned. Not to say that they do not deserve more sanctions or we need to ratchet up, but just to make sure people understand they are already sanctioned.

So I am happy to work with you if you could point out to me where it says here that this is sufficient or we do not need more, let's fix it. But I think it is important that people understand that these people are sanctioned.

Mr. MILLS. I appreciate that. And while I understand that a lot of these people are sanctioned, the level in which they are being sanctioned right now and the additional individuals that need to be sanctioned that are not included in this would make it to where this dilutes the intent of the MAHSA Act to be able to go after further individuals who committed these atrocious—

Mr. SCHNEIDER. I guess that is what I am asking, is where here does it say that. Because all this is saying is that it is acknowledging that the Supreme Leader and several others are already sanctioned. But it has not—and it is not intended to say more sanctions are not needed.

Mr. MILLS. But if that is the case and it is just recognizing that there's sanctions on the individuals that we are referring to, why even include that in the bill? It is already an established and acknowledgment.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Because I think it is important to note today and to note every day going forward that we are not resting on our laurels, we are not ignoring this in the past. We have already acknowledged that the Supreme Leader is leading a regime that supports—largest supporter of terrorism in the world. We are doing everything we can, for example, to get other nations to sanction and declare the IRGC as a terrorist organization.

All this is saying is that yes, we are aware of it. We are already sanctioning these people, and we need to apply more pressure.

Mr. MILLS. But again, I do not understand the point of this bill to recognize something that is already being established, when the key to this bill is just to give more teeth and more sanctioning on Ayatollah to ensure they do not have even the financial and economic instruments that are being utilized and being provided by the United States to ensure that we can go ahead.

And if you feel so confidently that they are being adequately sanctioned, then—

Mr. SCHNEIDER. That is not what this says. This says that—

Mr. MILLS. It is an open discussion just to State the fact that if you feel that they are being adequately sanctioned, then fine, let's not go ahead and look at the MAHSA Act, right. If we are saying that they are already sanctioned and we just need to strengthen it, then what is the point in saying something that was already established?

We know that they are being sanctioned. It is not to a point where it actually has enough teeth to be able to do something. It hasn't prevented them from the incentives that they're—atrocious events. It hasn't prevented them from going out and being a State sponsor of terror. It hasn't prevented them from the ostracization and the persecution of women in the streets.

So if those sanctions that you are referring to are so strong, then why is murders and atrocious human rights events still occurring today?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. We agree, the atrocities, the atrociousness of this regime is not up for debate. We need to move forward. All I am saying is we agree that we have to apply sanctions. This amendment recognizes that sanctions are already in place on these individuals.

I yield back.

Mr. ISSA. Would the gentleman yield? Does the gentleman agree that they are already sanctioned?

Mr. MILLS. I do agree.

Mr. ISSA. And does the gentleman, Mr. Schneider, agree that further sanctions are likely to be needed in order to get compliance that we are not currently getting?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Absolutely.

Mr. ISSA. Might I suggest that two of you work on specific report language that says that in a single paragraph, and that we put it at the beginning of the report language so that it is very clear that those two truths can both occur simultaneously?

Mr. MILLS. I would be OK with that.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Happy to add to that, but I still would like to—

Mr. ISSA. The gentleman will still insist on his amendment, but we—but you do agree to do it. And on behalf of the Chair, I agree to make sure that it gets in the report language.

I think the point and the dialog has been very helpful. I think this is something that this committee universally agrees with as to the lack of effectiveness to deter Iran from its activities, which the Administration and this body agree on.

The gentleman yields back. Anyone further seek recognition? Seeing no one further, the amendment—the question now agrees on the amendments to the amendment in the form of a substitute.

All those in favor, say aye.

Those opposed?

In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it. The noes have it. The amendment is not agreed to.

Are there any further amendments? Seeing no further amendments, the question now occurs on the McCaul Amendment in the nature of a substitute, No. 39.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

Those opposed, no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. That ayes have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

I now move the Committee to report H.R. 589, as amended, to the House with favorable recommendation. All those in favor—

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. ISSA. Yes, Mr.—

Mr. CONNOLLY. If I may just—with respect to your motion. And that is with that understanding that we are going to continue to work out the language we discussed earlier and the report language you——

Mr. ISSA. Absolutely. That is why I wanted it in the record, and we will—I believe we can get to an extremely good paragraph between the two gentlemen. I would ask you to work expeditiously, though.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the Chair, and of course we will support the motion with that understanding.

Mr. ISSA. Thank you. We now move the Committee—the Committee now moves H.R. 589, as amended, to the House, favorable recommendation. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

Any opposed, say no. In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it universally and unanimously. And the motion is agreed to. And we do not need a roll call. This is a committee should not have that roll call in there to be used at all.

Without objection, the motion is considered as laid on the table, and the staff is authorized to make technical and conforming changes, including the report language.

[Applause.]

Mr. ISSA. I normally would object to that, but I do not in this case.

Pursuant to notice, I now call up House Resolution 300, a resolution of inquiry requesting that the President, and directing the Secretary of Defense, to transmit respectively to the House of Representatives copies of all documents indicating any plans for current or future military assistance to Ukraine and documents indicating whether any United States forces, including special operation forces, are currently in Ukraine.

The measure was circulated in advance. The Clerk shall designate the resolution.

[The Text of H. Res. 300 follows:]

118TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 300

Requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit, respectively, to the House of Representatives copies of all documents indicating any plans for current or future military assistance to Ukraine and documents indicating whether any United States Armed Forces, including special operations forces, are currently deployed in Ukraine.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 17, 2023

Mr. GAETZ submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs

RESOLUTION

Requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit, respectively, to the House of Representatives copies of all documents indicating any plans for current or future military assistance to Ukraine and documents indicating whether any United States Armed Forces, including special operations forces, are currently deployed in Ukraine.

- 1 *Resolved*, That the President is requested, and the
- 2 Secretary of Defense is directed, to transmit, respectively,
- 3 to the House of Representatives, not later than 14 days
- 4 after the date of the adoption of this resolution, copies
- 5 of all documents in the possession of the President or the

1 Secretary of Defense, respectively, indicating any plans for
2 current or future military assistance to Ukraine and docu-
3 ments indicating whether any United States Armed
4 Forces, including special operations forces, are currently
5 deployed in Ukraine.

○

The CLERK. H.Res. 300, Resolution requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit, respectively, to the House of Representatives copies of all documents indicating any plans for current or future military assistance to Ukraine and documents indicating whether any United States Armed Forces, including special—

Mr. ISSA. Without objection, the first reading of the bill will be dispensed with, and the resolution is considered read and is open to amendment at any point.

I now recognize myself for a short statement.

One year and just over 2 months ago, Putin, President Putin, launched a full-scale, unprovoked war of aggression against Ukraine. Last week, the Committee heard heartbreaking stories from two survivors of Russian war crimes and heard from Ukrainian women who endured 5 days of Russian torture.

Then we heard the nightmare of a young, teenage Ukrainian boy endured when he was kidnaped by Russian invading forces, brought back to Russia, and subjected to forced abortion—forced adoption, thank you, and reeducation.

The Ukrainian women—the Ukrainian woman was just one of nearly 80,000 reported war crimes, and the young boy was just one of nearly 20,000 kidnaped Ukrainian children. The scale of Putin's war crimes is staggering.

In response to Congress—Congress has provided a significant amount of assistance to Ukraine and ensured Putin's aggression is stopped at Ukraine's border and to ensure NATO countries are not next.

I have supported this assistance because a victory by Putin in Ukraine would further embolden Americans' adversaries, especially and including Communist China, Iran, and North Korea. But every dollar counts. That is why this committee is considering and continuing to conduct vigorous oversight of the assistance provided to Ukraine.

For example, last month this committee held a hearing with the Inspectors General of DoD, State, and USAID to assess the Administration's oversight efforts to date. They each reported they had no significant misuse of U.S. funds to date.

This followed the Chairman's congressional delegation to Kyiv, which I was honored to join, to get firsthand knowledge and briefings, both unclassified and classified, on the safeguards of monitoring mechanisms in—the monitoring mechanisms in place for U.S. support.

It is unfortunate some misunderstand the strong oversight has provided the U.S. support for Ukraine self-defense against Putin and his brutal invasion. In reality, this oversight is vital and must continue. This committee is dedicated to the constant both public and private oversight of our monitoring of every single dollar and every weapon system.

U.S. support is enduring, but it is not without the strings of accountability. The resolution of inquiry requests the Administration to transmit relevant documents related to U.S. security assistance for Ukraine, as well as United States Armed Forces in country.

The American taxpayer deserves to know how U.S. assistance is being spent. That is why Congress included over 40 oversight pro-

visions across the four Ukrainian supplementals in Fiscal Year 1923 appropriations and defense policy bills.

These provisions include numerous requirements to report to Congress on every U.S. weapon sent to Ukraine, and accountability mechanisms in each of the—sorry, mechanisms in place to ensure these systems are used as intended.

Meanwhile, the small U.S. military presence in Ukraine, along with and providing embassy security is critical to U.S. defense attaché efforts to monitor the U.S. weapons provided to Ukraine.

Let me make it clear: they are not able to fight. They are not forces against Russia or in any way supporting directly the war effort. Instead, they are on the front lines of the oversight efforts.

I support this resolution, as it is consistent with House Republicans' oversight agenda and of the U.S. Ukraine aid.

Is there any further discussion on the resolution?

The gentlelady is recognized.

Ms. MANNING. I oppose H.Res. 300. As we consider this measure today, I cannot help but feel *deja vu* all over again. We considered a similar measure in the last Congress. That measure was at the time divisive and ill-advised, and so is this one.

Specifically, H.Res. 300 is a partisan political ploy and the height of legislative irresponsibility that jeopardizes the national security of the United States, of our European allies and partners, as well as the courageous Ukrainian people.

From day one of Russia's invasion of Ukraine in 2022 and long before, this committee and the entire Congress has remained resolutely bipartisan in our support for Ukraine as it fights against Russian aggression. This bipartisanship has been pivotal to Ukraine's success and its survival.

But measures like this put that bipartisanship in jeopardy. As we consider this resolution, my Republican colleagues will try to gloss over what this really means. They will claim that this measure is about oversight. It is not.

They may claim that it says nothing negative about the future of our support for Ukraine. But sadly, it does. Despite what my GOP colleagues may claim today, this resolution is not about transparency or strengthening accounting of our support for Ukraine, which we all agree is critically important.

This resolution is about division. Reporting it our favorably is irresponsible and ignores the bipartisan oversight work this committee is conducting.

This political measure from the lead author of the Ukraine Fatigue resolution is unnecessarily divisive and plays directly into Vladimir Putin's hands by seeking to force the disclosure of all current and future U.S. military plans and documents related to U.S. support to Ukraine, including sensitive details on the presence of U.S. personnel in Ukraine.

The sponsors of this measure play directly into Putin's hands and jeopardize the very lives of those with whom we are standing. Passage of this measure would represent a gift to Putin and his Kremlin cronies and provide visibility into the plans our military and intelligence leaders strive to protect at all costs.

Therefore, we must reject it. So I ask my colleagues, what message does supporting this measure knowing the sponsors have con-

tinually used extreme rhetoric to call into question U.S. assistance to Ukraine, and just last week called for cuts to such support just as Ukraine enters a critical phase of its military campaign against Russia's onslaught, what message does this send?

Support for this resolution ignores the painstaking efforts of the American and Ukrainian Governments and instead parrots the propaganda of the Kremlin.

I want to be clear: I support robust oversight of our assistance to Ukraine, and I invite members of this committee, as well as any others with interest, to avail themselves of any number of opportunities to participate in any of the briefings held on such matters, as well as review any of the numerous materials available to members on the details of our military assistance to Ukraine.

I also look forward to continuing to exercise this robust oversight of our assistance with the Administration and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to keep the safeguards on our assistance strong. Going forward, I urge my Republican colleagues, now in the majority, to embrace responsible oversight efforts and reject partisan politics.

Let's send out one message, that we on this Committee on Foreign Affairs support Ukraine, we will take meaningful steps to ensure our assistance is used properly and effectively, and remain committed to giving Ukrainians the resources they need to win and to thrive when this war is over.

I oppose this measure, the political stunt at the heart of it, and any efforts from within this body to divide us at such a pivotal time and over such an important issue. I will be voting no, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. I oppose this measure and urge my colleagues, once more, to please do the same.

Mr. ISSA. I thank the gentlelady. Does anyone have any amendments to offer?

OK, there being no amendments to offer, for what purpose does the gentleman seek recognition?

Mr. CONNOLLY. I wish to speak to the——

Mr. ISSA. The gentleman would like to strike the last word?

Mr. CONNOLLY. I strike the last word.

Mr. ISSA. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the Chair.

And I certainly appreciate his commitment to oversight. He was the Chairman of the Oversight Committee. I served on that committee with him. I certainly share his value system and how important oversight is.

However, the Chair would have us conveniently compartmentalize this action from the intent behind it. We cannot separate the stated, explicit reasoning of the author of this provision and some of his allies.

Let me read to you what Mr. Gaetz has said. "We must suspend all foreign aid for the war in Ukraine and demand that all combatants in this conflict reach a peace agreement immediately." Apparently Mr. Gaetz has decided for the Ukrainians what is in their best interest.

And that means that the intent behind this motion is that. I appeal to the Chair, you went to Kyiv. You saw with your own eyes and heard with your own ears the pain, the suffering, the courage

Ukrainians are exhibiting every day. So timing matters when this committee acts, even timing on oversight.

And if we pass a resolution authored by Mr. Gaetz and Ms. Green, we are sending an unequivocal message I do not believe you intend or I intend with respect to Ukraine.

We are in a war. Children are dying. Maternity hospitals are being blown to smithereens by a depraved sociopath in the Kremlin. This is no time to send any signal to those brave people that we waver one iota in our ongoing support. And I know, Mr. Issa, you share that view.

And so I join the ranking member in urging my colleagues to reject this. There will be time, this committee must insist, and I will join the Chair and my Republican colleagues in insisting on it, but this is not that time.

Mr. ISSA. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNOLLY. Of course.

Mr. ISSA. Yes, I could not agree with you more than any effort to undermine our support for Ukraine certainly does not enjoy the vast majority of people on either side of the aisle here or on the general floor.

I will note, if I could, that this first of all is not a privileged resolution, so there is no assurance that it will be considered on the floor.

I also would note that nowhere in this does any of the information, the sensitive information that you and I are both personally concerned about, would come to this committee at all. Every bit of the information requested as to troop movements and the like could be and would held only at the Select Intelligence Committee based on history.

So I might mention to the gentleman that when I am—when I read this, and I do support it, but I recognize—I support it because I know its limitations.

Mr. CONNOLLY. If I could reclaim my time?

Mr. ISSA. Or course, gentleman.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I would respectfully say to the Chair if all of the information requested in this motion would in fact go to the Intelligence Committee, not to us, then I respectfully suggest let the Intelligence Committee deal with this resolution rather than the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ISSA. I certainly, if I can further yield, I certainly agree with the Chairman that the Intelligence Committee can and has gotten the exact information that you and I are seeing in this resolution.

So although there may be some level of redundancy of their getting the same information given to them pursuant to this if it were to come to the floor and be passed, I would submit to the gentleman that they would be seeing it again. They would look at it again. But we would not see it in this committee. And I just want to make that clear for the record.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I appreciate that, although I also appreciate the contortions the Chairman is going through. I yield the balance of my time to Ms. Manning.

Ms. MANNING. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, I do believe this motion is privileged.

Mr. ISSA. If the gentleman further yield.

I want to be clear, and the gentlelady's right. It is privileged as to this committee, which is why we are considering it. It is not privileged to the floor, it does not—we are acting. So there is no requirement that this be considered by the whole House. But we are acting.

If we did not act, if we did not hold this today, based on the number of days, then it would automatically go to the floor. And that is one of the reasons that, as we all know here in the Committee, we have statutory responsibility to consider these and either reject or accept. But regardless, the privilege ends today at the end of our vote.

Ms. MANNING. Thank you for that clarification.

Mr. ISSA. No, thank you for that clarification.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I yield back.

Mr. ISSA. The gentleman yields back. Is there any further discussion? Seeing none—oh, the gentleman Mr. Mills is recognized to strike the last word.

Mr. MILLS. While I do appreciate my colleagues' comments regarding the fact that we want to support nothing more than a Ukrainian success, I note that this—actually just a resolution that is asking for any type of documentation indicating whether armed forces, United States Armed Forces, are involved in a conflict.

So I would ask under with AUMF do we have such authority of use of military force that would be a privileged and capable source that would even enable such a thing to allow our soft assets to be in country?

Now, I just spent the last 2 days with ARSOF and with with USASOC. And while I understand what their primary role is in training up the Ukrainian ranger forces, all this is simply saying is, is that they're requesting information if we were to use any type of military force in Ukraine, current or future.

And so we talk about oversight, we talk about the ideas of not allowing continual mission creep, which I have been a part of, given the fact that I spent over 7 years of my life in Iraq, over 3 years of my life in Afghanistan, Kosovo, Pakistan, Northern Somalia. Been blown up twice.

I can tell you, mission creep is something that does exist. And in many cases, the authorities which Congress has under Article 1 is sometimes surpassed because of the past AUMFs, like 1901, 1902.

But I would again just make the note that this is not preventing support to Ukraine. This is not empowering Putin. This is simply an inquiry for oversight by the President, or I should say request by Congress for the President and the Secretary of Defense to provide a line of questioning or a reasonable amount of information on if we are deploying currently or in the future military forces.

So again, I ask my colleagues, can you please tell me why would oppose the idea when there is no AUMF in place or any current authorization, whether that be Title 10 or a 333 under the armed services that this would actually be an issue?

I yield back.

Mr. ISSA. Would the gentleman yield briefly? You know, as someone who, you have spent so much time, you are aware of the—how we color various forces.

This resolution of inquiry actually does not designate whether they are under Title 10 combatants, which you and I know the AUMF would be required for. But in fact includes that the report to Congress, that it would include individuals who are there strictly to inventory systems or even potentially technical assistance.

Mr. MILLS. And if the gentleman would. I am fully in agreement with the idea if we are talking about members who are actually at the embassy who are there for accountability and oversight structures and functions.

Then a simple inquiry like this would only just provide a report to say we have ten members who are at the embassy who are actually providing accountability oversight for the following things. It is still just an informational thing for Congress to have the necessary oversight.

And so I agree with you, I am not explaining that it is a Title 10 or a 333 type of movement. I am just simply saying that I do not understand why would oppose the idea of just simply saying hey Congress, we have 15 people in who are logisticians who are looking at the following things. I think that that is a good thing for us to know here in Congress.

With that I yield back.

Mr. ISSA. I thank the gentleman. Any further discussion? The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. SELF. As a military planner for well over a decade, I have—and I am not privy to your intelligence committee information. But I think that this linking of military assistance in actually the same sentence for forces makes this problematic because military assistance can include operational planning and military forces. So I would just caution us to—and I think I am agreeing with Mr. Mills here, that we need some explanatory limiting of this resolution to make sure what we are discussing here is the resource support, not operational or combat unit support. So I would ask us to clean up the language here simply so that we do not get into the intelligence community information that we do not have. I yield back.

Mr. ISSA. I thank the gentleman. There being no further discussion of the resolution, the committee will move to consideration of amendments. Does any member offer an amendment?

There being no amendments, I move that the committee report House Resolution 300 to the House with a favorable recommendation.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

Any opposed, no.

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it.

Ms. MANNING. Mr. Chair, I ask for a recorded vote.

Mr. ISSA. A roll call vote being requested. Pursuant to the chair's previous announcement, the vote will be postponed. We now stand at a very short recess.

[Recess.]

Chairman MCCAUL [presiding]. The committee will come to order. Pursuant to notice, I now call up H.R. 1690, To authorize the Secretary of State to negotiate regional immigration agreements, and for other purposes. The bill was circulated in advance. The clerk shall designate the bill.

[The Bill H.R. 1690 follows:]

Union Calendar No. 30

118TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 1690

[Report No. 118–46, Part I]

To authorize the Secretary of State to negotiate regional immigration agreements, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 22, 2023

Mr. McCAUL introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned

MAY 5, 2023

Additional sponsors: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. McCORMICK, Mr. SELF, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. MILLS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. MAST, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WALTZ, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. BARR, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. KEAN of New Jersey

MAY 5, 2023

Reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs with an amendment

[Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in *italic*]

MAY 5, 2023

Committee on the Judiciary discharged; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

[For text of introduced bill, see copy of bill as introduced on March 22, 2023]

42

2

A BILL

To authorize the Secretary of State to negotiate regional
immigration agreements, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

4 *This Act may be cited as the “Orderly Requirements*
5 *Designed to Enforce and Regulate Latin American Migra-*
6 *tion Act” or the “ORDER Act”.*

7 **SEC. 2. UNITED STATES POLICY REGARDING WESTERN**
8 **HEMISPHERE COOPERATION ON IMMIGRA-**
9 **TION AND ASYLUM.**

10 *It is the policy of the United States to enter into agree-*
11 *ments, accords, and memoranda of understanding with sov-*
12 *ereign countries in the Western Hemisphere, the purposes*
13 *of which are to advance the interests of the United States*
14 *by reducing costs associated with illegal immigration and*
15 *to protect the human capital, societal traditions, and eco-*
16 *nomic growth of other sovereign nations in the Western*
17 *Hemisphere. It is further the policy of the United States*
18 *to ensure that humanitarian and development assistance*
19 *funding aimed at reducing illegal immigration is not ex-*
20 *pended on programs that have not proven to reduce illegal*
21 *immigrant flows in the aggregate.*

22 **SEC. 3. NEGOTIATIONS BY SECRETARY OF STATE.**

23 *(a) AUTHORIZATION TO NEGOTIATE.—The Secretary*
24 *of State shall seek to negotiate agreements, accords, and*
25 *memoranda of understanding between the United States,*

1 *Mexico, Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala, and other*
2 *countries in the Western Hemisphere with respect to co-*
3 *operation and burden sharing required for effective regional*
4 *immigration enforcement, expediting legal claims by aliens*
5 *for asylum, and the processing, detention, and repatriation*
6 *of foreign nationals seeking to enter the United States un-*
7 *lawfully. Such agreements shall be designed to facilitate a*
8 *regional approach to immigration enforcement and shall,*
9 *at a minimum, provide that—*

10 *(1) the Government of Mexico authorize and ac-*
11 *cept the rapid entrance into Mexico of nationals of*
12 *countries other than Mexico who seek asylum in Mex-*
13 *ico, and process the asylum claims of such nationals*
14 *inside Mexico, in accordance with both domestic law*
15 *and international treaties and conventions governing*
16 *the processing of asylum claims;*

17 *(2) the Government of Mexico authorize and ac-*
18 *cept both the rapid entrance into Mexico of all na-*
19 *tionals of countries other than Mexico who are ineli-*
20 *gible for asylum in Mexico and wish to apply for asy-*
21 *lum in the United States, whether or not at a port*
22 *of entry, and the continued presence of such nationals*
23 *in Mexico while they wait for the adjudication of*
24 *their asylum claims to conclude in the United States;*

1 (3) the Government of Mexico commit to provide
2 the individuals described in paragraphs (1) and (2)
3 with appropriate humanitarian protections;

4 (4) the Government of Honduras, the Govern-
5 ment of El Salvador, and the Government of Guate-
6 mala each authorize and accept the entrance into the
7 respective countries of nationals of other countries
8 seeking asylum in the applicable such country and
9 process such claims in accordance with applicable do-
10 mestic law and international treaties and conventions
11 governing the processing of asylum claims;

12 (5) the Government of the United States commit
13 to work to accelerate the adjudication of asylum
14 claims and to conclude removal proceedings in the
15 wake of asylum adjudications as expeditiously as pos-
16 sible;

17 (6) the Government of the United States commit
18 to continue to assist the governments of countries in
19 the Western Hemisphere, such as the Government of
20 Honduras, the Government of El Salvador, and the
21 Government of Guatemala, by supporting the en-
22 hancement of asylum capacity in those countries; and

23 (7) the Government of the United States commit
24 to monitoring developments in hemispheric immigra-
25 tion trends and regional asylum capabilities to deter-

1 *mine whether additional asylum cooperation agree-*
2 *ments are warranted.*

3 (b) *NOTIFICATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH CASE-ZA-*
4 *BLOCKI ACT.—The Secretary of State shall, in accordance*
5 *with section 112b of title 1, United States Code, promptly*
6 *inform the relevant congressional committees of each agree-*
7 *ment entered into pursuant to subsection (a). Such notifica-*
8 *tions shall be submitted not later than 48 hours after such*
9 *agreements are signed.*

10 (c) *ALIEN DEFINED.—In this section, the term “alien”*
11 *has the meaning given such term in section 101 of the Im-*
12 *migration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).*

13 **SEC. 4. MANDATORY BRIEFINGS ON UNITED STATES EF-**
14 **FORTS TO ADDRESS THE BORDER CRISIS.**

15 (a) *BRIEFING REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days*
16 *after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less fre-*
17 *quently than once every 90 days thereafter until the date*
18 *described in subsection (b), the Secretary of State, or the*
19 *designee of the Secretary of State, shall provide to the ap-*
20 *propriate congressional committees an in-person briefing on*
21 *efforts undertaken pursuant to the negotiation authority*
22 *provided by section 3 to monitor, deter, and prevent illegal*
23 *immigration to the United States, including by entering*
24 *into agreements, accords, and memoranda of understanding*
25 *with foreign countries and by using United States foreign*

1 assistance to stem the root causes of migration in the West-
2 ern Hemisphere.

3 (b) *TERMINATION OF MANDATORY BRIEFING.*—The
4 date described in this subsection is the date on which the
5 Secretary of State, in consultation with the heads of other
6 relevant Federal departments and agencies, determines and
7 certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that
8 illegal immigration flows have subsided to a manageable
9 rate.

10 (c) *APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DE-*
11 *FINED.*—In this section, the term “appropriate congres-
12 sional committees” means the Committee on Foreign Affairs
13 of the House of Representatives and the Committee on For-
14 eign Relations of the Senate.

The CLERK. H.R. 1690, a bill to authorize Secretary of State to negotiate regional immigration agreements, and for other purposes.

Chairman McCAUL. Without objection, first reading of the bill is dispensed with. The bill is considered read and open to amendment at any point. Without objection, the McCaul Amendment in the nature of a substitute, No. 40, circulated to members in advance shall be considered as read and will be treated as original text for purposes of the amendment.

[The Amendment offered by Mr. McCaul follows:]

**AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE
TO H.R. 1690
OFFERED BY MR. McCAUL OF TEXAS**

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

1 SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

2 This Act may be cited as the “Orderly Requirements
3 Designed to Enforce and Regulate Latin American Migra-
4 tion Act” or the “ORDER Act”.

**5 SEC. 2. UNITED STATES POLICY REGARDING WESTERN
6 HEMISPHERE COOPERATION ON IMMIGRA-
7 TION AND ASYLUM.**

8 It is the policy of the United States to enter into
9 agreements, accords, and memoranda of understanding
10 with sovereign countries in the Western Hemisphere, the
11 purposes of which are to advance the interests of the
12 United States by reducing costs associated with illegal im-
13 migration and to protect the human capital, societal tradi-
14 tions, and economic growth of other sovereign nations in
15 the Western Hemisphere. It is further the policy of the
16 United States to ensure that humanitarian and develop-
17 ment assistance funding aimed at reducing illegal immi-

1 gration is not expended on programs that have not proven
2 to reduce illegal immigrant flows in the aggregate.

3 **SEC. 3. NEGOTIATIONS BY SECRETARY OF STATE.**

4 (a) AUTHORIZATION TO NEGOTIATE.—The Secretary
5 of State shall seek to negotiate agreements, accords, and
6 memoranda of understanding between the United States,
7 Mexico, Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala, and other
8 countries in the Western Hemisphere with respect to co-
9 operation and burden sharing required for effective re-
10 gional immigration enforcement, expediting legal claims by
11 aliens for asylum, and the processing, detention, and repa-
12 triation of foreign nationals seeking to enter the United
13 States unlawfully. Such agreements shall be designed to
14 facilitate a regional approach to immigration enforcement
15 and shall, at a minimum, provide that—

16 (1) the Government of Mexico authorize and ac-
17 cept the rapid entrance into Mexico of nationals of
18 countries other than Mexico who seek asylum in
19 Mexico, and process the asylum claims of such na-
20 tionals inside Mexico, in accordance with both do-
21 mestic law and international treaties and conven-
22 tions governing the processing of asylum claims;

23 (2) the Government of Mexico authorize and ac-
24 cept both the rapid entrance into Mexico of all na-
25 tionals of countries other than Mexico who are ineli-

1 gible for asylum in Mexico and wish to apply for
2 asylum in the United States, whether or not at a
3 port of entry, and the continued presence of such
4 nationals in Mexico while they wait for the adjudica-
5 tion of their asylum claims to conclude in the United
6 States;

7 (3) the Government of Mexico commit to pro-
8 vide the individuals described in paragraphs (1) and
9 (2) with appropriate humanitarian protections;

10 (4) the Government of Honduras, the Govern-
11 ment of El Salvador, and the Government of Guate-
12 mala each authorize and accept the entrance into
13 the respective countries of nationals of other coun-
14 tries seeking asylum in the applicable such country
15 and process such claims in accordance with applica-
16 ble domestic law and international treaties and con-
17 ventions governing the processing of asylum claims;

18 (5) the Government of the United States com-
19 mit to work to accelerate the adjudication of asylum
20 claims and to conclude removal proceedings in the
21 wake of asylum adjudications as expeditiously as
22 possible;

23 (6) the Government of the United States com-
24 mit to continue to assist the governments of coun-
25 tries in the Western Hemisphere, such as the Gov-

1 ernment of Honduras, the Government of El Sal-
2 vador, and the Government of Guatemala, by sup-
3 porting the enhancement of asylum capacity in those
4 countries; and

5 (7) the Government of the United States com-
6 mit to monitoring developments in hemispheric im-
7 migration trends and regional asylum capabilities to
8 determine whether additional asylum cooperation
9 agreements are warranted.

10 (b) NOTIFICATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH CASE-ZA-
11 BLOCKI ACT.—The Secretary of State shall, in accordance
12 with section 112b of title 1, United States Code, promptly
13 inform the relevant congressional committees of each
14 agreement entered into pursuant to subsection (a). Such
15 notifications shall be submitted not later than 48 hours
16 after such agreements are signed.

17 (c) ALIEN DEFINED.—In this section, the term
18 “alien” has the meaning given such term in section 101
19 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

20 **SEC. 4. MANDATORY BRIEFINGS ON UNITED STATES EF-**
21 **FORTS TO ADDRESS THE BORDER CRISIS.**

22 (a) BRIEFING REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days
23 after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less
24 frequently than once every 90 days thereafter until the
25 date described in subsection (b), the Secretary of State,

1 or the designee of the Secretary of State, shall provide
2 to the appropriate congressional committees an in-person
3 briefing on efforts undertaken pursuant to the negotiation
4 authority provided by section 103 to monitor, deter, and
5 prevent illegal immigration to the United States, including
6 by entering into agreements, accords, and memoranda of
7 understanding with foreign countries and by using United
8 States foreign assistance to stem the root causes of migra-
9 tion in the Western Hemisphere.

10 (b) TERMINATION OF MANDATORY BRIEFING.—The
11 date described in this subsection is the date on which the
12 Secretary of State, in consultation with the heads of other
13 relevant Federal departments and agencies, determines
14 and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees
15 that illegal immigration flows have subsided to a manage-
16 able rate.

17 (c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DE-
18 FINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congres-
19 sional committees” means the Committee on Foreign Af-
20 fairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee
21 on Foreign Relations of the Senate.



Chairman MCCAUL. I now recognize myself for an opening statement. I have dealt with this issue well before Congress when I worked in the U.S. Attorney's Office in Texas. Western districts had from San Antonio to El Paso, the border, chief of counterterrorism and national security.

In Congress, I chaired the Homeland Security Committee for three terms. And in my judgment, I have never seen this border more wide open and out of operational control as the Chief Border Patrol Officer, Mr. Ortiz, testified to that we no longer have operational control of the border. In fact, we have ceded it to the cartels.

And I think it is very simple, the cause and effect, why are we in the situation we are in today? And this is not my words. It is from Border Patrol specifically because on day one, the Biden Administration rescinded the migrant protection protocols otherwise known as Remain in Mexico.

This program was actually working because they had to remain in Mexico pending their asylum claims. The very first bill I ever introduced in Congress was to end catch-and-release, and that was 20 years ago. But here we are today and the same policy there.

Why? Because when migrant protection protocols were rescinded, it allowed migrants to apply and stay in the United States. Since we do not have detention space that is adequate, they are released into our society. And we saw these numbers dramatically decline.

And I even talked to the Secretary of State about various other policies dealing with Haiti or Venezuela. When we do this, it works because the main magnet or driver is the expectation of political asylum even though only 15 percent of those claims are actually truly political. I do not have to go into all the numbers, but we do have a humanitarian crisis of generational proportions.

The Federal Government's job is to secure our borders, air, land, and sea. And unfortunately, that is not happening. And it is not me saying this. It is Border Patrol saying this.

We have had 5 million encounters at our border since this Administration came into office. And most sadly, we have had 100,000 Americans die from fentanyl. They are pouring into this country, precursors coming from China, and killing our young people.

My son went to a funeral last Sunday. His best friend died because he took something he thought was Xanax and it was laced with fentanyl and he never woke up. My oldest daughter has five of her friends that are now buried because of fentanyl.

Beyond that, we had 98 suspected terrorists who attempted to enter the homeland just last year alone. That is dangerous. We have had 12,000 criminals attempt to enter last year, 1,000 with assault-related charges and 62 homicide-related.

Sadly, many of these migrants do not make the dangerous journey because it is so dangerous. Women and children that die on the dangerous trek up. But even when they get in the country in my home State of Texas, we found an abandoned tractor trailer with, quote-unquote, "stacks of bodies" abandoned by the human smugglers and dying from an awful death of suffocation and heat.

One rescission, one stroke of the pen rescinding the Remain in Mexico policy was a direct cause and effect of the chaos we are seeing at our southern border. Again, do not take my word for it even

though I have had a lot of experience on this issue. This comes directly from our Border Patrol that live this nightmare day in and day out.

And that is why I introduce this legislation because whatever you want to say about the prior Administration, and I have told the Secretary of Homeland this, you can call it whatever you want. You do not have to have President Trump's name on this. But the policy was, in fact, working.

We tried to fix this problem for many years without success. I think now is the time. This legislation will push the State Department to renegotiate the asylum cooperation agreements which prohibit migrants who travel through any countries with asylum agreements from eligibility.

This policy was extremely effective in the prior Administration. And reinstating it will give a proven solution to reducing the crisis. By mandating the Secretary of State to reenter MPP and ACA, this bill bolsters the work being done on asylum reform and border security in both House Judiciary Committee, and House Homeland Security where I have been this morning.

We are also working with the Appropriations Committee to ensure the Administration complies with the legislation. As other committees pass border-related legislation, I would encourage this Administration to work with Congress, to reimplement MPP and other successful measures proven to secure operational control of our border and put an end to this generational crisis. I think, Mr. Ranking Member, that this shouldn't be a partisan issue.

It is an American issue. When I chaired Homeland Security, we passed a lot of border bills that were bipartisan. And I think this committee exercising its jurisdiction here has an opportunity to do the same.

And I have had these conversations with very high ranking officials in this Administration. I think they realize that the policy does work. It is just we have a political problem with it.

So I would like to challenge my colleagues to put aside our partisan differences and let's reinstitute a policy that was, in fact, working. And with that, if there is any further discussion, I recognize the ranking member, Mr. Connolly.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I guess I fundamentally take issue with the fact that the previous policy was pristine and working. It was racist.

President Trump referred to Haitian immigrants and allowing them into the country, quote, "they all have AIDS." He referred to Mexican immigrants as they are not sending their best people into the United States. He had a Muslim ban.

And the Return to Mexico policy may seem a successful policy to the chair. But ask those who return to Mexico the risks they suffer in terms of extortion and kidnaping and rape and risk to their families with an indefinite period of detention in Mexico because we have chosen to close our borders with respect to asylum seekers, creating a backlog that is anything but successful and anything but humanitarian. I oppose H.R. 1690.

It is clear we have a strong and divergent opinion about improving our imperfect immigration process and how best to respond to a regional migration crisis that has surged since the pandemic to

numbers not seen in a long time. This measure seeks to reinstate processes introduced under President Trump. They do not solve the challenges we face as I indicated.

The U.S. suspended and initiated the process to terminate asylum cooperative agreements with El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras back in 2021 in favor of creating a comprehensive regional framework to address the root causes of migration, manage migration flows, and expand legal pathways for protection and opportunity here and in the region. Why I believe we must protect our borders absolutely and enforce laws regarding irregular migration, the United States is also committed to a constructive agenda which can provide safe and orderly processing of those who arrive at our border and especially those seeking protective asylum. I believe we can achieve that outcome not by using sticks but instead by collaborating across the region to address the root causes of forced displacement and irregular migration, including by combating corruption and impunity, upholding our obligations to protect refugees, partnering to promote opportunity and prosperity for people and communities, trying to fight back the scourge of gangs and especially those who are most vulnerable all across the region.

I believe in multilateral solutions to complex challenges. The Los Angeles Declaration on Migration and Protection from the Summit of the Americas which included proposals for collaborative problem solving from countries in the region is a strong signal that if we are concerned about the stability of the region, we can and should spend our time brokering new partnerships and creating policies which open up possibilities for economic stability where people live, protect, respect, and uphold human rights. I oppose the measure before us for these and other reasons and urge my colleagues to reject it. And I yield back.

Chairman McCAUL. The gentleman yields. Is there any further discussion on the bill. Mrs. Young Kim is recognized.

Mrs. KIM OF CALIFORNIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I strongly support H.R. 1690, the Orderly Requirements Designed to Enforce and Regulation Latin American Border Act. We have a crisis on our southern border.

As an immigrant and mother of four, hearing stories of migrants losing their lives making the dangerous journey to our southern border breaks my heart. Since President Biden took office, illegal border crossings have tripled. And migrant deaths at the southern border continue to rise.

The International Organization for Migration has labeled this land crossing the deadliest in the world. I visited the southern border three times. And I heard directly from border patrol agents that they are overwhelmed and that the spike in migrants crossing the southern border is hurting their ability to stop the trafficking of fentanyl.

In 2022, 60 percent of fentanyl seized by CBP came from ports of entry in San Diego and Imperial Counties in Southern California near my district. Fentanyl is now a leading cause of death for Americans ages 18 through 49 and behind one in every five youth deaths in California. This crisis is directly hurting my constituents.

There is nothing compassionate, humane, or fair about what we are seeing from the Biden Administration's policies, including ter-

minating the asylum cooperative agreements or the Remain in Mexico policy. The Administration needs to come back to the table and secure the border now. They can do so by working with us on this legislation which authorizes the Secretary of State to reenter into asylum cooperative agreements which helped us keep the border under control in previous Administration.

So I want to thank Chairman McCaul for introducing this bill. I strongly support it, and I ask my colleagues to support the bill as well. And I yield the balance of my time.

Chairman MCCAUL. The gentlelady yields. Any further discussion on the bill? Mr. Cicilline is recognized.

Mr. CICILLINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise in opposition to H.R. 1690 and associate myself with the remarks of Mr. Connolly. But I just think it is an important time to remind everyone on this committee that the asylum system of the United States was once described as the crown jewel of America's humanitarian effort by the Evangelical community in this country.

It is something that we should continue to be proud of as a refuge for those fleeing persecution and famine and war and has always been an example to the world of what America does to those in desperate need. I am fearful that if we were to pass 1690 as it is drafted, it would not only really violate that long tradition of America being a place that welcomes people who are seeking asylum. And there are deficiencies.

Look, we have to invest a lot more so there is an orderly, safe, humane process for consideration. But we ought not shred our asylum system by taking the most fundamental part of it that America will accept you, welcome you, and then adjudicate your claim under our law. What is equally disturbing to me is it seems as if we are creating a two-tier system of justice or for asylum.

If you come from certain countries, you can be removed to Mexico and wait however long it takes which can pose as Mr. Connolly said lots of danger to those who are seeking asylum and fleeing terror or fear, persecution or violence. But if you are an asylum seeker from another part of the world, you go through our regular asylum system. That seems to me a terrible message that we will give certain people who have legitimate asylum claims one treatment and other people a different treatment. And that is mostly because of our failure to be able to process people in a fair, humane, and expeditious way.

So I think it is a terrible bill. It saddens me to say that because I have deep respect for the chairman. But I think this does violence to a long tradition that has made us admired by the world because of the way we have been a refuge for people who are fleeing some of the most unspeakable violence. And so I urge my colleagues to vote no.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Would my friend yield for—

Mr. CICILLINE. And I yield the balance of my time to Mr. Connolly.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Is it my friend's understanding that under this so-called successful policy that worked that the number of refugees allowed into the United States plummeted in a 4-year period from 50,000 to 15,000? Is that my friend's understanding?

Mr. CICILLINE. Yes, I believe that is correct, Mr. Connolly.

Mr. CONNOLLY. And that would seem to fly in the face of what you talked about in terms of the jewel in the crown, something that you could hold up to the rest of the world as a beacon as something to be emulated and respected.

Mr. CICILLINE. Yes, in fact, Mr. Connolly, as you, I know, recognize, we have a neighbor to the north in Canada whose Prime Minister has said we welcome refugees and those willing to come to Canada because we recognize you will add tremendously to our economy, to our growth, to the success of Canada. And they are literally begging people to come. So I think it runs counter to good economic policy, good social policy. But most importantly, we have that big statue in New York Harbor that is inscribed with those words.

And it is something that we have always held up and I think had great pride in as we should. And yes, it needs to be fixed. Yes, we need additional resources. Yes, we have to be sure that people are processed properly. But to export or responsibility or our privilege really of being this great humanitarian force in the world and compel people to remain in another country while we get our act in order is a terrible message.

Mr. CONNOLLY. And if I could ask another question, I mean, to your last point. So this great program that worked so well, traditionally if you apply for asylum and you are granted consideration of your application, you can within 150 days apply for a job in the United States pending your approval of asylum status. Is that your understanding?

Mr. CICILLINE. That is correct, Mr. Connolly.

Mr. CONNOLLY. And is it not true that under the Trump Administration, they extended that 150 days to a year or more, making it very difficult for people in an asylum status or pending asylum status in the United States to, in fact, have gainful employment while they wait for the adjudication of their application?

Mr. CICILLINE. That is correct.

Mr. CONNOLLY. And that is supposed to be an improvement, I understand. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank you, and I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MCCAUL. The gentleman yields back. Any further discussion on the bill? Mr. Mills is recognized.

Mr. MILLS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I find it funny that my colleagues want to talk about our neighbors to the north and the fact that they accept refugees. But they do not talk about the fact that they are illegal or legal which is a really big and pressing issue that we need to be discussing here.

We talk about there is such great improvement on our borders. Well, I think the numbers speak quite differently. I am looking at CBP.gov. And when I am looking through the numbers here, it is surprising to me that in 2020 it says 458,000, in 2021, 1.7, in 2022, 2.4.

And we are already at 1.3 going into 2023. It is interesting to me that we are also not talking about the fact that in 2018 we had our Mexican cartels who are making 500 million dollars a year in revenue. And last year, that exceeded up to 13 billion of which almost 50 percent was in human child and women sex trafficking.

So it is just ironic to me that we are talking about that we have somehow resolved the situation or talking about our immigration as if it is now improved when, in fact, it has gotten exponentially worse. And the numbers are there to prove it. So I will be happy to yield back to my colleague if he would like to explain to me how things have gotten so much better when the numbers from CBP and from everyone is showing quite the contrary.

Mr. CICILLINE. Are you asking me—oh, yes. Thank you for yielding. Look I think there is no question if you look at what is happening around the world. It should surprise no one that there are a greater number of people seeking refuge or asylum in the United States.

You look at the unrest and war that exists in many parts of the world. And so I take those numbers to be opportunities, opportunities to process people, to carefully consider their claims for asylum, to determine if they are valid, and if so, to grant them asylum. That is the same thing the Canadians do.

And we used to do it, and we ought to continue to do it. But we need to devote resources to do it. I think suggesting that the real answer is to export our responsibility to do that to another country or to make asylum seeking so difficult because you cannot work and you must stay in Mexico that people will not apply for it is not the answer. Remember people who are seeking a asylum are making a claim that they are in fear of imminent harm or death, that they are subjected to torture or violence or persecution—

[Simultaneous speaking.]

Mr. MILLS. I reclaim my time. Sir, I reclaim my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. OK. I thought you would.

Mr. MILLS. The bottom line is that is absolutely untrue. We are seeing where the majority of people who are crossing our borders are single adults, not the women and children that the Democrats try to paint that is refugees seeking asylum. And not only this, but if it is seeking asylum, why wouldn't you go to the next safe harbor which would be the next country over as opposed to going five and six seven countries just to try and cross into America?

Let's also look at the facts here. You are still ignoring the amount of money and revenue that has been increased as a result of the drug cartels. You are still ignoring the 70,000-plus people who are dying from Fentanyl overdoses in America.

You are still ignoring the fact that we had a Secretary Mayorkas who said that our borders were not open yet our numbers are contrary to every one of those beliefs. We are sitting here and you are trying to argue the fact that somehow the flooding of illegal immigration is somehow beneficial to America. But I think economically we would actually see something very different.

And from a criminality perspective and from the amount of overdoses of death, I think that it is very clear that this is not to the benefit of Americans. And so it is just absolutely absurd to me that we are trying to argue the fact. We are not saying that we are not a nation of immigrants.

We are a nation of legal migration. We are a nation that has respected our laws and our sovereignty. And so to sit here and act as if violations of sovereignty, porous borders, and a continuation of building up the drug cartels is absolutely abhorrent. And so I am

absolutely in support of stronger restrictions when it comes to our borders and I am in absolute support of anything which will prevent what we are seeing with the atrocities that is occurring. With that, I yield back.

Chairman MCCAUL. The gentleman yields. Any further discussion on the bill? Mr. Castro is recognized.

Mr. CASTRO. Thank you, Chairman. I strongly oppose this bill. I believe that the United States must play a vital role in the western hemisphere's shared challenge of forced migration.

But this bill does not do that. In fact, the approach in this bill is an out of sight, out of mind one. This bill does not address, for example, the root causes of migration.

It does not acknowledge the fact that countries in the western hemisphere that are much smaller than the United States already host hundreds of thousands of migrants themselves. And this bill goes beyond the Trump Administration, and Stephen Miller's own policy that was Remain in Mexico. For example, that policy recognized that we cannot send unaccompanied minors who seek asylum to Mexico where they have no family and are at serious risk.

That policy made exemptions for people who did not speak Spanish, often Indigenous communities, and wouldn't be able to remain in Mexico because of that. So the bill does neither of those things. My reading of the bill also turns up a very strange irony.

And I believe Mr. Mills made the point. His question or his critique was that people will often cross multiple countries without applying for asylum in those countries. But my reading of the bill is that this treats people even who may have not touched any of those countries, never come through Mexico, people that came by water from Cuba, for example, or even in my reading of the bill, people that may have come to the northern border, dumps them all back in Mexico when they were never in Mexico.

Or the bill also addresses Guatemala, for example. That is a major hole in this piece of legislation as far as I can tell. And it would ask those fleeing countries like Cuba, Nicaragua, and Venezuela to first apply for asylum in Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador.

Please realize that the size of the combined economies of those three countries is 0.6 percent of that of the United States. And the four countries outlined are already dealing with high levels of violence and insecurity that threaten their own civilians. So how are they supposed to provide ample protection to even more people, in other words, to these migrants?

They do not have the capability or capacity to give individuals a fair hearing. And this bill does nothing to help them improve these capabilities. And what the bill describes as burden-sharing is not burden-sharing.

It does not recognize almost any role for the United States except for loading people on planes. The United States is a country of 350 million with the world's largest economy and a proud tradition of accepting refugees, asylum seekers, and immigrants. It would put migrants in an uncertain dangerous situation as Mr. Cicilline said and would transfer our responsibilities to countries that have minimal resources.

The point was also made earlier about the number of crossings. Understand that when you take people who are seeking asylum in the United States, make it to the United States, and then you dump them back in Mexico, you are enriching the very dangerous cartels who we are talking about. In other words, you are subjecting these folks to danger, the migrants to danger, and also making more money for the cartels because they are trying to get them back again. And it also increases those numbers.

I understand, Chairman McCaul, your concern and would be happy to work with you and with my colleagues across the aisle on legislation that would meaningfully address migration in our hemisphere. But I believe that this bill is harmful, counterproductive, and turns our back on those fleeing oppression. And for that reason, I urge my colleagues to vote no. I yield back.

Chairman MCCAUL. The gentleman yields back. Any further discussion on the bill? Mr. Wilson is recognized.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I support each of the measures that we're addressing, this inexcusable crisis at our southern border, and I particularly am grateful for the leadership of Chairman Mike McCaul as he's protecting American families.

As an original of the ORDER Act to facilitate stronger border policy that works for the American people this bill supports the Judiciary border bill and directs the President to return to proven border practices.

The Biden Administration has failed on our southern border and this is a step in the right direction. We're turning to the migrant protection protocols and asylum cooperative agreements that will limit the strain of illegal immigration on our citizens and contribute to the safety of the migrants and deny the cartels the phenomenal funds that they receive and also deny the Chinese Communist Party the ability to bring fentanyl into our country, which kills almost a hundred thousand people a year.

And I have practiced immigration law prior to coming to Congress and it's always been inspiring to me to have the opportunity to see people coming to America to achieve citizenship legally. But it's just absolutely absurd and dangerous to see the efforts to recruit illegal aliens to come to our country.

In fact, I've been recently within the last 2 years to Del Rio and Texas. I've previously been to San Diego. I've been to Del Rio previously.

When I was there it was shocking to me when I asked how many people on the terrorist watch list had crossed the persons were really nice about it but they said, hey, we cannot tell you—it's classified.

And so I want to give credit to Chairman McCaul and others. We did not stop. Every meeting we would ask how many people on the terrorist watch list have crossed and we now know over 200.

Putting that in perspective, it only takes one person on the terrorist watch list to achieve their goal of mass murder. These people are highly educated, highly trained, well skilled mass murderers and I truly believe and I—the Biden Administration—it's just shameful to put American families at risk.

American families have never been at greater risk of attack in their homes than today because of the Biden policies of an open

border. An attack can occur any second based on the inexcusable recruiting of illegal aliens to include persons who are on the terrorist watch list to come to the United States.

With that, I yield back.

Chairman MCCAUL. The gentleman yields.

Any further discussion on the bill?

Ms. Jacobs is recognized.

Ms. JACOBS. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm opposed to this bill. We talk a lot in this committee about how to restore America's reputation on the world stage and, let's be clear, doing that starts here at home.

It starts with living our values in everything we do, even when it's hard or seems politically charged, and it starts with treating people who are fighting for their lives with dignity, respect, and humanity.

But this bill before us, H.R. 6090, does none of these things and instead it takes us down a dark path by codifying the harmful remain in Mexico policy.

I represent San Diego, a proud border community. So I can tell you firsthand the border isn't overrun. We do not have an open border. In fact, San Diego is one of the safest cities in the entire country.

But continuing to militarize the border and spew xenophobic rhetoric because it's an election year does nothing to address the real problems of our immigration system.

There's no doubt about it. We need comprehensive proactive immigration reform. But that means addressing the root causes of violence and poverty in the Northern Triangle. It means reducing our immigration court backlog. It means creating more legal pathways so that the only option we are leaving people isn't to show up and try and seek asylum.

But instead of working on solutions, this bill will intensify the problems of our immigration system. It will send asylum seekers who've traveled hundreds or thousands of miles carrying little more than the shirt on their back and children in tow back to face risk of kidnapping, extortion, rape, and other abuses in Mexico.

Put yourself in their shoes. Think about the level of danger and fear you must be facing to be willing to make this scary journey with your kids.

Think about how hard you must be hoping and willing for a better life in America and then think about making it to America against all odds just to be handed what amounts to be a death sentence when you're sent back into danger without the resources to make your case for asylum.

Seeking asylum under both domestic and international law is legal. We can do so much better than this bill. We can live up to our values and the founding of our country and we can keep Americans safe. But not like this, not with this bill.

So I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 6090. I yield back.

Chairman MCCAUL. The gentlelady yields back.

Any further discussion on the bill?

Mr. Moran is recognized.

Mr. MORAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to touch on a few things.

Last week—I'm on the Judiciary Committee—we took 15 hours to go through a markup on a comprehensive border and immigration bill. I know there's some work to be done also by the Homeland Security Committee.

Those are interrelated issues. We cannot divorce one from the other. In fact, Foreign Affairs Committee has a very important piece and I believe this is a very important piece to our overall immigration and border security strategy. I support this amendment in the nature of the substitute to H.R. 1690 and for a number of reasons.

I just heard my colleagues say, quote, "We do not have an open border." I do not know what else we need to have as evidence to indicate that we have an open border other than what we have seen in the past 2 years.

I'm astounded by the numbers as we look at them where we run from the hundreds of thousands coming across in a year to millions coming across over a year—a year's period of time. I've been to El Paso and, in fact, in my first Judiciary Committee hearing where we had the El Paso County judge sitting in front of us saying the same thing—we do not have a problem. We take care of everybody that comes across the border and there's no overrun at all.

And less than a month later we see throngs and hordes of individuals that are there at the gate pushing through, making sure that they try to get into the United States.

I do not fault anybody from—for trying to get into the United States for a better life. But, simply, the United States cannot offer that to others around the world until we take care of our own domestic policy, until we secure our own borders, until we ensure that our own sovereignty is taken care of and without secure borders, without policies in place that ensure that the rule of law is enforced day in and day out and protect those that are already here we cannot offer the greatness of America to the rest of the world. We simply cannot do that, or it dilutes it for everyone and that's what we have seen.

The Democrats have talked about burden sharing. I heard one of my Democratic friends talk about the United States needs to burden share more because these other countries cannot do that—do that much because they're smaller.

I think it's safe to say that the burden that the American taxpayer is carrying these days is well more than what it should—what he or she should be carrying.

I think that's evidenced by the fact that as you see some of these illegal aliens being moved to northern States, these northern liberal mayors are besought and beside themselves because they cannot take care of tens of thousands of immigrants that are now in their cities, where States like my own in Texas we're having to deal with millions of immigrants in our cities, overrunning our counties on a day to day basis.

That committee hearing last week brought out some astounding facts as well that undergird why this particular bill is important to the Foreign Affairs Committee.

As I sat in Judiciary, one of the things that we heard over and over again was about unaccompanied minors and about the atrocities that are happening to unaccompanied minors where before the

Biden Administration took over we were seeing about 30,000 a year come across our borders.

Now we're dealing with over the past few years almost 150,000 per year in 2021 and 2022 and now in 2023 70,000 already this year to surpass the numbers that we saw in the past 2 years. Eighty-five thousand of those unaccompanied children are unaccounted for currently by the Biden Administration.

If we cannot account for the children that are coming across because of our open border policies then how can we continue to press for an open asylum policy, which is effectively what the Biden Administration has advocated for. That's what I hear my friends on the left advocating for as well, that we want—that they want to see anyone be able to seek asylum here in the United States and expanding that definition and expanding the interpretation of who actually qualifies under asylum.

In fact, we need to go back to a more strict definition. We need to go back to more strict enforcement of the policies. This bill does that and it does that in a number of ways that we talked about last week, again, in Judiciary and that is why do not we detain or return those that are seeking those asylum claims.

I bet if we quit just releasing those folks into the wild without knowing where they're going to come back—when or where and how and whether or not they will ever come back for a court hearing—that if they are returned back to Mexico or remain in Mexico pending the decision for their asylum case or they're returned to their home country or they're detained in a facility, which we will have room for if we can enforce our other border policies, then I bet you those asylum claims will be reduced and we'll actually see the true asylum claims.

I was privileged to be part of bringing a group over. I see my time waning so I'm going to stop and not tell that story. But I'll say, Mr. Chairman, thank you for bringing this bill. I support it. We need to get this passed. I yield back.

Chairman MCCAUL. The gentleman yields back.

Any further discussion on the bill?

Ms. Kamlager-Dove is recognized.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I have to respectfully oppose this bill.

What we are facing at our southern border is a crisis of people in need. Migrants who are coming to the United States are choosing to leave their families, uproot their lives, and make a treacherous journey with no guarantee that they'll reach safety or that they will remain alive.

They are doing this not because they want to but because they have no choice, and countries in Latin America and the Caribbean have endured massive stressors and upheaval over the past few years as the pandemic exacerbated economic instability, political repression, and food insecurity throughout the region.

Haiti is facing its most severe political and security crisis in decades. Ortega has consolidated his autocratic rule in Nicaragua. Bukele has jailed 2 percent of the adult population in El Salvador. Venezuela is suffering one of the worst humanitarian crises in the region's history.

I could go on and on and on. Yet, under Trump the United States was disengaged, it was indifferent, and missing in action as these developments were unfolding. It was also punitive and xenophobic.

We refuse to understand that Latin America's problems are our problems—their prosperity is our prosperity, and now as people come to seek safe haven at our border this bill shirks our responsibility to process these migrants with humanity and dignity by asking the very countries people are fleeing to host them for us.

That is just immoral and it is pernicious. I just have to add that, you know, Americans are not at risk because of Mexico.

Americans are at risk because they're being denied the right to vote, because they're being denied the right to access because they're being shot at school by other Americans.

That's what's putting Americans at risk. Immigration reform is critical but we cannot create new policies that further demonize brown migrants with maybe the exception of Cuba because our feelings are still hurt from years ago.

We have to come up with immigration reform that is humanitarian, that is diplomatic, and that is equal and we do not do that. You know, some of the comments that have been made in this hearing have been incredibly demoralizing and dehumanizing.

We are not releasing people into the wild. They are not animals. We are trying to find ways to be thoughtful with how we are addressing immigration reform and policies that keep people alive.

And so with that, I just have to urge my colleagues to vote no.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Will my friend yield?

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank—I want to thank her for her observation and just underscore maybe that very last point you made. We're talking about human beings. When we use terms like illegal aliens we objectify human beings, these human beings seeking a better future and overwhelmingly because the situation in their home countries has become untenable.

What mother wants her kids to be recruited by a violent gang and risk death or imprisonment if there's an option—some better option? It motivates the very basic nature of being a parent.

So treating people with respect, including how we describe them at this committee, how we verbally describe this issue and the people involved in it, matters and the more we can at least take cognizance of and respect the humanity that's at stake here I think the better off all of us would be served and the debate would be the richer for it.

I thank my friend for bringing that very much to the forefront of our attention.

Chairman MCCAUL. The gentleman yields.

Any further discussion? Mr. Self is recognized.

Mr. SELF. A little bit of history. Back in 1986 we conflated legal immigration and illegal immigration. President Reagan agreed to some limited amnesty in exchange for securing the border.

The illegal amnesty happened. Securing the border did not. From what I hear across the aisle we're asking to do the same thing. Several months ago—many months ago now I was on the border watching a very sophisticated operation. Little pickups would drop off three or four people.

Two rafts would make trips across the river bringing them across. The Texas National Guard would take them up out of the rafts, turn them over to the border control. They would put their wristbands on the ground because they had been delivered, which the word on the wristband was delivery. So they paid \$6,000, \$8,000 to be delivered across.

There was an interview with one of the illegal immigrants in Spanish, of course, across—through an interpreter that there are actually social media platforms that tell you where to go and they tell you where you will cross the border.

So once you get across the border how are they repaying that \$6,000, \$8,000, \$10,000? We have indentured servitude in America today because we do not have a secure border.

We need the rule of law on the border. We do not need more money. We simply need the policy of this Administration to be to enforce the laws that we have on the books.

I heard the phrase missing in action recently. We do have someone missing in action. It's called the border czar. We have a border czar.

The border czar, I believe, has been to the border once recently when pressure was put on and I will tell you from my military experience that if you're going to lead on anything, which the borders are—you're supposed to lead—you should be there.

Presence is important if you're going to lead anything for the Administration. We have a missing in action borders czar.

Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman MCCAUL. The gentleman yields.

Any further discussion on the bill?

There being no further discussion, the committee will move to consideration of amendments. Does any member wish to offer an amendment?

Mr. Castro is recognized.

Mr. CASTRO. Thank you, Chairman. I have an amendment at the desk. I think it's Castro amendment No. 2.

Chairman MCCAUL. The clerk shall distribute the amendment. Clerk will report the amendment. Clerk will report the amendment.

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1690 offered by Mr. Castro.

Chairman MCCAUL. Without objection further reading of the amendment is dispensed with. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

[The Amendment offered by Mr. Castro follows:]

**AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE
NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE TO H.R. 1690
OFFERED BY M . _____**

Page 2, after line 2, insert the following: “It is additionally the policy of the United States, as provided for in existing law, that individuals have a right to petition for asylum.”.



Mr. CASTRO. Thank you, Chairman.

This bill calls for the Secretary of State to negotiate agreements with Mexico, Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador that have serious implications on how U.S. laws are applied.

As you know, I've been candid that I usually oppose the actions of this Administration when it comes to negotiating agreements like this because I believe they attempt to solve a problem without actually fixing it.

If Congress is calling on the Administration to negotiate these agreements they should go through full review. This amendment is simple. It would subject any such agreements to Senate ratification before they go into effect. I urge my colleagues to support this measure, and I yield back.

Chairman MCCAUL. The gentleman yields back.

I oppose this amendment. Do any other members seek recognition?

Mr. MORAN. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, not every agreement signed with a foreign government qualifies as a treaty under Article Two of the Constitution.

As a leading foreign relations law textbook States, the executive branch, quote, "makes many more executive agreements than treaties and these agreements cover a wide array of topics and serve many different aims," end quote.

More specifically, so-called ex-ante congressional executive agreements are those that Congress authorizes the executive branch to make in advance. The idea is that the executive branch then negotiates and concludes the agreement without returning to Congress.

This is the standard. There's nothing unique going on here. It's Foreign Relations Law 101. Presumably, Democrats would like the agreement to be a treaty for the reason that they want to preserve congressional authority and our ability to make sure the text adheres to congressional intentions.

But here, the ORDER Act spells out exactly what the Secretary of State must negotiate. In other words, the content of the treaty is not left up to his whims. So Congress is already involved and it will remain involved and that is because under the Case-Zablocki Act the State Department must send us any agreements with foreign governments.

So Congress will not be left in the dark. In short, this amendment is unnecessary because it does not recognize the many legal forms foreign agreements may take. It is unnecessary and I oppose it. I yield back.

Chairman MCCAUL. The gentleman yields back.

Any further discussion on the amendment?

There being no further discussion, the question now occurs on the amendment offered by Representative Castro.

All those in favor signify by saying aye.

All those opposed signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the chair, the yeas have it and the amendment is not agreed to.

Are there any further amendments?

Mr. Castro is recognized.

Mr. CASTRO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, Castro amendment number—I believe it is No. 2.

Chairman MCCAUL. The clerk shall report the amendment. I'm sorry.

Mr. CASTRO. I'm sorry. It's No. 1, Chairman. My apologies.

Chairman MCCAUL. The clerk shall distribute the amendment. The clerk shall report the amendment.

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1690 offered by Mr. Castro of Texas.

Chairman MCCAUL. Without objection, further reading of the amendment is dispensed with. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

[The Amendment offered by Mr. Castro follows:]

**AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE
NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE TO H.R. 1690
OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS**

Page 4, beginning line 10, strike subsection (b) and
insert the following:

1 () REQUIREMENT FOR RATIFICATION.—Any agree-
2 ment reached pursuant to the authority provided by this
3 section shall be deemed to be a treaty that is subject to
4 the requirements of article II, section 2, clause 2 of the
5 Constitution of the United States, requiring that the trea-
6 ty is subject to the advice and consent of the Senate, in
7 order to enter into effect.



Mr. CASTRO. Thank you, Chairman.

I offer this amendment for consideration to reaffirm what many of us on both sides of the aisle know and have supported for many years in the past, that seeking asylum is a basic human right.

This right is codified in the United States domestic law and in international law and commitments. Congress has also made clear that seeking asylum at the border, even if not at a designated port of arrival, is lawful. Therefore, United States policy must reflect these legal obligations.

Unfortunately, over the last several years, as hostility toward refugees, asylum seekers, and immigrants has grown in the United States, particularly among my colleagues across the aisle, the right to asylum has been chipped away at and endangered and this bill has the possibility of further fundamentally taking away the right to asylum in the United States.

So I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this amendment, which also helps clarify the bill.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Would my friend yield?

Mr. CASTRO. I absolutely will.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend, and I thank him for introducing this amendment.

It's kind of sad that we think we need it. As Mr. Cicilline and I were talking about this a little bit earlier, the long proud tradition of America is to be that beacon on the hill, that one safe haven where those who suffer persecution, violence, can find a new home that is welcoming and they—when they do—when they actually seek legal status in asylum as refugees under our own law they are entitled to certain rights and a procedure and, frankly, that's been whittled away.

And so I thank my friend for introducing this amendment. I will gladly support it because I think reaffirming this principle is absolutely necessary in the current political climate.

Mr. CASTRO. Thank you, Mr. Connolly, and I'm going to yield to Mr. Cicilline in just a second. But you're right, the right to asylum is fundamentally under threat in the United States, which is a sad thing to say, given this Nation's history.

I yield to Mr. Cicilline.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and I want to thank him for introducing this amendment.

You know, we very often hear people speak about the asylum and refugee process as if it's not a legal process. This is a process that was created by Congress.

There's a legal standard. There's a right to have that standard determined by an appropriate court. This is part of the rule of law of this country and I do think it is really, really important and I really beseech my Republican colleagues.

Whatever you think about immigration, whatever you think about what is the right border policy, let's speak with one voice and say America has an asylum system and individuals have a right to petition for it. That determination then can be made by the appropriate court under the right standard and the right process.

But let's not lose this moment to just reaffirm for the world that we're proud of our asylum and refugee system and the great tradition of it in this country and what it has meant to the world as

an example and what it's meant to our country in terms of our extraordinary power as the greatest economic power in the world because of the arrival of people who have been fearing persecution and violence and famine and started companies and become great scientists and politicians and doctors and teachers.

So this would be a great moment to just reassert we have a broad disagreement on how it should be fixed and what we need to do to make our immigration system work.

But I hope there's no disagreement that fundamentally we respect and honor our great asylum system and I thank the gentleman for giving us that opportunity.

Mr. CASTRO. Thank you, Mr. Cicilline. I yield back, Chairman.

Chairman MCCAUL. The gentleman yields.

Any further discussion on the amendment?

Mr. Moran is recognized.

Mr. MORAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This really is not a debate or shouldn't be debate today about whether asylum should be offered and this—that's not what this bill is about.

This bill is about the process for seeking asylum and this amendment is not necessary. I oppose it for this reason. Under the existing proposed bill individuals have the right to petition but they just do not have the right to be released unmonitored into the United States while their petition is pending.

One of the Democratic colleagues just mentioned this. He said, quote, "The right to asylum is fundamentally under threat in the U.S." and I actually agree with that. I agree with that for this reason, that in the past 2 years the Biden Administration has diluted those that actually need asylum in this country by the throngs of people asserting asylum claims that are not rightful claims.

We certainly need to provide the ability for folks that really truly need asylum to get it in this country but the process of how that happens is what the—what the bill was really focused on.

We need to ensure that that process remains true to our rule of law, not to release folks out in our country before those asylum claims are actually vetted because then those that do not qualify for asylum how do we get them back?

I was just involved in a claim by some folks that were fleeing Chinese oppression. The Communist Party in China oppressed a church over there called the Mayflower Church and it took years for that group to work through the process outside of the United States before they got authorization to enter the United States to escape that oppression by the Chinese Communist Party.

Glad to say that in the last month all those approvals happened the way they needed to so they could receive the benefit of what America has to offer for those that are—that are being oppressed across this world.

But they did it legally. They did it through a process and they waited outside the United States before they got authorization. Now they've been resettled. Glad to say they've been resettled in east Texas and we're welcoming them with open arms and we're doing so because it's the right thing for us to do.

But we cannot do that in a way that is unbecoming of the rule of law and just unfettered to allow anybody in this country while their claim is being processed.

I yield back.

Chairman McCAUL. The gentleman yields.

Any further discussion?

Ms. Manning is recognized.

Ms. MANNING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to speak in favor of my colleague's amendment, and I'd just like to remind everyone that last week we observed Holocaust Remembrance Day. Members on the other side of the aisle were very happy to walk in the procession with those who had survived the Holocaust while 6 million had perished.

How much better it would have been if we had had in place and asylum process that would have allowed millions to escape their tormentors and we could have—we could have celebrated with those who had survived thanks to legal—some legal asylum.

In light of the way President Trump and many on the other side of the aisle demonized those who seek asylum I think it is more than appropriate that we offer in this bill an amendment to affirm that we do have a process for asylum, that it is legal to apply for asylum, and that it's most often not appropriate or feasible for people to wait in their home countries to apply for asylum.

So I applaud my colleague for introducing this amendment, and I will be supporting it.

Chairman McCAUL. The gentlelady yields.

Any further discussion. Mr. Mast is recognized.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Could I just ask my colleague to yield for a minute?

Chairman McCAUL. Mr. Mast has—controls the time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. No. No. I was—I was asking if you would allow Ms. Manning to just yield to me briefly before you call—

Chairman McCAUL. I'll allow for that.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the chair, and thank you, Ms. Manning.

I just want to apply what you said about the Holocaust. When one goes back to the history of the 1940's, Franklin Delano Roosevelt had a very rigid strict immigration quota system, and Congress and the immigration bureau were unrelenting and they weren't going to make exceptions.

He actually tried to use the quota system to get more Jewish refugees into the United States, knowing they were at incredible risk in Nazi-occupied Europe and the system did not allow for it.

And your point is quite profound. Millions died because we wouldn't let them in because of our rules. And so it's something to keep in mind in terms of the humanity behind the rules we create or that ought to be behind the rules we create and that, again, human lives are at stake.

I thank—I thank my friend for reminding us of that history, and thank you Mr. Chairman for accommodating.

Chairman McCAUL. The gentleman yields.

The chair recognizes Mr. Mast.

Mr. MAST. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

To my colleague, you just said something to keep in mind. Something to keep in mind right now is Americans, the American people, real Americans. Let's keep that in mind for a little while because, frankly, Mr. Cicilline, you said you are proud of our asylum system. I am not. There is nothing about it right now to be proud

of. It is like Central Park: anybody can walk in there, it is crime-ridden, and everybody around it has to pay the price for that.

That is what is going on with our system of asylum right now. There is nothing about it to be proud of.

I would absolutely personally, speaking for myself, want to shut off the entire system of asylum right now until we have dealt with the program as a whole and in an appropriate manner.

And I would give this last comparison; right? If your bathtub is overflowing, what is the first thing that you do if your bathtub is overflowing? You shut off the water. That is not controversial or hyperbolic to anybody. It is common sense that if it is overflowing you turn off the water.

That is what is going on with our system of asylum, it is overflowing. It is the bathtub filling up in the United States of America, it is bringing crime across the entire breadth of our country. And the American people, the American people are having to pay for it.

I yield back my time.

Chairman MCCAUL. The gentleman yields back.

Any further discussion?

Mr. Cicilline is recognized.

Mr. CICILLINE. Thank you. Thank you, Mr.—

Mr. MAST. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CICILLINE. No. Time was yielded to me. I have not been recognized.

Mr. MAST. No, that is true. You have not been recognized.

Mr. CICILLINE. No. Time was yielded to me from Mr. Castro's time.

Mr. MAST. OK. Mr. Castro is recognized. And say I yield my—

Mr. CICILLINE. I try. I know Mr. Mast does not want me to respond but I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. MAST. I generally do not.

Mr. CICILLINE. Yes, I know that.

Mr. MAST. I generally do not.

Mr. CONNOLLY. No wonder people think we are uncivil with that kind of observation, Mr. Mast.

Mr. MAST. I try to be.

Mr. CICILLINE. Look, I felt the need to respond.

First of all, I, every decision I make in my work is about real Americans. That is all of Americans, all the people who live in this country, all the people who are here in America.

The notion that there are some real Americans that we should really care about, I do not, I do not know who the other Americans are if they are ones that some people do not think are real, but.

Mr. MAST. Would you yield?

Mr. CICILLINE. No. I actually will not yield. I am happy to let you apologize for that term if you want.

But the truth is, there is a fundamental disagreement between at least Mr. Mast and me on this question of asylum. He actually said he would stop asylum.

When I think of the consequences for humanity if America stopped our beautiful asylum system that gave refuge to people, seek—you know, fleeing some of the most unspeakable, unimaginable violence. Think about places like Syria, and Myanmar, and

Ukraine, and the list goes on and on. Think of some places in Central America. The idea that we would stop asylum and we somehow have compared it to overflowing bathtubs.

When I think about the benefits of the asylum system, it is not just for the people who are granted asylum, we all benefit from the presence of these incredible people who become business owners, and entrepreneurs, and great scientists, and great lawyers, and great teachers, and CNAs, and caregivers. But the idea that somehow we do not benefit as a country from the arrival of some of the most persistent, determined, resilient people who have lived through, frankly, conditions most of us could not even imagine, but somehow it is only a benefit to them and America hasn't benefited or my constituents have not benefited from asylum seekers?

That is a terribly sad statement for me to hear from a member of the U.S. Congress. Because it ignores the fundamental reality that our country has been made stronger, more vibrant, more dynamic, more powerful because of the arrival of immigrants, and refugees, and asylum seekers.

And, frankly, to hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim that this is the problem with crime in America, you know what the problem with crime in America is? Gun violence. The leading cause of death of children in America. And we cannot get our Republican colleagues to pass a single bill to do a single thing about it.

Oh, wait. I am wrong. They are trying to abolish the ATF. That is the response.

If you care about crime, you would care about gun violence. And the notion that you are describing the asylum system as the reason for crime in America is factually wrong. The vast majority of people coming to America are law-abiding individuals who make tremendous contributions. And the ones who commit crimes ought to be prosecuted.

But it just defies reality to somehow assign responsibility for crime in America to people who are fleeing war, famine, and persecution, and trying to avail themselves of the asylum system. And it makes me sad, actually, to hear that kind of commentary.

And I would like to yield to Mr. Connolly because I know he always has something to improve on my words.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Well, I think the gentleman is right. And where some—no one here of course—have used immigration as a punching bag, as sort of a catchall for all that is wrong in our communities or our society, and I think the gentleman from Rhode Island makes a really profound point. America was built on immigration.

I am the grandson of an immigrant who came here, I might add, with very little education and no skills. And yet a grandson sits here as a Member of Congress.

Immigration has been good for America. And we need more of it if we are going to fill the ranks of future labor forces, if we are going to make sure that safety, safety net commitments are met, and the needs of the country are addressed, and that we continue to grow, unlike some of our competitors who have to plan for actual constructions given their demographic reality.

Reasonable immigration measures to protect the border but to allow for this influx of people who want to come here is in Amer-

ica's interest. And I think that is a really important point you make, Mr. Cicilline.

Thank you for allowing me to underscore it.

I yield back.

Chairman MCCAUL. The gentleman yields back.

Any—

Mr. CICILLINE. I know it is expired, but I intend to ask Mr. Mast, ask you give me 1 minute. Give me 1 minute.

Chairman MCCAUL. The rules are the rules. Just like with immigration.

The gentleman from Florida is correct.

Any further members seek recognition?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MCCAUL. Mr. Schneider is recognized.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Thank you.

I just want to reflect on this idea of who are real Americans, what is immigration?

Some of the people—well, let me start here. I am going to quote from the American Battlefield Trust. "To this day Haym Salomon remains one of the most forgotten members of the founding generation." I do not know if anyone knows who Haym Salomon is. "Yet the revolution may have failed without the financial support and mind of this Polish-born Jew. Still he remains, sadly, but a footnote in the founding of the United States." One of the great financiers of our country. We wouldn't have been able to fight the War of Independence without the support of an immigrant.

Some of the others I might mention who sought refuge in this country, made a significant difference as Americans: Albert Einstein; Elie Wiesel; two secretaries of State, Henry Kissinger and Madeleine Albright; entertainers including Gloria Estefan, Ruth Westheimer, Andy Garcia, Mikhail Baryshnikov; business leaders, as my colleague Mr. Cicilline noted, Sergey Brin of Google, Andy Grove, Intel.

And I want to read just a excerpt from Andy Grove's memoir that talks about what it means to be able to look to a nation like ours from a place suffering from oppression or occupation.

Andy Groves said, "By the time I was 20, I had lived through a Hungarian fascist dictatorship, German military occupation, the Nazi's Final Solution, the siege of Budapest by the Soviet Red Army, a period of chaotic democracy in the years immediately after the war, a variety of repressive communist regimes, and a popular uprising that was put down at gunpoint where many young people were killed, countless others were interned. Some 200,000 Hungarians escaped to the West. I was one of them."

Andy Grove came to this country. He founded a company called Intel, one of the great American companies that we celebrate, that we need to succeed into the future. This country is stronger because people from around the world look to who we are as a Nation, the promise that America and the United States has held out for so many from so many places. And those people who come here make us stronger, make our economy stronger, make our Nation better.

We need to reform our immigration laws. We need border security. There is no question about that. What we need is comprehen-

sive immigration reform, and we have not been able to have it because too many people, especially on the other side of the aisle, are unwilling to work with us to get it done.

I yield back.

Chairman MCCAUL. The gentleman yields back.

Any further discussion?

There being no further discussion, the question now occurs on the amendment offered by Representative Castro, Number 1.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a recorded vote. A recorded vote.

Chairman MCCAUL. A recorded vote has been called for, a roll call vote has been requested.

Pursuant to the chair's previous announcement, this vote will be postponed.

I will remind members we will be voting at 1:30 in the interests of time.

Any further amendments?

Mr. CASTRO. I have got an amendment at the desk, Chairman.
[The Amendment offered by Mr. Castro follows:]

**AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE
NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE TO H.R. 1690**

OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS

Page 4, after line 16, insert the following:

1 () LIMITATION OF SCOPE OF AGREEMENTS.—The
2 authorization to enter into agreements pursuant to this
3 section does not include an authorization to enter into any
4 agreement relating to or affecting foreign nationals that—
5 (1)(A) belong to a religious minority or are oth-
6 erwise petitioning for asylum on the basis of reli-
7 gious persecution; and
8 (B) are nationals of a country designated
9 by the President as a “country of particular
10 concern” pursuant to section 402 of the Inter-
11 national Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22
12 U.S.C. 6442);
13 (2) are individuals with disabilities and seeking
14 asylum; or
15 (3) are displaced by the Russian invasion of
16 Ukraine, including those seeking asylum.



Chairman MCCAUL. The clerk shall distribute the amendment.

Mr. CASTRO. Castro Amendment Number 8.

Chairman MCCAUL. The clerk shall report the amendment.

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Chairman MCCAUL. Without objection, further reading of the amendment is dispensed with.

The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASTRO. Thank you, Chairman.

I have this amendment which would exclude three categories of individuals from the bill's provisions:

First, the disabled; second, religious minorities fleeing religious persecution from certain countries; and, finally, Ukrainians fleeing the Russian invasion.

First let me speak about persons with disabilities. Some of you may have seen a few weeks ago, I thought CNN did an excellent job. They have a documentary series with Anderson Cooper on a Sunday night, and they follow these migrants who are crossing through the Darien Gap, and all of their incredible hardships.

And if you watch the struggles of these people, and the hardships of these people, nobody would ever call them lazy. Nobody would ever say that they are coming here to just sit down and do nothing.

But they followed certain families along the trail, and one of the families, a woman and a few of her kids, I think, they followed. And one of the children was a girl who looked to be, I do not know, maybe 10, between 10 and 12 years old, who was a disabled girl that was having a lot of trouble even staying conscious. And the mom after a while could no longer carry her.

And along the route there were other men, migrant men, who were helping her carry her daughter across the Darien Gap. And so, the bill as it is currently written would force people with disabilities who are able to make it to the United States, would send them back to places like Mexico or Guatemala where there is no infrastructure for actually medically treating them and making sure that, at a minimum, they get the medical attention that they need. Instead, they would just be dumped in Reynosa, and Tijuana, and Juarez, and many of them likely die.

The second is religious persecution, people fleeing religious persecution who are religious minorities in their countries. This amendment would protect people like the Rohingya in Burma, the Catholics in Nicaragua, the Uyghurs in China whom many of us have spoken about concern for on multiple committees in this Congress, and other religious minorities.

It would also include, this bill, my amendment, Ukrainians displaced by Russia's unprovoked invasion into Ukraine, making sure that they can stay here in the United States as their asylum claims are processed.

So, three exemptions: disability, religious minorities fleeing religious persecution, and Ukrainians who are fleeing the deadly Russian invasion.

That is my amendment.

Sending these individuals that I have laid out to unknown situations in Mexico or Central America with no access to family support or proper resources is unconscionable. I know many of my Re-

publican friends have expressed support for each of these groups in different ways who are fleeing persecution. And I hope they will continue to publicly support them by voting yes on this amendment.

And I just want to add that I also believe that the rhetoric in the United States, the rhetoric in this Congress, the rhetoric from people across the aisle, the Republicans, is getting dangerous. It is ill-informed and it is oftentimes malicious.

You notice, let me give you a direct example, you notice that over the years folks have moved away from calling human beings illegal. And now we have multiple who I think have said it today.

I was reading an article in San Antonio from a news organization and, probably about a week ago, and it said, you know, something, something, illegal aliens, illegal immigrants. Part of the reason that we have not been using those terms is because at the least we were able to all acknowledge that these are human beings. And you are trying not to dehumanize human beings.

But, unfortunately, many people, including many people in this Congress—and you can hear it today—start from the assumption that everybody that is coming here is out to kill Americans, is out to harm Americans. That is the assumption that people start with, that people are not gentle people, that they are not compassionate people like those people that volunteered to help that woman whose daughter was disabled and having trouble walking. They start with the idea that these are killers, that these are terrorists, and they are here to harm you. And then they go sell it to a big, a wide swath of the American people.

People disingenuously say that the border is open when we have three or four times the number of Border Patrol agents that we did in the year 2000, 23 years ago. We have got drones on the border, we have got surveillance, all kinds of surveillance mechanisms on the border and, yet, people say that it is open for political reasons.

I urge your support on this amendment.

And I yield back, Chairman.

Chairman McCAUL. The gentleman yields back.

I oppose this amendment. It is currently law on the books.

So, any members seek recognition?

Mr. Mast is recognized.

Mr. MAST. Thank you. A couple of things to address here.

I think our colleagues, you honestly have to think the American people are stupid. Because there has been nobody on this dais that said every person that comes from another country is here to commit a crime. Nobody said that.

But you are putting blinders on, being willfully naive to the fact of that matter that the asylum system, people pouring through our borders, is bringing in gross levels of crime. You used the term “unconscionable.” There is nothing unconscionable about sending somebody from Guatemala back to Guatemala.

And your own remarks bear out exactly what really is unconscionable, the fact that you said, well, if they go back to Guatemala they are not going to get the care that they need, or this that they need, or this that they need. You are literally saying you want the American people to pay for, in your example, somebody from Guatemala’s health care, or their food, or their lodging, or everything

else. That is what is truly unconscionable about what you want to allow with this system of immigration, again just allowing anybody to come.

And I will say again, there are real Americans. You have said there is no, oh, there is no such thing as a real American, it is hateful to say real Americans. No, there are real Americans. That is a fact.

And there is nothing wrong with calling somebody illegal if they are here illegally. That is a fact. You do not have to be so sensitive as to not simply say what is the truth. It is all right to say that. You should get comfortable with saying these things that are true. We would be in a better place for the people of the United States of America. We would be in a better place about what goes on with their dollars that we spend. Because every dollar is somebody, somebody's dollar that they went to work for.

I know you all are looking to redistribute it in a host of different ways, whether it is because of somebody's credit score, or whether it is because of all the things that you listed off in your bill here you will redistribute. Not because somebody is wealthy and they pay taxes. Anybody that pays taxes, because that is what pays for every bit of the policy that you are talking about whether they are from Guatemala or somewhere else, to pay for their health care, their lodging, their food, their everything else. It does not have to be a wealthy person. It could be somebody that is a thousandaire. Right? Not a millionaire, a thousandaire.

You are asking for them to pay for the health care of somebody else instead of having the money to pay for the health care of their own family. That is an example of unconscionable, to use your language. That is an example of being ill-informed and, I would say, not worthy of representing the American people because you do not think that there are real Americans to go out there and represent.

But I would again say there are. They are the ones that are most deserving of our attention, paying attention to their needs, their communities, their tax dollars, their time away from their families, the work of their hands, their labor which you are very clearly not willing to take a look at in an appropriate way.

And that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

Chairman MCCAUL. The gentleman yields back.

Any further discussion?

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I believe the words Mr. Mast just used to describe a colleague on this committee are perilously close to words that should be taken down. And I would urge the chair to counsel all members to take care in how they describe the person and the motivation of any colleague in this body.

Chairman MCCAUL. Any further discussion?

Mr. CASTRO. Sure. Will you yield to me, Gerry?

Someone has to yield me time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Who is asking? I will gladly yield to Mr. Castro.

Mr. CASTRO. All right, Brian, you can say whatever you want about me. That is fine. Will you yield me time to do that? Well, you just did, so, just more, if you want to give me more, I am happy to keep going.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Reclaiming my time just a little bit, Mr. Castro.

Mr. CASTRO. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Actually, the rules of the House do not allow Mr. Mast to say anything he wants to say about you. And that is what I am reminding our colleagues of. There is a decorum that must be respected. Sometimes in the heat of the moment we may forget that, but I think we have to show fundamental respect for each other if we are going to get the people's business done in a meaningful way.

I yield again to you, Mr. Castro.

Mr. CASTRO. Yes. Look, well, first of all my amendment is on these three exemptions. But I have expressed concern about where one particular party is headed in the United States. I believe it is getting dangerous. I believe in some instances it is getting hysterical. And it is detached from reality.

And, quite honestly, and I am not speaking about any individual person, but I believe that a lot of it is animated by racism and bigotry. And somebody may not say something as directly, they may say something indirectly, but when you add up all of those comments and how they are speaking about people, I think it is hard not to reach that conclusion.

And, by the way, I am not the only one that believes that. There are millions and millions of real Americans who believe that.

I represent a hometown in San Antonio, Texas, of real Americans who go to work every day, and work hours, and hours, and hours. I grew up in an area that was 95 percent Mexican American.

My grandmother came here in 1922 before the major immigration laws of the 1920's were really, I mean, if you talk about a period in American history where there was an open border it was really before about 1924. OK. And my grandmother came to the United States because both her parents had died around the time of the Mexican Revolution, and the closest relatives that could take her in were not in Mexico but were in San Antonio, Texas.

And there was a line in the documents when she arrived at Eagle Pass, Texas, that asked why she was coming. And her relatives wrote in that line "to live," that she was coming to live.

So, that is how different immigration policy was in 1922 than it is now. Now you have got drones, and Border Patrol agents, and all the surveillance—I am on the Intelligence Committee—all of these, all the things that we do to make sure that we have as safe a border as possible.

So, that is why I say it is detached from reality, or it is either detached from reality or it is disingenuous. And that is the problem with our politics, both of those things.

You know, a lot of folks take codels over here to El Paso, or to McAllen, or wherever it may be. Maybe they go to San Diego. And the mayors and the others tell them, hey, this is a safe city. But people who live 1,000 miles from the border insist that they know better than the elected officials and the residents who actually live along the border.

These are some of the, literally by the numbers, by the American numbers, these are some of the safest cities in the country. Yet, there is a whole hysteria created around the asylum seekers, you know, who want to have their asylum claims processed here in the United States.

I yield back to Mr. Connolly.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I yield back my time, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MCCAUL. OK. The gentleman yields back.

Any further discussion?

There being no further discussion, the question now occurs on the amendment offered by Representative Castro, Number 8.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it. And the amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. CASTRO. I ask for a recorded vote, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MCCAUL. A roll call vote has been requested.

Pursuant to the chair's previous announcement, this vote will be postponed.

Any further amendments?

Ms. Kamlager-Dove is recognized.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have an amendment.

[The Amendment offered by Ms. Kamlager-Dove follows:]

☐

Chairman McCAUL. The clerk shall distribute the amendment.

And the clerk shall report.

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R.—

Chairman McCAUL. Without objection, further reading of the amendment is dispensed with.

The gentlelady is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

You know, sometimes it is the what, but oftentimes it is the how. And this amendment seeks to reflect the core component of our immigration policy that was omitted from the original text. The humanitarian and development assistance we provide countries in the region is pivotal to addressing the push factors of migration that are driving people to leave their home countries.

Any sustainable approach to migration should focus on reducing the untenable conditions that are forcing people to flee. That is called strategic partnerships, strategic alliances. And without this focus we are left with an immigration policy that only addresses the symptoms and not the root causes.

And it is so important that if we are going to solve problems, we also look at the underlying issues, the root causes, and figure out ways that we can address those.

My amendment recognizes the importance of United States humanitarian and development assistance in our immigration policy. And I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

With that, I yield back.

Chairman McCAUL. The gentlelady yields.

Any further discussion?

Mr. Self is recognized.

Mr. SELF. I understand the desire is to, and the central policy is to spend more money. We have spent billions, billions in humanitarian and development assistance in this region. Very little evidence that it has affected the factors incentivizing people to migrate.

The border is open. I believe the policy of the Biden Administration is an open border. This amendment should be focused on the security assistance against the drug cartels, the sex trade. The sex trade in Houston is now worth \$68 billion a year. It now more lucrative than the drug trade, which is hard to imagine.

We have to get into a serious conversation about allocating money toward the real issues in this, in this region of the world. And we need to make sure that it reduces the flow of the illegal immigrants to the United States.

Thank you. I yield back.

Chairman McCAUL. The gentleman yields back.

Any further discussion?

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

I wanted to first support my colleague Castro on his comment. The rhetoric that is coming from the other side is disruptive, and it removes the humanity that we need to look at other people's suffering.

As a first generation Haitian American whose parents came here fleeing a dictator, seeing the grotesque actions and activities and how people were treated, we have to remember that we can live up to our greatness as Americans, but still take care of our neighbors and being great neighbors.

In addition to that, I think you are incorrect when you say that the money we spent on humanitarian efforts has not helped us in making sure that people stay in their homes. The truth of it is, no one wants to come to the United States. No one wants to leave their family, their home, and be stripped away from their culture. The reason why they are coming here is for centuries we have been the beacon of hope. For centuries we have been what everyone aspires to be.

So, if we proceed in these directions, what we are becoming is no longer the leader of international policy and humanitarian, we have a responsibility to be good neighbors. And when we see countries are suffering, step in, and that would not deteriorate us as Americans.

So, the amendment that Ms. Kamlager-Dove has here is actually appropriate to what we need to do. Because if we are going to stop migration, especially the extreme migration we have seen post-COVID, we have to step in and be those kinds of neighbors we see Canada engaging in, we see other countries. And it is reducing.

And another thing we have to acknowledge, that our borders are not open. They are not open. There are many people who are sent back who are still suffering, who are being deported back to their country, and they are dying there.

Americans are being attacked in Latin America right now. Americans. When do we actually start to stabilize and be good neighbors? When do we stop the rhetoric? When do we actually live up to what people voted us to do and to be here, and we actually unify instead of perpetrating these lies. We have to be honest.

The humanitarian aid we have given has worked. The borders are closed. The rhetoric is detrimental to all of us as Americans, and we see hate rising every single day. And so our responsibility is to ensure that we have fair policies, fair immigration practices. And that can only be done when we are honest and we have compassion for all humans.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman MCCAUL. The gentlelady yields back.

Any further discussion?

There being no further discussion, the question now occurs on the amendment offered by Representative Kamlager-Dove.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the chair, the yeas have it and the amendment is not agreed to.

MS. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Chair, a recorded vote. Ask for a recorded vote.

Chairman MCCAUL. A roll call vote has been requested.

Pursuant to the chair's previous announcement, this vote will be postponed.

Pursuant to notice, I now call up H.R. 2789, To direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy on efforts to strengthen sub-

national cooperation between the United States and Mexico, and
for other purposes.
[The Bill H.R. 2789 follows:]

118TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2789

To direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy on efforts to strengthen subnational cooperation between the United States and Mexico, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 20, 2023

Mr. STANTON introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs

A BILL

To direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy on efforts to strengthen subnational cooperation between the United States and Mexico, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

4 This Act may be cited as the “American Cooperation
5 with Our Neighbors Act”.

6 SEC. 2. SUBNATIONAL COOPERATION STRATEGY.

7 (a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the
8 date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State,
9 in coordination with the Administrator of the United

1 States Agency for International Development, shall submit
2 to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Rep-
3 resentatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of
4 the Senate a strategy on efforts to strengthen subnational
5 cooperation between the United States and Mexico for the
6 purposes of—

7 (1) enhancing law enforcement cooperation at a
8 subnational level for the purpose of curbing fentanyl
9 trafficking and other synthetic opioids, including ac-
10 tivities such as—

11 (A) bolstering technical assistance for law
12 enforcement agencies;

13 (B) carrying out exchange programs for
14 the purposes of professional development; and

15 (C) enhancing data sharing, as appro-
16 priate;

17 (2) bolstering subnational dialogue between
18 local governments, civil society, faith-based organiza-
19 tions, and business community leaders and inte-
20 grating issues faced by local communities, including
21 with respect to trafficking of fentanyl and other syn-
22 thetic opioids; and

23 (3) strengthening capacity building and provide
24 resources for border towns and organizations within

1 those towns that attempt to meet the needs of local
2 communities.

3 (b) UPDATE.—Not later than 2 years after the date
4 of the submission of the strategy under subsection (a), the
5 President shall submit to the congressional committees
6 specified in subsection (a) an update containing an assess-
7 ment of the implementation and effectiveness of the strat-
8 egy, lessons learned from the past year with respect to
9 the strategy, and planned changes to the strategy.

10 (c) FORM.—The strategy under subsection (a), and
11 the update under subsection (b), shall be submitted in un-
12 classified form.

13 **SEC. 3. LOW-EARTH ORBIT SATELLITE TECHNOLOGIES FEA-**
14 **SIBILITY STUDY AND REPORT.**

15 (a) FEASIBILITY STUDY.—The Secretary of State, in
16 consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, the Admin-
17 istrator of the United States Agency for International De-
18 velopment, the Director of the United States Trade and
19 Development Agency, and the heads of other Federal
20 agencies as appropriate, shall conduct a feasibility study
21 for the countries of Mexico, Central America, and the Car-
22 ibbean on the possibility of low-Earth orbit satellites, high
23 altitude platforms systems, or other trusted space-based
24 telecommunications technologies to—

1 (1) provide broadband connection to remote
2 areas that lack access to network service;

3 (2) provide mobile and internet services without
4 the use of untrusted telecommunications equipment
5 or services; and

6 (3) provide uncensored internet access to the
7 people of such countries the governments of which
8 use firewalls to prevent their populations from freely
9 accessing information.

10 (b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the com-
11 pletion of the feasibility study under subsection (a), the
12 Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Committee on
13 Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and Com-
14 mittee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report on the
15 results of the feasibility study under subsection (a) that
16 includes an analysis of the—

17 (1) scalability of the implementation of the
18 technologies described in subsection (a);

19 (2) economic viability of using space-based tech-
20 nologies to reach remote areas, including the cost of
21 space-enabled broadband service per newly connected
22 person;

23 (3) feasibility of using such technologies to limit
24 or phase out the use of untrusted telecommuni-
25 cations equipment or services; and

1 (4) capability of satellite internet technologies
2 to provide uncensored internet to people in countries
3 where open internet access is forbidden or curtailed.

4 **SEC. 4. DEPARTMENT OF STATE REVIEW OF ACCESS TO FI-**
5 **NANCE IN THE COUNTRIES OF THE CARIB-**
6 **BEAN.**

7 (a) REVIEW.—The Secretary of State, in consultation
8 with the Secretary of Treasury, shall conduct a review to
9 determine any steps, balancing costs and benefits, that the
10 Secretaries could take to expand financial access to the
11 countries of the Caribbean, including through a review
12 of—

13 (1) sanctions enforcement laws and compliance
14 standards;

15 (2) reporting requirements pertaining to nar-
16 cotics trafficking and illicit finance thereof;

17 (3) possible expansion of embassies and con-
18 sulates in the region; and

19 (4) programming or lack thereof pertaining to
20 access to capital in the region.

21 (b) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to the ap-
22 propriate congressional committees a report on the find-
23 ings of the Secretary pertaining to the review under sub-
24 section (a).

1 (c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DE-
2 FINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congres-
3 sional committees” means—

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

7 (2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and
8 the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Af-
9 fairs of the Senate.

○

Chairman MCCAUL. The clerk shall designate the bill.

The clerk shall designate the bill.

The CLERK. Amendment in the nature of a substitute to——

Chairman MCCAUL. Without objection, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with. The bill is considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Without objection the amendment in the nature of a substitute circulated to members in advance shall be considered as read and will be treated as original text for purposes of amendment.

Votes have been called, so I am going to recess now until after the floor votes, and then recognize members for their statements on the bill.

[Whereupon, at 1:30 p.m., the committee recessed, to reconvene at 2:29 p.m. the same day.]

AFTERNOON SESSION

Mr. MAST [presiding]. Committee will come to order.

You ready, Mr. Connolly?

Mr. CONNOLLY. [Inaudible] Mr. Connolly wants Mr. Sherman to do it

[inaudible.]

Mr. MAST. We are open to Mr. Sherman.

Does any member seek recognition to speak on the bill?

Mr. Stanton is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STANTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I represent a border State of Arizona and I have heard time and time again from frustrated mayors, county executives, heads of non-profits, business owners, and especially law enforcement about the disastrous effects of the fentanyl trafficking in our communities. It is devastating. And not only do these local leaders feel they are not getting the support and resources they need from the Federal Government to tackle the problem, they are shut out of the conversation. These are folks on the ground with deep knowledge and expertise and it is a rich untapped resource.

This legislation, the American Cooperation With Our Neighbors Act, tasks the Department of State and USAID with improving cooperation and collaboration between local leaders and agencies on both sides of the border.

We know fentanyl trafficked into the U.S. largely from a single source: Mexican cartels. Seizures along the southern border have been rising for many years but it is clear to anyone paying attention that the pace is accelerating rapidly.

This Congress has provided more funding to law enforcement and to the Border Patrol and modernized infrastructure at our ports of entry where most drugs are trafficked through, but it is going to take an all-hands-on-deck approach with every stakeholder working together toward a common goal.

This bill aims to improve coordination between local law enforcement agencies, State and Federal security forces, and our counterparts in Mexico by sharing data, creating professional development exchange programs, and supporting technical assistance to crack down on fentanyl traffickers.

I have seen this sort of interagency collaboration work first hand. Before I served in this Congress, before I served in local govern-

ment in Arizona I served as deputy attorney general for the State of Arizona. We took notice that cartels were quick—were using quick anonymous Western Union wire transfers to launder money they made trafficking narcotics.

So we got to work and that office created the Transaction Record Analysis Center, or TRAC, that law enforcement across the southwest can use to investigate and interdict the money laundering activities of national and international criminals and to mitigate the violence associated with smuggling activities that fund these organizations. It has been incredibly successful and was recently instrumental in a 3-year drug bust operation leading to the seizure of over 4.5 million fentanyl-laced fake prescription pills, 66 kilograms of fentanyl powder, \$2 million in cash, and nearly 50 firearms.

But this bill goes well beyond subnational law enforcement cooperation. It will also improve coordination between the Federal Government and the local leaders, businesses, hospitals, faith-based organizations who are working to combat the fallout from the epidemic like organizations treating substance abuse or creating alternatives to gang affiliation and businesses that make fentanyl testing strips and innovate ways to keep our pharmaceutical safe.

Some of that collaboration is already happening, but it is on a very ad hoc basis. This bill creates the space for sustained and strategic collaboration to fight the fentanyl crisis ensuring that we are using our resources and vast knowledge of our local communities wisely.

Fentanyl has taken a heavy toll in Mexico as well. Overdose deaths are steadily rising along with the brutal cartel violence and rampant corruption that trafficking has fueled. To fight the fentanyl crisis we need to commit to sustained and collaborative engagement to end joint law enforcement not just at the international Federal level, but between local leaders bearing the brunt of this crisis.

The second section of this bill tasks the State and Treasury Departments with expanding access to financial markets for certain Caribbean nations. One thing that State and Treasury will have to consider is how each country deals with reporting narcotics trafficking and the financing of narcotics.

This study will help us better understand how we can cooperate with our third border and how we can incentivize collaboration on drug trafficking.

So I hope I can count on the support of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to advance this important legislation. I yield back.

Mr. MAST. The gentleman yields back.

Is there any further discussion?

The chair recognizes Mr. Sherman for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Fortunately I will not take 5 minutes. I come from a border State as does Mr. Stanton and I think this is an important bill. That is why I support H.R. 2789.

The measure offers a way to ensure that subnational dialogs on transnational challenges are not lost in our bilateral relationship. The issues which communities near the border face, including the impact of fentanyl, humans and arms trafficking, and migration flows, and the humanitarian response all deserve our attention. These issues are not just criminal in nature, but they also involve

public health, youth development, business, local capacity concerns, and they deserve to be considered as part of any high-level dialog. Moreover, leaders in these locations have experiences to share including best practices and new proposals.

Local officials, community organizations, and others need to build capacity and need access to resources. A strategy which contemplates the local reality can enhance diplomatic relations with Mexico and build robust responses to multifaceted and transnational challenges. The States of Mexico dealing with the States of the United States, localities and cities dealing with each other will certainly help us move in the right direction.

Another part of this bill is also important. That part of the bill would require a review of obstacles and steps needed to ensure that CARICOM nations have access to the financial services they need. For far too long many of these island nations have faced tremendous adversity from devastating climate events and models which limit banking options due to perceptions of risk. This bill requires the State Department to conduct a review of current practices so that we are able to propose solutions to challenges that hinder Caribbean nations for providing much needed financial protection and services to their population.

That being said, it is important that our friends in the Caribbean not become a haven for tax evasion, a haven for those evading our anti-money laundering statutes, and our Know Your Customer statutes.

And we particularly have got to be attuned to cryptocurrency as a device. We know that FTX was headquartered in the Bahamas.

So I look forward to this review making sure that banking for development and for transactions in the CARICOM nations goes forward without those nations serving either to promote cryptocurrency or for those who want to shield their assets. So often the Cayman Islands allows people to shield them from legitimate tax laws.

I support this bill and yield back.

Mr. MAST. The gentleman yields back.

I now recognize myself for 5 minutes, and simply to bring up a discussion. Though many members that were in the last debate are no longer in the room, it is it say this: We are now speaking about a bill, we are speaking about crime, we are speaking about human trafficking, we are speaking about drugs, and everything that is coming with our problems of immigration, but just a few minutes ago as we were talking about the system of asylum, if you brought up the fact that there was crime that was associated with—it immediately went hyperbolic saying, well, if you say there is crime associated with the asylum system, then you must be saying that every person seeing asylum is a criminal.

Well, let me just say this: No. 1, if you are coming into our country illegally, you are a criminal. But now it is so hypocritical to me what I see going on here, the way this is discussed in one place and not in another place. Again, there is crime, there is human trafficking, there is drugs. This is all a part of the same conversation and it all needs to be addressed.

And I will make the same statement that I made in the last debate: If your tub is overflowing, the first thing that you do is you

shut off the water to keep it from continually overflowing and then you deal with some of the problems. And we are at the point in my opinion that we need to shut off the water because of the way Americans are being affected by what is going on with our borders.

In that, not seeing any further—is there any further discussion on the bill?

I believe you were already recognized.

Mr. SHERMAN. If the gentleman would lead—would yield 30 seconds of his time?

Mr. MAST. I will yield you 30 seconds of my time.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will simply say that it is my understanding of the law that it does not make you criminal to come to our country and request asylum. Obviously every group that involves hundreds of thousands of people includes a few people that might commit a crime. That is true of my own constituents, 750,000 of them. Some of them have engaged in criminal activity.

So I look forward to working with you on this bill and want to say that asylum is an important part of our law.

Mr. MAST. And I will regain my time and just respond briefly and say again certainly not every person seeking asylum is a criminal, but if somebody enters the United States of America uninvited—there are ways that you are invited to come in and ways that you are not. If you enter the United States of America, no matter what situation it is that you come from, then you are a criminal. You are breaking America's laws and you are a criminal. And that shouldn't be hyperbolic.

You have to come in by proper invitation just as I cannot go into Mexico or Guatemala or Canada or anywhere else by proper invitation. I cannot smuggle something in there. I cannot seek a job. I cannot do anything but by proper invitation without being a criminal in that country and we deserve to offer our people the same respect to our laws.

In that, any further debate? I see Mr. Self raising his hand, so the chair recognizes Mr. Self for 5 minutes.

Mr. SELF. We have conflated asylum with being right. Asylum means that you get vetted, you get adjudicated. That is what we are not doing. I do not think that anyone is arguing with the international law about asylum and our own laws about asylum. What we are arguing about is how we do asylum in this country. And we are not. I yield back.

Mr. MAST. The gentleman yields back.

There being no further discussion of the bill, the committee will move to consideration of amendments. Does any member have an amendment that they wish to offer?

Mr. ISSA. I have amendment at the desk.

Mr. MAST. I will say this very slowly so you can regain your sense of where we are right now.

The clerk shall now distribute the amendment.

The clerk shall report the amendment

The CLERK. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 2789 offered by Mr. Issa of California. Page 3, after line 3, insert the following—

Mr. MAST. Without objection, further reading of the amendment is dispensed with. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes on the amendment.

[The amendment of Mr. Issa follows:]

**AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE
NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE TO H.R. 2789
OFFERED BY MR. ISSA OF CALIFORNIA**

Page 3, after line 3, insert the following new subsection:

- 1 (d) LIMITATION ON DATA SHARING.—
- 2 (1) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of State may
- 3 not carry out any project, program, or activity that
- 4 implements the strategy under subsection (a) for the
- 5 purpose specified in paragraph (1)(C) of such sub-
- 6 section until the Secretary submits to the appro-
- 7 priate congressional committees a notification re-
- 8 garding the data intended to be shared with foreign
- 9 countries pursuant to such strategy.
- 10 (2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMIT-
- 11 TEES.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate
- 12 congressional committees” means—
- 13 (A) the Committee on the Judiciary, the
- 14 Committee on Homeland Security, the Com-
- 15 mittee on Foreign Affairs, and the Permanent
- 16 Select Committee on Intelligence of the House
- 17 of Representatives; and

G:\M\18\ISSA\ISSA_033.XML

2

1 (B) the Committee on the Judiciary, the
2 Committee on Homeland Security and Govern-
3 mental Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Rela-
4 tions, and the Select Committee on Intelligence
5 of the Senate.



Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Amendment 33 exists for an important reason, and that is that in the underlying bill, whether you agree with it or disagree with it, it fails to be specific about the need for the committees of jurisdiction to be informed about an agreement prior to its implementation. This gives Congress the transparency to understand, object if appropriate, rather than having a proposed agreement become a fait accompli without it.

As you can see, we are not—they are not requiring that we approve or hold votes, but there is no question at all Congress has a role. And I have named at least a sub-list of the committees who clearly need to be informed about the impact of deals including the Committee of Jurisdiction for Immigration, a committee that I might remind you does in fact recognize that if someone presents at the border of entry for a claim, that is not illegal, but if they come over the border and are found north of the border not through a border of—an entry port, that is illegal. And hopefully things like that in agreement by being reported to the various committees of jurisdiction in the House would give us the kind of information so that we can make sure these agreements are as complying.

We think it is simple. Quite frankly, I expect that this is the kind of thing we voice vote and move into the underlying bill.

And I thank the chairman for allowing me to briefly explain it and I yield back.

Mr. MAST. The gentleman yields back.

I support this amendment. Do any other members seek recognition?

The chair now—

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, just to say I support the amendment. It is my understanding the ranking member does as well.

Mr. MAST. That is correct.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yield back.

Mr. MAST. Very good. The gentleman yields back.

Do any other members seek recognition?

The chair now recognizes Mr. Stanton for 5 minutes.

Mr. STANTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

The underlying bill does require, No. 1, a written strategy to be presented by USAID and State to Congress. It also has a 2-year review.

That being said, I see no issue with the amendment that Congressman Issa has presented. It presents additional opportunities for congressional review of the subnational cooperation. And I do believe that it does add to the value of the bill and I support the amendment as well.

Mr. MAST. The gentleman yields back.

Do any other members seek recognition?

No? There being no further discussion, the question now occurs on the amendment offered by Rep. Issa, No. 33.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, say no.

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it and the amendment is agreed to.

Are there any further amendments?

There being no further amendments, the question now occurs on the Stanton Amendment in the nature of a substitute.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the chair, the nays have it.

Mr. SHERMAN. I would ask for——

Mr. MAST. All the ayes—yeas and nays?

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am ready to ask——

Mr. MAST. Do we need a recorded vote?

Mr. SHERMAN. A recorded vote would require so many of our colleagues to come back.

Mr. MAST. Roll call vote has been requested. Pursuant to the chair's previous announcement this vote will be postponed.

Are there any further amendments?

The committee will recess subject to the call of the chair and we will reconvene to take votes at a later time. the clerk will send out a notice. We are adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 2:46 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned subject to the call of the chair.]

APPENDIX



**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
FULL COMMITTEE MARKUP NOTICE
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6128**

Michael T. McCaul (R-TX), Chairman

April 24, 2023

Revised

TO: MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

You are respectfully requested to attend an OPEN markup of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to be held at 10:30 a.m. in room 210 of the House Visitor's Center. The markup is available by live webcast on the Committee website at <https://foreignaffairs.house.gov/>.

DATE: Wednesday, April 26, 2023

TIME: 10:30 a.m.

LOCATION: HVC-210

MARKUP OF: H.R. 589, To impose sanctions on the Supreme Leader of Iran and the President of Iran and their respective offices for human rights abuses and support for terrorism;

H.R. 1690, To authorize Secretary of State to negotiate regional immigration agreements, and for other purposes;

****** H.Res. 300, Requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit, respectively, to the House of Representatives copies of all documents indicating any plans for current or future military assistance to Ukraine and documents indicating whether any United States Armed Forces, including special operations forces, are currently deployed in Ukraine; and

****** H.R. 2789, To direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy on efforts to strengthen subnational cooperation between the United States and Mexico, and for other purposes.

****Measures added**

***NOTE:** Measures may be added

By Direction of the Chair

The Committee on Foreign Affairs seeks to make its facilities accessible to persons with disabilities. If you are in need of special accommodations, please call 202-226-8467 at least four business days in advance of the event, whenever practicable. Questions with regard to special accommodations in general (including availability of Committee materials in alternative formats and assistive listening devices) may be directed to the Committee.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
MINUTES OF FULL COMMITTEE HEARING

Day Wed./Fri. Date 26/28 April Room HVC-210

Starting Time 1052 Ending Time 1007

Recesses 26 (1052 to 1446) (940 to 1007) (____ to ____) (____ to ____) (____ to ____) (____ to ____)

Presiding Member(s)

Chairman McCaul

Check all of the following that apply:

Open Session ☒

Electronically Recorded (taped) ☒

Executive (closed) Session ☐

Stenographic Record ☒

Televised ☒

TITLE OF HEARING:

Full Committee Markup

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Attached

NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

None

HEARING WITNESSES: Same as meeting notice attached? Yes ☒ No ☐

(If "no", please list below and include title, agency, department, or organization.)

STATEMENTS FOR THE RECORD: *(List any statements submitted for the record.)*

Connolly, Phillips, Perry, Schneider

TIME SCHEDULED TO RECONVENE _____

or

TIME ADJOURNED 1446

Mag Wagner
Full Committee Hearing Coordinator

Committee on Foreign Affairs

118th Congress

ATTENDANCE

Meeting on: Full Committee Markup

Date: April 26-28, 2023

Representative	Present	Absent	Representative	Present	Absent
Mr. McCaul	X		Mr. Meeks	X	
Mr. Smith	X		Mr. Sherman	X	
Mr. Wilson	X		Mr. Connolly	X	
Mr. Perry	X		Mr. Keating	X	
Mr. Issa	X		Mr. Cicilline	X	
Mrs. Wagner	X		Mr. Bera	X	
Mr. Mast	X		Mr. Castro	X	
Mr. Buck	X		Ms. Titus	X	
Mr. Burchett	X		Mr. Lieu	X	
Mr. Green	X		Ms. Wild	X	
Mr. Barr	X		Mr. Phillips	X	
Mr. Jackson	X		Mr. Allred	X	
Mrs. Kim	X		Mr. Kim	X	
Mrs. Salazar	X		Ms. Jacobs	X	
Mr. Huizenga	X		Ms. Manning	X	
Mrs. Radewagen	X		Mrs. Cherfilus-McCormick	X	
Mr. Hill	X		Mr. Stanton	X	
Mr. Davidson	X		Ms. Dean	X	
Mr. Baird	X		Mr. Moskowitz	X	
Mr. Waltz	X		Mr. Jackson	X	
Mr. Kean	X		Mrs. Kamlager-Dove	X	
Mr. Lawler	X		Mr. Costa	X	
Mr. Mills	X		Mr. Crow	X	
Mr. McCormick	X		Mr. Schneider	X	
Mr. Moran	X				
Mr. James	X				
Mr. Self	X				

STATEMENT FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED FROM
REPRESENTATIVE CONNOLLY

Markup
House Foreign Affairs Committee
10:00 AM, Wednesday, April 26, 2023
Rep. Gerald E. Connolly

H.R. 589, To impose sanctions on the Supreme Leader of Iran and the President of Iran and their respective offices for human rights abuses and support for terrorism.

The courageous spirit of the Iranian people was put on full display after widespread protests broke out throughout the country after the death of 22-year-old Mahsa Amini at the hands of the Guidance Patrol, Iran's "morality police" on September 16th, 2023; three days after her arrest. As many as 20,000 protesters have been arrested, with reports of hundreds of innocent Iranians killed during the protests.

Iran is ruled by a brutal and corrupt regime that engages in significant human rights abuses to maintain its stranglehold on the Iranian people. Tehran further acts as a destabilizing force supporting Russia's illegal and brutal campaign in Ukraine, the Houthis in Yemen and Shia militias in Iraq and Syria. Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) bankrolls and arms regional terrorist organizations, including Hezbollah and Hamas.

Each of these behaviors constitutes a threat to U.S. national security interests and therefore demands an appropriate response. That is precisely why I am an original cosponsor of H.Con.Res. 110, a concurrent resolution "commending the bravery, courage, and resolve of the women and men of Iran demonstrating in more than 80 cities and risking their safety to speak out against the Iranian regime's human rights abuses." The resolution lauds the Iranian people protesting against flagrant abuse and encourages efforts by the Biden administration to impose sanctions, prioritize efforts to expand internet access in Iran, and prevent the Iranian regime from obtaining and exploiting facial recognition technology for mass surveillance.

I am also a cosponsor of H.Res. 310, a resolution condemning inaction by the Islamic Republic of Iran in addressing the poisoning of Iranian schoolgirls. There must be an immediate investigation into the poisoning of the Iranian girls, and inaction from the Iranian regime has only further underscored the need for a thorough and independent investigation.

On November 16th, 2022, I was proud to join my fellow members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee by issuing a joint statement in full support of the Iranian protests. After two months of protesting, these brave men and women continue to stand up for their basic human rights while their government unleashes violence and brutality upon them. Beyond the violent crackdowns, the Iranian government has also held sham trials and even sentenced protestors to death. In our statement, we committed to continue working with the Biden Administration to hold Iran accountable by providing increased internet access across Iran and sanctioning key government officials responsible for their retaliation to the protests. We must continue to pressure this regime and stand with the courageous protestors.

The Biden administration has taken swift and robust action to hold accountable those responsible for the human rights violations committed against peaceful protestors across Iran and has already

issued numerous tranches of sanctions to support the people of Iran in the face of these and other human rights abuses by the Iranian regime. The Biden administration has sanctioned individuals like Sayyed Abdolrahim Mousavi, the Commander-in-Chief of the Iranian Army, and Habib Shahsavari, Commander of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) Shohada Provincial Corps in West Azerbaijan Province for directing machine gunfire at protesters and the torture of detained protesters. The Biden administration has also sanctioned individuals like the Technical Director of the Cyberspace Affairs Deputy of the Prosecutor General's Office of Iran, Mahdi Amiri, for acting on behalf of an entity that has engaged in censorship or other activities that prohibit, limit, or penalize the exercise of freedom of expression or assembly. The Biden administration has also found success working closely with allies in the United Kingdom and the European Union, as it has designated members of the Ministry of Intelligence and IRGC for committing some of the worst acts by Iranian security forces since the beginning of protests in September 2022.

Just yesterday, on April 25, 2023, the Biden Administration designated 11 additional Iranian officials who are "believed to be responsible for, or complicit in, the abuse, detention or killing of peaceful protesters or inhibiting their rights to freedom of expression or peaceful assembly." These designations, taken in coordination with the United Kingdom, promote accountability for the Iranian regime's continued human rights abuses across the Atlantic.

While the MAHSA Act provides no new authorities to the administration to sanction members of the Iranian government who have directed or committed gross violations of human rights, it is my hope that there will be bipartisan agreement that will satisfy the constitutional concerns expressed with regard to the original bill text. The Biden Administration has issued devastating targeted sanctions against Iran for its violent response to peaceful protesters and its material support for Russia's illegal and criminal invasion of Ukraine, and I look forward to continuing to support those efforts.

H.Res. 300, Requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit, respectively, to the House of Representatives copies of all documents indicating any plans for current or future military assistance to Ukraine and documents indicating whether any United States Armed Forces, including special operations forces, are currently deployed in Ukraine.

It is unfortunate that another member has offered a Resolution of Inquiry, a frivolous request for documents related to Ukraine. The House Foreign Affairs Committee held a hearing on March 29, 2023, in which we were told that the Departments of States and Defense, as well as USAID, were cooperating with the Joint Strategic Oversight Plan, Inspectors General coming together to conduct thorough oversight over U.S. assistance to Ukraine.

Security Assistance that the United States sends to Ukraine is subject to "end-use monitoring (EUM)" which requires the Department of State and Defense to track the use of the U.S. origin weapons and machinery. Once weapons are inside of Ukraine, the government of Ukraine and its respective ministries track transferred U.S. weapons from the border to where they are used on the front line. The Department of Defense has worked closely with the Ukrainian Armed Forces to bolster Ukraine's capacity to maintain relevant data on weapons stocks, including damage reports to capture losses. As of October 2022, DOD

personnel have actually resumed on-site inspections to verify collected data and to further assess weapon stocks in country, security conditions permitting.

As of January 6, 2023, U.S. Government oversight agencies have published 14 reports since Russia's invasion of Ukraine in February 2022 and reported findings and recommendations to improve internal controls, reduce costs, ensure safety, and improve operational efficiencies. These oversight agencies continue to monitor, audit, and evaluate activities related to the Ukraine response with 64 ongoing or planned projects. These projects include: a State OIG audit of humanitarian assistance efforts in Ukraine, GAO evaluation of USAID risk mitigation delivering humanitarian assistance, USAID OIG audit of modifications to programs in Ukraine, and a USAID OIG review of seven key safeguards and monitoring mechanisms over USAID's direct budget support to Ukraine through the World Bank

In its March 27 report, the Joint Strategic Oversight Plan detailed how the OIGs have "developed and widely disseminated information to the public in Ukraine and other countries, ... including through websites, phone numbers, and QR codes – to report misuse, including fraud, waste, abuse, or corruption promising the integrity of U.S. assistance." As of March 1, 2023, the three OIGs had received 189 Ukraine response-related hotline complaints, including allegations that were submitted by Ukrainian citizens themselves. The JSOP March 27 report forcefully affirmed, "OIG investigations resulting from these and other allegations have not yet substantiated significant waste, fraud, or abuse."

VOTES SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD



COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
FULL COMMITTEE MARKUP
 118th CONGRESS
 VOTES OF THE COMMITTEE

Vote: McCaul ANS #40 to HR 1690

Representative	Yea	Nay	Representative	Yea	Nay
Representative Smith	X		Ranking Member Meeks		X
Representative Wilson	X		Representative Sherman		X
Representative Perry			Representative Connolly		X
Representative Issa	X		Representative Keating		X
Representative Wagner	X		Representative Cicilline		X
Representative Mast	X		Representative Bera		X
Representative Buck	X		Representative Castro		X
Representative Burchett	X		Representative Titus		X
Representative Green	X		Representative Lieu		X
Representative Barr	X		Representative Wild		X
Representative Ronny Jackson	X		Representative Phillips		X
Representative Young Kim	X		Representative Allred	X	
Representative Salazar			Representative Andy Kim		X
Representative Huizenga	X		Representative Jacobs		X
Representative Radewagen			Representative Manning		X
Representative Hill	X		Representative Cherfilus-McCormick		X
Representative Davidson	X		Representative Stanton		X
Representative Baird	X		Representative Dean		X
Representative Waltz	X		Representative Moskowitz		X
Representative Kean	X		Representative Jonathan Jackson		X
Representative Lawler	X		Representative Kamlager-Dove		X
Representative Mills	X		Representative Costa		X
Representative McCormick	X		Representative Crow		X
Representative Moran	X		Representative Schneider		
Representative James	X				
Representative Self	X				
Mr. Chairman	X				

Yeas [25] Nays [22]



COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
FULL COMMITTEE MARKUP
 118th CONGRESS
 VOTES OF THE COMMITTEE

Vote: McCaul ANS #40 to HR 1690

Representative	Yea	Nay	Representative	Yea	Nay
Representative Smith	X		Ranking Member Meeks		X
Representative Wilson	X		Representative Sherman		X
Representative Perry			Representative Connolly		X
Representative Issa	X		Representative Keating		X
Representative Wagner	X		Representative Cicilline		X
Representative Mast	X		Representative Bera		X
Representative Buck	X		Representative Castro		X
Representative Burchett	X		Representative Titus		X
Representative Green	X		Representative Lieu		X
Representative Barr	X		Representative Wild		X
Representative Ronny Jackson	X		Representative Phillips		X
Representative Young Kim	X		Representative Allred	X	
Representative Salazar			Representative Andy Kim		X
Representative Huizenga	X		Representative Jacobs		X
Representative Radewagen			Representative Manning		X
Representative Hill	X		Representative Cherfilus-McCormick		X
Representative Davidson	X		Representative Stanton		X
Representative Baird	X		Representative Dean		X
Representative Waltz	X		Representative Moskowitz		X
Representative Kean	X		Representative Jonathan Jackson		X
Representative Lawler	X		Representative Kamlager-Dove		X
Representative Mills	X		Representative Costa		X
Representative McCormick	X		Representative Crow		X
Representative Moran	X		Representative Schneider		
Representative James	X				
Representative Self	X				
Mr. Chairman	X				

Yeas [25] Nays [22]



COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
FULL COMMITTEE MARKUP
 118th CONGRESS
 VOTES OF THE COMMITTEE

Vote: Castro Amendment #1 to HR 1690

Representative	Yea	Nay	Representative	Yea	Nay
Representative Smith		X	Ranking Member Meeks	X	
Representative Wilson			Representative Sherman	X	
Representative Perry			Representative Connolly		
Representative Issa		X	Representative Keating	X	
Representative Wagner		X	Representative Cicilline	X	
Representative Mast		X	Representative Bera	X	
Representative Buck		X	Representative Castro	X	
Representative Burchett		X	Representative Titus	X	
Representative Green		X	Representative Lieu		
Representative Barr		X	Representative Wild	X	
Representative Ronny Jackson		X	Representative Phillips	X	
Representative Young Kim		X	Representative Allred	X	
Representative Salazar			Representative Andy Kim	X	
Representative Huizenga		X	Representative Jacobs	X	
Representative Radewagen			Representative Manning	X	
Representative Hill		X	Representative Cherfilus-McCormick	X	
Representative Davidson		X	Representative Stanton	X	
Representative Baird		X	Representative Dean	X	
Representative Waltz			Representative Moskowitz	X	
Representative Kean		X	Representative Jonathan Jackson	X	
Representative Lawler		X	Representative Kamlager-Dove		
Representative Mills		X	Representative Costa	X	
Representative McCormick		X	Representative Crow	X	
Representative Moran		X	Representative Schneider		
Representative James		X			
Representative Self		X			
Mr. Chairman		X			

Yeas [20] Nays [22]



COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
FULL COMMITTEE MARKUP
 118th CONGRESS
 VOTES OF THE COMMITTEE

Vote: Castro Amendment #8 to HR 1690

Representative	Yea	Nay	Representative	Yea	Nay
Representative Smith		X	Ranking Member Meeks	X	
Representative Wilson		X	Representative Sherman	X	
Representative Perry			Representative Connolly	X	
Representative Issa		X	Representative Keating	X	
Representative Wagner		X	Representative Cicilline	X	
Representative Mast		X	Representative Bera	X	
Representative Buck		X	Representative Castro	X	
Representative Burchett		X	Representative Titus	X	
Representative Green		X	Representative Lieu	X	
Representative Barr		X	Representative Wild	X	
Representative Ronny Jackson		X	Representative Phillips	X	
Representative Young Kim		X	Representative Allred	X	
Representative Salazar			Representative Andy Kim	X	
Representative Huizenga		X	Representative Jacobs	X	
Representative Radewagen			Representative Manning	X	
Representative Hill		X	Representative Cherfilus-McCormick	X	
Representative Davidson		X	Representative Stanton	X	
Representative Baird		X	Representative Dean	X	
Representative Waltz			Representative Moskowitz	X	
Representative Kean		X	Representative Jonathan Jackson	X	
Representative Lawler		X	Representative Kamlager-Dove	X	
Representative Mills		X	Representative Costa	X	
Representative McCormick		X	Representative Crow	X	
Representative Moran		X	Representative Schneider		
Representative James		X			
Representative Self		X			
Mr. Chairman		X			

Yeas [23] Nays [23]



COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
FULL COMMITTEE MARKUP
 118th CONGRESS
 VOTES OF THE COMMITTEE

Vote: Kamlager-Dove Amendment #9 to HR 1690

Representative	Yea	Nay	Representative	Yea	Nay
Representative Smith		X	Ranking Member Meeks	X	
Representative Wilson		X	Representative Sherman	X	
Representative Perry			Representative Connolly	X	
Representative Issa		X	Representative Keating	X	
Representative Wagner		X	Representative Cicilline	X	
Representative Mast		X	Representative Bera	X	
Representative Buck		X	Representative Castro	X	
Representative Burchett		X	Representative Titus	X	
Representative Green		X	Representative Lieu	X	
Representative Barr		X	Representative Wild	X	
Representative Ronny Jackson		X	Representative Phillips	X	
Representative Young Kim		X	Representative Allred	X	
Representative Salazar			Representative Andy Kim	X	
Representative Huizenga		X	Representative Jacobs	X	
Representative Radewagen			Representative Manning	X	
Representative Hill		X	Representative Cherfilus-McCormick	X	
Representative Davidson		X	Representative Stanton	X	
Representative Baird		X	Representative Dean	X	
Representative Waltz		X	Representative Moskowitz	X	
Representative Kean		X	Representative Jonathan Jackson	X	
Representative Lawler		X	Representative Kamlager-Dove	X	
Representative Mills		X	Representative Costa	X	
Representative McCormick		X	Representative Crow	X	
Representative Moran		X	Representative Schneider		
Representative James		X			
Representative Self		X			
Mr. Chairman		X			

Yeas [23] Nays [24]



COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
FULL COMMITTEE MARKUP
 118th CONGRESS
 VOTES OF THE COMMITTEE

Vote: HR 1690

Representative	Yea	Nay	Representative	Yea	Nay
Representative Smith	X		Ranking Member Meeks		X
Representative Wilson	X		Representative Sherman		X
Representative Perry			Representative Connolly		X
Representative Issa	X		Representative Keating		X
Representative Wagner	X		Representative Cicilline		X
Representative Mast	X		Representative Bera		X
Representative Buck	X		Representative Castro		X
Representative Burchett	X		Representative Titus		X
Representative Green	X		Representative Lieu		X
Representative Barr	X		Representative Wild		X
Representative Ronny Jackson	X		Representative Phillips		X
Representative Young Kim	X		Representative Allred	X	
Representative Salazar			Representative Andy Kim		X
Representative Huizenga	X		Representative Jacobs		X
Representative Radewagen			Representative Manning		X
Representative Hill	X		Representative Cherfilus-McCormick		X
Representative Davidson	X		Representative Stanton		X
Representative Baird	X		Representative Dean		X
Representative Waltz	X		Representative Moskowitz		X
Representative Kean	X		Representative Jonathan Jackson		X
Representative Lawler	X		Representative Kamlager-Dove		X
Representative Mills	X		Representative Costa		X
Representative McCormick	X		Representative Crow		X
Representative Moran	X		Representative Schneider		
Representative James	X				
Representative Self	X				
Mr. Chairman	X				

Yeas [25] Nays [22]



COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
FULL COMMITTEE MARKUP
 118th CONGRESS
 VOTES OF THE COMMITTEE

Vote: HRes 300

Representative	Yea	Nay	Representative	Yea	Nay
Representative Smith	X		Ranking Member Meeks		X
Representative Wilson			Representative Sherman		X
Representative Perry			Representative Connolly		
Representative Issa	X		Representative Keating		X
Representative Wagner	X		Representative Cicilline		X
Representative Mast	X		Representative Bera		X
Representative Buck	X		Representative Castro		X
Representative Burchett	X		Representative Titus		X
Representative Green	X		Representative Lieu		
Representative Barr	X		Representative Wild		X
Representative Ronny Jackson	X		Representative Phillips		X
Representative Young Kim	X		Representative Allred		X
Representative Salazar			Representative Andy Kim		X
Representative Huizenga	X		Representative Jacobs		X
Representative Radewagen			Representative Manning		X
Representative Hill	X		Representative Cherfilus-McCormick		X
Representative Davidson	X		Representative Stanton		X
Representative Baird	X		Representative Dean		X
Representative Waltz			Representative Moskowitz		X
Representative Kean	X		Representative Jonathan Jackson		X
Representative Lawler	X		Representative Kamlager-Dove		
Representative Mills	X		Representative Costa		X
Representative McCormick	X		Representative Crow		X
Representative Moran	X		Representative Schneider		
Representative James	X				
Representative Self	X				
Mr. Chairman	X				

Yeas [22] Nays [20]



COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
FULL COMMITTEE MARKUP
 118th CONGRESS
 VOTES OF THE COMMITTEE

Vote: Castro Amendment #1 to HR 1690

Representative	Yea	Nay	Representative	Yea	Nay
Representative Smith		X	Ranking Member Meeks	X	
Representative Wilson			Representative Sherman	X	
Representative Perry			Representative Connolly		
Representative Issa		X	Representative Keating	X	
Representative Wagner		X	Representative Cicilline	X	
Representative Mast		X	Representative Bera	X	
Representative Buck		X	Representative Castro	X	
Representative Burchett		X	Representative Titus	X	
Representative Green		X	Representative Lieu		
Representative Barr		X	Representative Wild	X	
Representative Ronny Jackson		X	Representative Phillips	X	
Representative Young Kim		X	Representative Allred	X	
Representative Salazar			Representative Andy Kim	X	
Representative Huizenga		X	Representative Jacobs	X	
Representative Radewagen			Representative Manning	X	
Representative Hill		X	Representative Cherfilus-McCormick	X	
Representative Davidson		X	Representative Stanton	X	
Representative Baird		X	Representative Dean	X	
Representative Waltz			Representative Moskowitz	X	
Representative Kean		X	Representative Jonathan Jackson	X	
Representative Lawler		X	Representative Kamlager-Dove		
Representative Mills		X	Representative Costa	X	
Representative McCormick		X	Representative Crow	X	
Representative Moran		X	Representative Schneider		
Representative James		X			
Representative Self		X			
Mr. Chairman		X			

Yeas [20] Nays [22]

MATERIALS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD FROM REPRESENTATIVE PHILLIPS

Rep. Dean Phillips Statement on H.R.589, The MAHSA Act

On September 16, 2022, Mahsa Amini, a 21-year-old woman, was laid to rest after being harassed, beaten, and ultimately murdered by the “Morality Police” for allegedly wearing her hijab incorrectly. In response to her tragic death, the people of Iran – women and men, young and old – took to the streets, making their voices heard and demanding to be treated with human dignity.

But instead of listening, the Iranian regime brutally cracked down on its own citizens, gunning down protestors, arresting people en masse, and resorting to physical and sexual violence. Since the protests began, human rights activists in Iran have reported that nearly 20,000 people have been detained and more than 500 have been killed, including children. What’s more, the Iranian regime executed four protestors, with many more being sentenced for crimes that carry the death penalty. These horrific human rights abuses unfortunately only further demonstrate that the regime has only one goal – its own survival.

The sanctions regime against Iran is currently as far-reaching and comprehensive as nearly any sanctions regime in American history. U.S. sanctions against Iran are imposed for issues ranging from human rights abuses and its burgeoning nuclear program to weapons proliferation and spreading terrorism through its use of proxy forces. The U.S., in coordination with our allies and powers, continue to impose sanctions on the regime and those who support it. The Treasury Department has imposed 11 rounds of sanctions actions targeting the Iranian regime and its security elements and officials that are involved in brutal crackdown on peaceful demonstrations since nationwide protests began in September 2022. In addition, the U.S. has pushed for accountability in international forums through the creation of an independent factfinding mission to investigate the human rights abuses at the UN Human Rights Council and the removal of Iran from the UN Commission on the Status of Women. Still, we must all be vigilant in ensuring the Iranian regime bears full responsibility for its actions.

I am glad to see Congress working in a bipartisan way alongside the Biden Administration to continue to seek out ways to hold the Iranian regime to account and to ensure that the people of Iran fighting for equal rights and freedoms are supported and heard around the world.

MATERIALS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD FROM REPRESENTATIVE PERRY

4/25/23, 6:41 PM

Foreign Aid Can't Stem Illegal Immigration: The Case of Guatemala | The Heritage Foundation

Foreign Aid Can't Stem Illegal Immigration: The Case of Guatemala

Report [Americas](#)

Foreign Aid Can't Stem Illegal Immigration: The Case of Guatemala

April 6, 2023 18 min read

Authors: [Max Primorac](#) and [Mateo Haydar](#)

Summary

The three Northern Triangle countries—Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador—account for at least one-third of all U.S. southern border encounters, totaling more than 500,000 illegal migrants from the region every year. In 2022, nearly half came from Guatemala. With a 600-mile porous and densely forested border with Mexico to the north and borders with Honduras and El Salvador to its south, Guatemala is a geographic chokepoint, a linchpin “second U.S. southern border” for northbound migration, drug trafficking, and human trafficking. If the United States wants to reduce illegal immigration from Central America, it must secure the border, enforce U.S. immigration laws, and revive its border agreements with its southern neighbors. Foreign aid is not the solution to the border crisis

Key Takeaways

Since 2021, U.S. policy toward Guatemala has been largely driven by the Administration’s “root causes” strategy—which increased foreign aid.

Expanding foreign aid while maintaining failed border policies, however, has not curbed illegal immigration, nor drug trafficking and human trafficking.

Instead of just continuing foreign aid, the U.S. must secure its border, enforce its immigration laws, and revive its border agreements with its southern neighbors.

[Twitter](#) [Facebook](#) [LinkedIn](#) [Email](#) [Print](#) [Copied](#)

Select a Section 1/0

[Toggle open close](#)

Since 2021, U.S. policy toward the countries of the so-called Northern Triangle—Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador—has been largely driven by the Biden Administration’s “Strategy to Address the Root Causes of Migration.”^{REF} This strategy includes a robust U.S. foreign aid package with Vice President

Kamala Harris's 2021 "Call to Action" to promote U.S. investment as the long-term solution to stemming illegal migration to the United States.REF

The Administration's root causes strategy, announced in February 2021, is in fact a placeholder for abandoned U.S. efforts to secure the border, enforce existing U.S. law, and advance cooperation agreements with U.S. partners amid the border crisis. In December 2022, total border encounters for the year soared to the highest number ever recorded in U.S. history—251,487 southwest land-border encounters—and fiscal year 2023 encounters, specifically from the Northern Triangle, remain higher than in the months before President Joe Biden took office.REF

Expanding foreign aid while maintaining failed border policies, however, has not curbed illegal immigration, nor has it stemmed lethal drug-trafficking and human-trafficking flows.REF Moreover, the Biden Administration's aid efforts have failed to meet its own criteria of addressing the economic push factors of illegal migration while being misused to export its progressive radical ideology.

This Backgrounder's analysis and recommendations are based on the authors' recent research trips to Guatemala made over the past year and dozens of interviews conducted with civil society, think tank, media, faith, and business leaders, as well as government officials.

Why Guatemala and the Northern Triangle Matter

Given their proximity to the United States, the three Northern Triangle countries account for at least one-third of all U.S. southern border encounters, totaling more than 500,000 illegal migrants from the region every year.REF In 2022, nearly half came from Guatemala. With a roughly 600-mile porous and densely forested border with Mexico to the north and borders with Honduras and El Salvador to its south, Guatemala is a geographic chokepoint, a linchpin "second U.S. southern border" for northbound migration, drug trafficking, and human trafficking.

With a gross domestic product (GDP) of \$86 billion, Guatemala is Central America's largest economy and largest recipient of U.S. foreign aid. In 2021, Guatemala received a record \$15 billion in remittances, largely from immigrants in the U.S., both legal and illegal, dwarfing the amount that the U.S. and other donors give in foreign aid and constituting 18 percent of Guatemala's GDP—a key disincentive for the government to pursue pro-growth and inclusive economic policies.

That said, Guatemala is the only one of the three countries that has never been led by far-left allies of the dictatorships in Cuba and Venezuela and that has been a steadfast ally of the United States. In addition, Guatemala followed America's lead in recognizing Jerusalem as Israel's capital and in designating Hezbollah as a terrorist organization,REF and it was the first country in the region to send a head of state to visit Ukraine after Russia's invasion.REF Conservatives will note its staunch pro-life government policies.REF Today, Guatemala is a key partner in countering China's growing influence, as the largest country in the world to formally recognize Taiwan. This contrasts sharply with El Salvador, which switched recognition from Taiwan to China in 2018, and from Honduras, whose leftist president vowed to switch over this March.REF

“Root Causes” and the Partnership for Central America

In February, Vice President Harris announced \$4.2 billion in private-sector commitments as proof that the Administration’s root causes strategy is working. The Vice President also announced the Central America Forward framework, the latest in a series of root causes measures since being charged by President Biden with managing the border crisis. In 2021, she announced the Partnership for Central America (PCA) with the aim of mobilizing the private sector to invest in the region.^{REF} A closer look reveals a far more modest record of achievement than touted by the Administration.

The framework’s stated objective to “create and secure jobs for one million individuals by 2032”^{REF} in the three countries is an example. That objective would be roughly 300,000 to 350,000 jobs created in each country within a decade. The problem with the math is that Guatemala alone, with a population of more than 17 million, sees an additional 200,000 individuals enter the labor market every year, while the economy generates only 30,000 additional formal sector jobs annually. If the Administration’s aim is to curb emigration, 350,000 possible jobs in Guatemala over 10 years will not stop the other hundreds of thousands entering the labor market from emigrating.

Even then, \$4.2 billion in new U.S. private investment would still be an amazing feat. But it is unclear that this is actually the case. These are “commitments,” not finalized deals, expressing an intent to invest, not actual investments. Worse, several companies and private-sector officials described that they had been invited to participate in the Call to Action, but this simply meant that their pre-existing investment plans would count toward “commitments” to the PCA. Most of the firms listed were already operating in the region. While the PCA may be drawing some investors, the full list of commitments released by the Administration has little to do with Administration policy.

Finally, the Administration said that it will use the U.S. International Development Finance Corporation (DFC), a development bank launched by the Trump Administration to compete with China, to finance private-sector-led projects. After slow-rolling the Trump Administration’s America Crece (Growth in the Americas) Program, a hemispheric initiative to catalyze large-scale private-sector investment in energy and infrastructure projects, including \$1 billion in DFC loans just for Guatemala, only \$200 million of the funds have since been released.^{REF}

Foreign Aid and Woke Funding

Since 2021, the Biden Administration has disbursed more than \$1 billion in combined foreign aid to Northern Triangle countries. While branded as part of its new strategy, these aid programs are reminiscent of the Obama-era Alliance for Prosperity (A4P), launched in 2014 to similarly “attend to the structural causes of irregular migration” through a smorgasbord of aid programs for governance, human rights, security, economic aid, and anti-corruption efforts. A4P was launched amid the crisis of unaccompanied minors at the U.S. southern border that year largely from the three countries. It, too, failed to curb illegal immigration, which would not drop until the Trump Administration’s border policies came into effect.^{REF}

A4P also had a troubling record of funding leftist organizations that created local distrust of U.S. foreign aid that still acutely resonates today.REF Between 2010 and 2014, for example, the U.S.-funded Inter-American Foundation provided \$395,000 to the Committee for Peasant Development (CODECA), a radical leftist activist group previously led by socialist presidential candidate Thelma Cabrera.REF CODECA seeks to “nationalize all goods and services privatized in the country,”REF a communist tenet and an approach inconsistent with economic growth. CODECA has been implicated in criminal activity including electricity theft in rural Guatemala.REF The A4P poured millions into ideology-driven programs related to gender activism, climate, and “reproductive health” that alienated deeply religious Guatemalans.REF

Since 2021, the U.S. has disbursed \$476 million in foreign aid to Guatemala. These funds are disbursed through multiple federal agencies, mostly the U.S. Department of State and U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), but are implemented through for-profit contractors, international nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and United Nations agencies. There are many similarities between A4P and the current strategy. Despite years of American assistance, more than half of the children in Guatemala still suffer from chronic malnutrition, one of the highest rates in the world.REF Guatemala lags behind in economic freedom, particularly in property rights, rule of law, and labor.REF Notably, there is a direct relationship between poor economic performance and migration in these countries. Current aid efforts have not catalyzed economic reforms that will put the country on a path to growth, while millions are spent on woke ideology-driven initiatives.

Climate. Since 2021, the United States has obligated roughly \$30 million in climate and environment-related programs in Guatemala. This includes programs designated for categories unrelated to climate according to U.S. Foreign Assistance data.REF One example is Save the Children, which receives U.S. funding for education, while its programs promote radical climate activism in classroom programs for young children, calling climate change a “grave threat.”REF While the Administration boasts jobs created from U.S.-funded conservation programs, most of these are short-term seasonal jobs. Russia, meanwhile, has made significant gains in Guatemala’s mining sector, including the Izabal Biosphere Reserve with large deposits of nickel needed for powering electric vehicles as well as uranium to fuel clean nuclear power.REF

Identity-Based Activism. Aid dollars are supporting identity-based activism. The Consortium for Elections and Political Process Strengthening receives funding for electoral reform projects in Guatemala as the country prepares for national elections later this June.REF While it is indeed important to support electoral transparency in Guatemala amid recent news of election interference from China and Russia in other countries of the hemisphere, USAID’s Deputy Administrator publicly boasts that the project promotes LGBTQI+ and “intersex” legal reforms and partners with gender activists.REF

Under “education,” USAID financed Asociación Lambda, which has trained hundreds of political leaders on gender identity and sexual orientation.REF Against the country’s conservative norms, Guatemalan judges now use a “gender perspective” for legal cases.REF Similarly, according to congressional sources, the State Department listed a \$909,690 grant in 2022 to the LGBTQ+ Victory Institute, which trains and

supports leftwing candidates in several Latin American countries, including members of the Guatemalan congress. Another large recipient of U.S. foreign aid, CARE International, is building a regional \$50 million center in the region to promote “gender equity.”^{REF} CARE, including its current CEO, is known for maintaining intimate ties to Democratic Party leaders, promoting strict racial quotas in its hiring policies, and defining gender as “nonbinary.”^{REF} Widespread polling and research show that Guatemalans emigrate primarily for economic or security reasons, not because of gender identity or discrimination.^{REF}

Abortion and “Reproductive Health.” Last year, Guatemala declared itself “the pro-life capital of Latin America.”^{REF} Nevertheless, that year about \$11 million in U.S. foreign assistance to the country went to NGO-led “reproductive health” programs. Guatemala has a constitutional ban on abortion.^{REF} While this makes funding for abortion illegal, the lack of transparency in U.S. aid programs, such as not publicly listing subaward recipients, raises the question of potential pro-abortion activities being supported under the rubric of reproductive health as abortion advocates equate the availability of abortion with reproductive health.^{REF}

Other U.S.-funded initiatives, such as Health Policy Plus, focus on sexual and reproductive health. In September, the Biden Administration announced an additional \$50 million for the U.N. Population Fund. Both groups promote abortion. One USAID partner, Banyan Global, delivered a study in 2018 with recommendations for the Guatemalan government to promote “reproductive rights in education.”^{REF} Over the past decade, USAID has also partnered with U.N.-funded organizations to promote a National Condom Strategy and other divisive education manuals advocating “reproductive rights” and “sexual health.” These programs blatantly contradict religion-based norms in the 95 percent conservative Catholic and Protestant country.

Supporting the Left. Partnering with organizations like Forests for All Forever and the FSC Indigenous Foundation, USAID has also actively supported initiatives promoting ancestral land claims that could undermine Guatemala’s already weak property rights system. Politically directed land invasions run rampant in the country and undercut major job-generating development projects, especially in rural areas where poverty is most acute.^{REF} Only 4 percent of municipalities have completed land records, a situation that benefits illicit actors who can exploit untitled land as key trafficking routes. The country’s weak property rights disproportionately affect poor Guatemalans who hold small plots of land, but, without title, are unable to leverage them as working capital.^{REF} Strengthening Guatemala’s property rights would be a boon to the country’s poor and help to transition the country away from international food aid.

In January 2021, USAID headlined an event to discuss a “plurinational constituent assembly,” in line with the “indigenist” agenda of leftist radical groups. Plurinationalism has been manipulated by leftwing governments in Chile and Bolivia to undermine democratic constitutions.^{REF} While the Administration claims to address the root causes of migration, supporting leftwing NGOs and activists undercuts pro-U.S. allies in Guatemala and sustains ideologies that are anathema to market-based economic growth.

Strategic Concerns. Meanwhile, China and its allies are expanding their influence in the Northern Triangle. China has invested more than \$700 million in Guatemala's technology sector^{REF} and its state-affiliate Huawei is rapidly dominating the cellular device market transforming Central America into an exclusive Chinese IT zone. In 2020, despite Guatemala's ties to Taiwan, Huawei inaugurated a telecoms tower with the Guatemalan government to train technicians for 4G and 5G spectrum networks, laying the groundwork for China to win future spectrum bids.^{REF}

While the U.S. Treasury Department recently issued individual sanctions against two Russian and Belarusian nationals linked to Russia's major mining operations in Guatemala, their business activity continues.^{REF} Similarly, the Cuban dictatorship has maintained hundreds of indentured doctors, infiltrated by Cuban intelligence agents, across Guatemala since 1998, for which the Guatemalan government pays Havana \$4.6 million a year.^{REF} In all these cases, the Biden Administration is failing to leverage hundreds of millions of dollars in aid to promote its strategic interests as U.S. adversaries expand their footprint.^{REF}

Recommendations for the United States

The U.S. government must revise its foreign aid approach in Guatemala and the region. To do so, Congress should:

Decouple foreign aid from border security. More foreign aid will not reduce illegal immigration. While foreign aid can encourage economic reforms that create jobs at home and expand markets for U.S. goods and services, Congress should reject further aid requests until the Administration revives Trump-era border policies that stemmed illegal immigration.

Conduct oversight on climate, gender, reproductive health, and other 'woke' ideology-driven aid programs. These programs alienate locals—to China's strategic advantage—lack bipartisan support, and waste taxpayer dollars. Congress should freeze all aid programs until USAID and the State Department provide a comprehensive list of program partners and subaward recipients to determine the extent to which foreign aid is being misused as a vehicle to promote the Administration's woke agenda. In addition, Congress should ask USAID's Office of the Inspector General to audit the effectiveness of U.S. aid programs in Northern Triangle countries to promote private investment.

Hold the Biden Administration accountable for the slow pace of DFC disbursements to Guatemala.

Congress should ask the Administration to report on the status of the \$1 billion in DFC funds committed in 2020 to support private-sector investment in Guatemala and include a list of actual investments made, not committed, as the metric of effectiveness of its foreign aid strategy in the country.

Require the State Department to report on China's and other malign actors' activities. Poverty in Central America provides opportunities for America's strategic adversaries to threaten U.S. national security. The report should include Communist China's commercial and military activities in the region, Russia's mining operations, and Cuba's "medical missions."

Prevent election interference in Guatemala's 2023 elections. Congress should ask the State Department to report on the potential risks of external election interference in Guatemala, including by hemispheric actors. It should examine if U.S. government election support programs are being misused to promote social reengineering of a conservative society.

Conclusion

If the United States wants to reduce illegal immigration from Central America, it must secure the border, enforce U.S. immigration laws, and revive its border agreements with its southern neighbors. More foreign aid is not the solution.

Max Primorac is Director of the Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy at The Heritage Foundation. Mateo Haydar is a Research Assistant in the Allison Center at The Heritage Foundation.

Authors

[Max Primorac](#)

Director, Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies



[Mateo Haydar](#)

Research Assistant, Latin America

[Read Full Report +](#)

**MATERIALS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD FROM
REPRESENTATIVE SCHNEIDER**

Mr. Chairman, I am submitting this statement for the record to account for votes I missed on April 28th, 2023 when a markup held on April 26th was extended. I was not able to be present due to a longstanding personal commitment outside of Washington, DC. I am proud to support the MAHSA Act, which was passed by voice vote out of Committee on April 26th. Had I been present at the extended portion of the markup, I would have voted as follows:

I would have voted no to report H.Res. 300 to the House with a favorable recommendation.

On H.R. 1690, I would have cast the following votes: I would have voted aye on Castro #1 to the McCaul ANS; I would have voted aye on Castro #8 to the McCaul ANS. I would have voted aye on Kamlager-Dove #9 to the McCaul; I would have voted no on adopting the McCaul ANS #40; and I would have voted no to report H.R. 1690 to the House with a favorable recommendation.

On H.R. 2789, I would have cast the following votes: I would have voted aye on adopting the Stanton ANS and I would have voted aye to report H.R. 2789 to the House with a favorable recommendation.

**FULL COMMITTEE MARKUP OF H.R. 1690 AND
H.R. 589
DAY 2**

Friday, April 28, 2023

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:40 a.m., in room 210, House Visitor Center, Hon. Michael McCaul (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Chairman McCAUL. The committee will come to order. The committee postponed further proceedings on reporting House Resolution 300 favorably to the House in which the ayes prevailed by a voice vote. The question now occurs on reporting the measure to the House with a favorable recommendation. The Clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Representative Smith.

Mr. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Smith votes aye.

Representative Wilson.

Wilson?

[No response.]

Representative Perry.

Perry?

[No response.]

Representative Issa.

Issa?

[No response.]

Representative Wagner.

Ms. WAGNER. Aye.

The CLERK. Wagner votes aye.

Representative Mast.

Mr. MAST. Aye.

The CLERK. Mast votes aye.

Representative Buck.

Mr. BUCK. Aye.

The CLERK. Buck votes aye.

Representative Burchett.

Burchett?

[No response.]

Representative Green.

Mr. GREEN. Aye.

The CLERK. Green votes aye.

Representative Barr.
 Mr. BARR. Aye.
 The CLERK. Barr votes aye.
 Representative Ronny Jackson.
 Mr. JACKSON OF TEXAS. Aye.
 The CLERK. Jackson votes aye.
 Representative Young Kim.
 Mrs. KIM OF CALIFORNIA. Aye.
 The CLERK. Kim votes aye.
 Representative Salazar.
 Salazar?
 [No response.]
 Representative Huizenga.
 Mr. HUIZENGA. Aye.
 The CLERK. Huizenga votes aye.
 Representative Radewagen.
 Radewagen?
 [No response.]
 Representative Hill.
 Mr. HILL. Aye.
 The CLERK. Hill votes aye.
 Representative Davidson.
 Davidson?
 [No response.]
 Representative Baird.
 Mr. BAIRD. Aye.
 The CLERK. Baird votes aye.
 Representative Waltz.
 Waltz?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Representative Kean.
 Mr. KEAN. Yes.
 The CLERK. Kean votes aye.
 Representative Lawler.
 Mr. LAWLER. Aye.
 The CLERK. Lawler votes aye.
 Representative Mills.
 Mr. MILLS. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mills votes aye.
 Representative McCormick.
 Mr. McCORMICK. Aye.
 The CLERK. McCormick votes aye.
 Representative Moran.
 Mr. MORAN. Aye.
 The CLERK. Moran votes aye.
 Representative James.
 Mr. JAMES. Aye.
 The CLERK. James votes aye.
 Representative Self.
 Mr. SELF. Aye.
 The CLERK. Self votes aye.
 Ranking Member Meeks.
 Mr. MEEKS. No.
 The CLERK. Meeks votes no.

Representative Sherman.
 Mr. SHERMAN. No.
 The CLERK. Sherman votes no.
 Representative Connolly.
 Connolly?
 [No response.]
 Representative Keating.
 Keating?
 Representative Cicilline.
 Cicilline?
 [No response.]
 Representative Bera.
 Mr. BERA. No.
 The CLERK. Bera votes no.
 Representative Castro.
 Castro?
 [No response.]
 Representative Titus.
 Mr. TITUS. No.
 The CLERK. Titus votes no.
 Representative Lieu.
 Lieu?
 [No response.]
 Representative Wild.
 Ms. WILD. No.
 The CLERK. Wild votes no.
 Representative Phillips.
 Mr. PHILLIPS. No.
 The CLERK. Phillips votes no.
 Representative Allred.
 Allred?
 [No response.]
 Representative Andy Kim.
 Kim?
 [No response.]
 Representative Jacobs.
 Ms. JACOBS. No.
 The CLERK. Jacobs votes no.
 Representative Manning.
 Ms. MANNING. No.
 The CLERK. Manning votes no.
 Representative Cherfilus-McCormick.
 Cherfilus-McCormick?
 [No response.]
 Representative Stanton.
 Mr. STANTON. No.
 The CLERK. Stanton votes no.
 Representative Dean.
 Ms. DEAN. No.
 The CLERK. Dean votes no.
 Representative Moskowitz.
 Mr. MOSKOWITZ. No.
 The CLERK. Moskowitz votes no.
 Representative Jonathan Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON OF ILLINOIS. No.
 The CLERK. Jackson votes no.
 Representative Kamlager-Dove.
 Kamlager-Dove?
 [No response.]
 Representative Costa.
 Mr. COSTA. No.
 The CLERK. Costa votes no.
 Representative Crow.
 Mr. CROW. No.
 The CLERK. Crow votes no.
 Representative Schneider.
 Schneider?
 [No response.]
 Mr. Chairman.
 Chairman MCCAUL. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes aye.
 Chairman MCCAUL. Have all members voted? Mr. Burchett is recognized. How do you vote?
 Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. After deep deliberation, I vote yes.
 Chairman MCCAUL. You were at the Sizzler, I know.
 Mr. BURCHETT. I was.
 Chairman MCCAUL. That early bird breakfast thing that you like.
 Mr. BURCHETT. I just closed it out. They missed you at the chocolate fountain this morning, Mr. Chairman.
 The CLERK. Representative Burchett votes aye.
 Chairman MCCAUL. Does any member wish to change his or her vote?
 The Clerk will report the tally.
 Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, how am I recorded?
 Chairman MCCAUL. How is Mr. Issa recorded? You're tardy, sir. How do you vote, Mr. Issa?
 Mr. ISSA. Yes. Late, yes.
 The CLERK. Representative Issa votes aye.
 Chairman MCCAUL. Mr. Keating, how is Mr. Keating voting?
 Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Chairman, how am I recorded?
 Cherfilus-McCormick votes no.
 Chairman MCCAUL. Then we have Mr. Davidson?
 Mr. DAVIDSON. Davidson votes aye.
 Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Cherfilus-McCormick votes no.
 Chairman MCCAUL. I think we know that.
 The CLERK. Representative Cherfilus-McCormick votes no. Davidson votes aye.
 Mr. KIM OF NEW JERSEY. Andy Kim votes no.
 The CLERK. Representative Andy Kim votes no.
 Mr. CASTRO. Castro votes no.
 The CLERK. Representative Castro votes no.
 Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, in this orderly process, am I recorded? Did Representative Wagner vote for me?
 The CLERK. Representative Allred votes no. On this vote, the ayes are 22, the noes are 20.

Chairman MCCAUL. OK. I have to have a chat with my members. Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid is on the table. Staff is authorized to make any technical and conforming changes.

The committee postponed further proceedings on the roll call vote on the amendment No. 1 offered by Representative Castro to the McCaul amendment in the nature of a substitute on which the noes had prevailed by voice.

The question now occurs on agreeing to the amendment. The Clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Representative Smith.

Mr. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Smith votes no.

Representative Wilson.

Wilson?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Representative Perry.

Perry?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Representative Issa.

Mr. ISSA. No.

The CLERK. Issa votes no.

Representative Wagner.

Ms. WAGNER. No.

The CLERK. Wagner votes no.

Representative Mast.

Mr. MAST. No.

The CLERK. Mast votes no.

Representative Buck.

Mr. BUCK. No.

The CLERK. Buck votes no.

Representative Burchett.

Mr. BURCHETT. No.

The CLERK. Burchett votes no.

Representative Green.

Mr. GREEN. No.

The CLERK. Green votes no.

Representative Barr.

Mr. BARR. No.

The CLERK. Barr votes no.

Representative Ronny Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON OF TEXAS. No.

The CLERK. Jackson votes no.

Representative Young Kim.

Mrs. KIM OF CALIFORNIA. No.

The CLERK. Kim votes aye.

Representative Salazar.

Salazar?

[No response.]

Representative Huizenga.

Mr. HUIZENGA. No.

The CLERK. Huizenga votes no.

Representative Radewagen.

Radewagen?

[No response.]

Representative Hill.
 Mr. HILL. No.
 The CLERK. Hill votes no.
 Representative Davidson.
 Mr. DAVIDSON. No.
 The CLERK. Davidson votes no.
 Representative Baird.
 Mr. BAIRD. No.
 The CLERK. Baird votes no.
 Representative Waltz.
 Waltz?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Representative Kean.
 Mr. KEAN. No.
 The CLERK. Kean votes no.
 Representative Lawler.
 Mr. LAWLER. No.
 The CLERK. Lawler votes no.
 Representative Mills.
 Mr. MILLS. No.
 The CLERK. Mills votes no.
 Representative McCormick.
 Mr. McCORMICK. No.
 The CLERK. McCormick votes no.
 Representative Moran.
 Mr. MORAN. No.
 The CLERK. Moran votes no.
 Representative James.
 Mr. JAMES. No.
 The CLERK. James votes no.
 Representative Self.
 Mr. SELF. No.
 The CLERK. Self votes no.
 Ranking Member Meeks.
 Mr. MEEKS. Yes.
 The CLERK. Meeks votes aye.
 Representative Sherman.
 Mr. SHERMAN. Aye.
 The CLERK. Sherman votes aye.
 Representative Connolly.
 Connolly?
 [No response.]
 Representative Keating.
 Mr. KEATING. Aye.
 The CLERK. Keating votes aye.
 Representative Cicilline.
 Mr. CICILLINE. Aye.
 The CLERK. Cicilline votes aye.
 Representative Bera.
 Mr. BERA. Yes.
 The CLERK. Bera votes aye.
 Representative Castro.
 Mr. CASTRO. Aye.
 The CLERK. Castro votes aye.

Representative Titus.
 Mr. TITUS. Aye.
 The CLERK. Titus votes aye.
 Representative Lieu.
 Lieu?
 [No response.]
 Representative Wild.
 Ms. WILD. Aye.
 The CLERK. Representative Wild votes aye.
 Representative Phillips.
 Mr. PHILLIPS. Aye.
 The CLERK. Phillips votes aye.
 Representative Allred.
 Mr. ALLRED. Aye.
 The CLERK. Allred votes aye.
 Representative Andy Kim.
 Mr. KIM OF NEW JERSEY. Aye.
 The CLERK. Kim votes aye.
 Representative Jacobs.
 Ms. JACOBS. Aye.
 The CLERK. Jacobs votes aye.
 Representative Manning.
 Ms. MANNING. Aye.
 The CLERK. Manning votes no.
 Representative Cherfilus-McCormick.
 Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Aye.
 The CLERK. Cherfilus-McCormick votes aye.
 Representative Stanton.
 Mr. STANTON. Aye.
 The CLERK. Stanton votes aye.
 Representative Dean.
 Ms. DEAN. Aye.
 The CLERK. Dean votes aye.
 Representative Moskowitz.
 Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Aye.
 The CLERK. Moskowitz votes aye.
 Representative Jonathan Jackson.
 Mr. JACKSON OF ILLINOIS. Aye.
 The CLERK. Jackson votes aye.
 Representative Kamlager-Dove.
 Kamlager-Dove?
 [No response.]
 Representative Costa.
 Mr. COSTA. Aye.
 The CLERK. Costa votes aye.
 Representative Crow.
 Mr. CROW. Aye.
 The CLERK. Crow votes aye.
 Representative Schneider.
 Schneider?
 [No response.]
 Mr. Chairman?
 Chairman MCCAUL. Chairman votes no.
 The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes no.

Chairman McCAUL. The Clerk will report the tally.

The CLERK. On this vote, the ayes are 22 and the noes are—the ayes are 20 and the noes are 22.

Chairman McCAUL. The noes have it and the amendment is not agreed to.

The chair postponed a further proceeding in the roll call vote on Amendment 8 offered by Representative Castro to the McCaul amendment in the nature of a substitute on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The question now occurs on agreeing to the amendment. The Clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Representative Smith.

Mr. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Smith votes no.

Representative Wilson.

Wilson?

[No response.]

Representative Perry.

Perry?

[No response.]

Representative Issa.

Mr. ISSA. No.

The CLERK. Issa votes no.

Representative Wagner.

Ms. WAGNER. No.

The CLERK. Wagner votes no.

Representative Mast.

Mr. MAST. No.

The CLERK. Mast votes no.

Representative Buck.

Mr. BUCK. No.

The CLERK. Buck votes no.

Representative Burchett.

Mr. BURCHETT. No.

The CLERK. Burchett votes no.

Representative Green.

Mr. GREEN. No.

The CLERK. Green votes no.

Representative Barr.

Mr. BARR. No.

The CLERK. Barr votes no.

Representative Ronny Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON OF TEXAS. No.

The CLERK. Jackson votes no.

Representative Young Kim.

Mrs. KIM OF CALIFORNIA. No.

The CLERK. Kim votes no.

Representative Salazar.

Salazar?

[No response.]

Representative Huizenga.

Mr. HUIZENGA. No.

The CLERK. Huizenga votes no.

Representative Radewagen.

Radewagen?
 [No response.]
 Representative Hill.
 Mr. HILL. No.
 The CLERK. Hill votes no.
 Representative Davidson.
 Mr. DAVIDSON. No.
 The CLERK. Davidson votes no.
 Representative Baird.
 Mr. BAIRD. No.
 The CLERK. Baird votes no.
 Representative Waltz.
 Waltz?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Representative Kean.
 Mr. KEAN. No.
 The CLERK. Kean votes no.
 Representative Lawler.
 Mr. LAWLER. No.
 The CLERK. Lawler votes no.
 Representative Mills.
 Mr. MILLS. No.
 The CLERK. Mills votes no.
 Representative McCormick.
 Mr. MCCORMICK. No.
 The CLERK. McCormick votes no.
 Representative Moran.
 Mr. MORAN. No.
 The CLERK. Moran votes no.
 Representative James.
 Mr. JAMES. No.
 The CLERK. James votes no.
 Representative Self.
 Mr. SELF. No.
 The CLERK. Self votes no.
 Ranking Member Meeks.
 Mr. MEEKS. Yes.
 The CLERK. Ranking Member Meeks votes aye.
 Representative Sherman.
 Mr. SHERMAN. Aye.
 The CLERK. Sherman votes aye.
 Representative Connolly.
 Mr. CONNOLLY. Aye.
 The CLERK. Representative Connolly votes aye.
 Representative Keating.
 Mr. KEATING. Yes.
 The CLERK. Keating votes aye.
 Representative Cicilline.
 Mr. CICILLINE. Aye.
 The CLERK. Cicilline votes aye.
 Representative Bera.
 Mr. BERA. Yes.
 The CLERK. Bera votes aye.
 Representative Castro.

Mr. CASTRO. Aye.
The CLERK. Castro votes aye.
Representative Titus.
Mr. TITUS. Aye.
The CLERK. Titus votes aye.
Representative Lieu.
Lieu?
[No response.]
Representative Wild.
Ms. WILD. Aye.
The CLERK. Wild votes aye.
Representative Phillips.
Mr. PHILLIPS. Aye.
The CLERK. Phillips votes aye.
Representative Allred.
Mr. ALLRED. Aye.
The CLERK. Allred votes aye.
Representative Andy Kim.
Mr. KIM OF NEW JERSEY. Aye.
The CLERK. Kim votes aye.
Representative Jacobs.
Ms. JACOBS. Aye.
The CLERK. Jacobs votes aye.
Representative Manning.
Ms. MANNING. Aye.
The CLERK. Manning votes no.
Representative Cherfilus-McCormick.
Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Aye.
The CLERK. Cherfilus-McCormick votes aye.
Representative Stanton.
Mr. STANTON. Aye.
The CLERK. Stanton votes aye.
Representative Dean.
Ms. DEAN. Aye.
The CLERK. Dean votes aye.
Representative Moskowitz.
Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Aye.
The CLERK. Moskowitz votes aye.
Representative Jonathan Jackson.
Mr. JACKSON OF ILLINOIS. Aye.
The CLERK. Jonathan Jackson votes aye.
Representative Kamlager-Dove.
Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Aye.
The CLERK. Kamlager-Dove votes aye.
Representative Costa.
Mr. COSTA. Aye.
The CLERK. Costa votes aye.
Representative Crow.
Mr. CROW. Aye.
The CLERK. Crow votes aye.
Representative Schneider.
Schneider?
[No response.]
Mr. Chairman?

Chairman MCCAUL. Chairman votes no.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes no.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, didn't Republicans pass an amendment prohibiting keeping a vote open for the purpose of changing that vote?

Chairman MCCAUL. How is Mr. Wilson recorded?

The CLERK. Representative Wilson votes no.

Chairman MCCAUL. OK, perfect.

Mr. MEEKS. How is Mr. Lieu recorded?

The CLERK. Representative Lieu votes aye.

Chairman MCCAUL. Clerk will report the tally.

The CLERK. On this vote, the ayes are 23 and the noes are 23.

Chairman MCCAUL. The vote is a tie and the amendment is not agreed to. That is the authority of the chair. You may not like it, Jerry, but I am going to exercise my authority. I am exercising my authority.

Ms. JACOBS. Madam Clerk, point of order. Per the HPAC rules, can the chair hold a markup vote open?

Chairman MCCAUL. That is an appropriate question for the Clerk. I can hold the vote, waiting for members to appear as we just finally have Mr. Waltz appear. Thank you. We need you, buddy.

The committee postponed further proceedings on the roll call vote on Amendment 9 offered by Representative Kamlager-Dove to the McCaul amendment in the nature of a substitute which the noes prevailed by a voice vote. The question now occurs on agreeing to the amendment. The Clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Representative Smith.

Mr. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Smith votes no.

Representative Wilson.

Wilson?

Mr. WILSON. No.

The CLERK. Wilson votes no.

Representative Perry.

Perry?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Representative Issa.

Mr. ISSA. No.

The CLERK. Issa votes no.

Representative Wagner.

Ms. WAGNER. No.

The CLERK. Wagner votes no.

Representative Mast.

Mr. MAST. No.

The CLERK. Mast votes no.

Representative Buck.

Mr. BUCK. No.

The CLERK. Buck votes no.

Representative Burchett.

Mr. BURCHETT. No.

The CLERK. Burchett votes no.

Representative Green.

Mr. GREEN. No.

The CLERK. Green votes no.
 Representative Barr.
 Mr. BARR. No.
 The CLERK. Barr votes no.
 Representative Ronny Jackson.
 Mr. JACKSON OF TEXAS. No.
 The CLERK. Jackson votes no.
 Representative Young Kim.
 Mrs. KIM OF CALIFORNIA. No.
 The CLERK. Kim votes no.
 Representative Salazar.
 Salazar?
 [No response.]
 Representative Huizenga.
 Mr. HUIZENGA. No.
 The CLERK. Huizenga votes no.
 Representative Radewagen.
 Radewagen?
 [No response.]
 Representative Hill.
 Mr. HILL. No.
 The CLERK. Hill votes no.
 Representative Davidson.
 Mr. DAVIDSON. No.
 The CLERK. Davidson votes no.
 Representative Baird.
 Mr. BAIRD. No.
 The CLERK. Baird votes no.
 Representative Waltz.
 Waltz?
 Mr. WALTZ. No.
 The CLERK. Waltz votes no.
 Representative Kean.
 Mr. KEAN. No.
 The CLERK. Kean votes no.
 Representative Lawler.
 Mr. LAWLER. No.
 The CLERK. Lawler votes no.
 Representative Mills.
 Mr. MILLS. No.
 The CLERK. Mills votes no.
 Representative McCormick.
 Mr. MCCORMICK. No.
 The CLERK. McCormick votes no.
 Representative Moran.
 Mr. MORAN. No.
 The CLERK. Moran votes no.
 Representative James.
 Mr. JAMES. No.
 The CLERK. James votes no.
 Representative Self.
 Mr. SELF. No.
 The CLERK. Self votes no.
 Ranking Member Meeks.

Mr. MEEKS. Yes.
The CLERK. Meeks votes aye.
Representative Sherman.
Mr. SHERMAN. Aye.
The CLERK. Sherman votes aye.
Representative Connolly.
Mr. CONNOLLY. Aye.
The CLERK. Connolly votes aye.
Representative Keating.
Mr. KEATING. Yes.
The CLERK. Keating votes aye.
Representative Cicilline.
Mr. CICILLINE. Aye.
The CLERK. Cicilline votes aye.
Representative Bera.
Mr. BERA. Yes.
The CLERK. Bera votes aye.
Representative Castro.
Mr. CASTRO. Aye.
The CLERK. Castro votes aye.
Representative Titus.
Mr. TITUS. Aye.
The CLERK. Titus votes aye.
Representative Lieu.
Mr. LIEU. Aye.
The CLERK. Lieu votes aye.
Representative Wild.
Ms. WILD. Aye.
The CLERK. Wild votes aye.
Representative Phillips.
Mr. PHILLIPS. Aye.
The CLERK. Phillips votes aye.
Representative Allred.
Mr. ALLRED. Aye.
The CLERK. Allred votes aye.
Representative Andy Kim.
Mr. KIM OF NEW JERSEY. Aye.
The CLERK. Kim votes aye.
Representative Jacobs.
Ms. JACOBS. Aye.
The CLERK. Jacobs votes aye.
Representative Manning.
Ms. MANNING. Aye.
The CLERK. Manning votes aye.
Representative Cherfilus-McCormick.
Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Aye.
The CLERK. Cherfilus-McCormick votes aye.
Representative Stanton.
Mr. STANTON. Aye.
The CLERK. Stanton votes aye.
Representative Dean.
Ms. DEAN. Aye.
The CLERK. Dean votes aye.
Representative Moskowitz.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Aye.
 The CLERK. Moskowitz votes aye.
 Representative Jonathan Jackson.
 Mr. JACKSON OF ILLINOIS. Aye.
 The CLERK. Jackson votes aye.
 Representative Kamlager-Dove.
 Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Aye.
 The CLERK. Kamlager-Dove votes aye.
 Representative Costa.
 Costa?

Mr. COSTA. Aye.
 The CLERK. Costa votes aye.
 Representative Crow.
 Mr. CROW. Aye.
 The CLERK. Crow votes aye.
 Representative Schneider.
 Schneider?

[No response.]

Mr. Chairman?

Chairman MCCAUL. Chairman votes no.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes no.

Chairman MCCAUL. The Clerk will report the tally.

The CLERK. On this vote, the ayes are 23 and the noes are 24.

Chairman MCCAUL. The noes have it and the amendment is not agreed to.

The question now occurs on the McCaul amendment in the nature of a substitute, number 40.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it and the amendment—

Mr. MEEKS. I request a roll call vote.

Chairman MCCAUL. I cannot believe you just said that. A roll call vote has been requested. The Clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Representative Smith.

Mr. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Smith votes aye.

Representative Wilson.

Wilson?

Mr. WILSON. Aye.

The CLERK. Wilson votes aye.

Representative Perry.

Perry?

[No response.]

Representative Issa.

Mr. ISSA. Aye.

The CLERK. Issa votes aye.

Representative Wagner.

Ms. WAGNER. Aye.

The CLERK. Representative Mast.

Mr. MAST. Aye.

The CLERK. Mast votes aye.

Representative Buck.

Mr. BUCK. Aye.

The CLERK. Buck votes aye.
Representative Burchett.
Mr. BURCHETT. Aye.
The CLERK. Burchett votes aye.
Representative Green.
Mr. GREEN. Aye.
The CLERK. Green votes aye.
Representative Barr.
Mr. BARR. Aye.
The CLERK. Barr votes aye.
Representative Ronny Jackson.
Mr. JACKSON OF TEXAS. Aye.
The CLERK. Jackson votes aye.
Representative Young Kim.
Mrs. KIM OF CALIFORNIA. Aye.
The CLERK. Young Kim votes aye.
Representative Salazar.
Salazar?
[No response.]
Representative Huizenga.
Mr. HUIZENGA. Aye.
The CLERK. Huizenga votes aye.
Representative Radewagen.
Radewagen?
[No response.]
Representative Hill.
Mr. HILL. Aye.
The CLERK. Hill votes aye.
Representative Davidson.
Mr. DAVIDSON. Aye.
The CLERK. Davidson votes aye.
Representative Baird.
Mr. BAIRD. Aye.
The CLERK. Baird votes aye.
Representative Waltz.
Mr. WALTZ. Aye.
The CLERK. Waltz votes aye.
Representative Kean.
Mr. KEAN. Yes.
The CLERK. Kean votes aye.
Representative LAWLER.
Mr. LAWLER. Aye.
The CLERK. Lawler votes aye.
Representative Mills.
Mr. MILLS. Yes.
The CLERK. Mills votes aye.
Representative McCormick.
Mr. MCCORMICK. Aye.
The CLERK. McCormick votes aye.
Representative Moran.
Mr. MORAN. Aye.
The CLERK. Moran votes aye.
Representative James.
Mr. JAMES. Aye.

The CLERK. James votes aye.
 Representative Self.
 Mr. SELF. Aye.
 The CLERK. Self votes aye.
 Ranking Member Meeks.
 Mr. MEEKS. No.
 The CLERK. Meeks votes no.
 Representative Sherman.
 Mr. SHERMAN. No.
 The CLERK. Sherman votes no.
 Representative Connolly.
 Mr. CONNOLLY. Nay.
 The CLERK. Connolly votes no.
 Representative Keating.
 Mr. KEATING. No.
 The CLERK. Keating votes no.
 Representative Cicilline.
 Mr. CICILLINE. No.
 The CLERK. Cicilline votes no.
 Representative Bera.
 Mr. BERA. No.
 The CLERK. Bera votes no.
 Representative Castro.
 Mr. CASTRO. No.
 The CLERK. Castro votes no.
 Representative Titus.
 Mr. TITUS. No.
 The CLERK. Titus votes no.
 Representative Lieu.
 Mr. LIEU. No.
 The CLERK. Lieu votes no.
 Representative Wild.
 Ms. WILD. No.
 The CLERK. Wild votes no.
 Representative Phillips.
 Mr. PHILLIPS. No.
 The CLERK. Phillips votes no.
 Representative Allred.
 Mr. ALLRED. Yes.
 The CLERK. Allred votes aye.
 Representative Andy Kim.
 Mr. KIM OF NEW JERSEY. No.
 The CLERK. Kim votes no.
 Representative Jacobs.
 Ms. JACOBS. No.
 The CLERK. Jacobs votes no.
 Representative Manning.
 Ms. MANNING. No.
 The CLERK. Manning votes no.
 Representative Cherfilus-McCormick.
 Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. No.
 The CLERK. Cherfilus-McCormick votes no.
 Representative Stanton.
 Mr. STANTON. No.

The CLERK. Stanton votes no.

Representative Dean.

Ms. DEAN. No.

The CLERK. Dean votes no.

Representative Moskowitz.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. No.

The CLERK. Moskowitz votes no.

Representative Jonathan Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON OF ILLINOIS. No.

The CLERK. Jackson votes no.

Representative Kamlager-Dove.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. No.

The CLERK. Kamlager-Dove votes no.

Representative Costa.

Mr. COSTA. No.

The CLERK. Costa votes no.

Representative Crow.

Mr. CROW. No.

The CLERK. Crow votes no.

Representative Schneider.

Schneider?

[No response.]

Mr. Chairman?

Chairman MCCAUL. Chairman votes aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes aye.

Chairman MCCAUL. The Clerk will report the tally.

The CLERK. On this vote, the ayes are 25, the noes are 22.

Chairman MCCAUL. The ayes have it. The McCaul amendment in the nature of a substitute is agreed to. There being no further amendments to dispense with, I move that the committee report H.R. 1690, as amended, to the House with a favorable recommendation.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it and the motion is agreed to.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I request a roll call vote.

Chairman MCCAUL. A roll vote has been requested. The Clerk shall call the roll.

The CLERK. Representative Smith?

Mr. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Smith votes aye.

Representative Wilson.

Mr. WILSON. Aye.

The CLERK. Wilson votes aye.

Representative Perry.

Perry?

[No response.]

Representative Issa.

Mr. ISSA. Aye.

The CLERK. Issa votes aye.

Representative Wagner.

Ms. WAGNER. Aye.

The CLERK. Wagner votes aye.

Representative Mast.
Mr. MAST. Aye.
The CLERK. Mast votes aye.
Representative Buck.
Mr. BUCK. Aye.
The CLERK. Buck votes aye.
Representative Burchett.
Mr. BURCHETT. Aye.
The CLERK. Burchett votes aye.
Representative Green.
Mr. GREEN. Aye.
The CLERK. Green votes aye.
Representative Barr.
Mr. BARR. Aye.
The CLERK. Barr votes aye.
Representative Ronny Jackson.
Mr. JACKSON OF TEXAS. Aye.
The CLERK. Jackson votes aye.
Representative Young Kim.
Mrs. KIM OF CALIFORNIA. Aye.
The CLERK. Kim votes aye.
Representative Salazar.
Salazar?
[No response.]
Representative Huizenga.
Mr. HUIZENGA. Aye.
The CLERK. Huizenga votes aye.
Representative Radewagen.
Radewagen?
[No response.]
Representative Hill.
Mr. HILL. Aye.
The CLERK. Hill votes aye.
Representative Davidson.
Mr. DAVIDSON. Aye.
The CLERK. Davidson votes aye.
Representative Baird.
Mr. BAIRD. Aye.
The CLERK. Baird votes aye.
Representative Waltz.
Mr. WALTZ. Aye.
The CLERK. Waltz votes aye.
Representative Kean.
Mr. KEAN. Yes.
The CLERK. Kean votes aye.
Representative Lawler.
Mr. LAWLER. Aye.
The CLERK. Lawler votes aye.
Representative Mills.
Mr. MILLS. Aye.
The CLERK. Mills votes aye.
Representative McCormick.
Mr. MCCORMICK. Aye.
The CLERK. McCormick votes aye.

Representative Moran.
Mr. MORAN. Aye.
The CLERK. Moran votes aye.
Representative James.
Mr. JAMES. Aye.
The CLERK. James votes aye.
Representative Self.
Mr. SELF. Aye.
The CLERK. Self votes aye.
Ranking Member Meeks.
Mr. MEEKS. No.
The CLERK. Meeks votes no.
Representative Sherman.
Mr. SHERMAN. No.
The CLERK. Sherman votes no.
Representative Connolly.
Mr. CONNOLLY. Nay.
The CLERK. Connolly votes no.
Representative Keating.
Mr. KEATING. No.
The CLERK. Keating votes no.
Representative Cicilline.
Mr. CICILLINE. No.
The CLERK. Cicilline votes no.
Representative Bera.
Mr. BERA. No.
The CLERK. Bera votes no.
Representative Castro.
Mr. CASTRO. No.
The CLERK. Castro votes no.
Representative Titus.
Mr. TITUS. No.
The CLERK. Titus votes no.
Representative Lieu.
Mr. LIEU. No.
The CLERK. Lieu votes no.
Representative Wild.
Ms. WILD. No.
The CLERK. Wild votes no.
Representative Phillips.
Mr. PHILLIPS. No.
The CLERK. Phillips votes no.
Representative Allred.
Mr. ALLRED. Aye.
The CLERK. Allred votes aye.
Representative Andy Kim.
Mr. KIM OF NEW JERSEY. No.
The CLERK. Kim votes no.
Representative Jacobs.
Ms. JACOBS. No.
The CLERK. Jacobs votes no.
Representative Manning.
Ms. MANNING. No.
The CLERK. Manning votes no.

Representative Cherfilus-McCormick.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. No.

The CLERK. Cherfilus-McCormick votes no.

Representative Stanton.

Mr. STANTON. No.

The CLERK. Stanton votes no.

Representative Dean.

Ms. DEAN. No.

The CLERK. Dean votes no.

Representative Moskowitz.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. No.

The CLERK. Moskowitz votes no.

Representative Jonathan Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON OF ILLINOIS. No.

The CLERK. Jackson votes no.

Representative Kamlager-Dove.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. No.

The CLERK. Kamlager-Dove votes no.

Representative Costa.

Mr. COSTA. No.

The CLERK. Costa votes no.

Representative Crow.

Mr. CROW. No.

The CLERK. Crow votes no.

Representative Schneider.

Schneider?

[No response.]

Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman?

Chairman MCCAUL. Votes aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes aye. On this vote, the ayes are 25, the noes are 22.

Chairman MCCAUL. The ayes have it, and the motion is received without objection. The motion to reconsider is laid on the table. Staff is authorized to make any technical and conforming changes.

I ask unanimous consent to vacate the record vote on the Stanton ANS and we will redo the voice vote.

The question now occurs on the Stanton amendment in the nature of a substitute as amended.

All in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

The opinion of the chair, the ayes have it and the amendment in the nature of a substitute is agreed to.

There being no further amendments to dispense with, I move that the committee report H.R. 2789, as amended, to the House with a favorable recommendation.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

The opinion of the chair, the ayes have it and motion is agreed to.

Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table. Staff is authorized to make any technical and conforming changes.

This concludes, ladies and gentlemen, this very exciting markup. Thanks to all of you for showing up timely and we will see you next time.

[Whereupon, at 10:07 a.m., the committee was adjourned.]

MARKUP SUMMARY

4/26/23-4/28/23 Foreign Affairs Markup Summary

The Chair called up the following measures separately:

1. H.R. 589, To impose sanctions on the Supreme Leader of Iran and the President of Iran and their respective offices for human rights abuses and support for terrorism (Banks) (ordered favorably reported to the House, voice vote)
 1. [Mills #1](#) to the McCaul ANS (adopted, voice vote)
 2. [Schneider #26](#) to the McCaul ANS (not adopted, voice vote)
 3. [Meeks #3](#) to the McCaul ANS (not adopted, voice vote)
 4. [McCaul ANS #39](#), as amended (adopted, voice vote)
2. [H.Res. 300](#), Requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit, respectively, to the House of Representatives copies of all documents indicating any plans for current or future military assistance to Ukraine and documents indicating whether any United States Armed Forces, including special operations forces, are currently deployed in Ukraine. (Gaetz) (ordered favorably reported to the House, **22 Y – 20 N**)
3. H.R. 1690, To authorize the Secretary of State to negotiate regional immigration agreements, and for other purposes. (McCaul) (ordered favorably reported to the House, **25Y – 22N**)
 1. [Castro #2](#) to the McCaul ANS (not adopted, voice vote)
 2. [Castro #1](#) to the McCaul ANS (not adopted, **20 Y, 22 N**)
 3. [Castro #8](#) to the McCaul ANS (not adopted, **23 Y, 23 N**)
 4. [Kamlager-Dove #9](#) to the McCaul ANS (not adopted, **23 Y to 24 N**)
 5. [McCaul ANS #40](#) (adopted, **25Y to 22N**)
4. H.R. 2789, To direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy on efforts to strengthen subnational cooperation between the United States and Mexico, and for other purposes. (Stanton) (ordered favorably reported to the House, voice vote)
 1. [Issa #33](#) to the Stanton ANS (adopted, voice vote)
 2. [Stanton ANS](#), as amended (adopted, voice vote)