Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—179

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Bost
Brown (FL)
Delaney
Hastings
McDermott
Nadler
Nugent
Rooney (FL)
Takai
Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1749

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 177, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 388]

AYES—243

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—177

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Bost
Brown (FL)
Castor (FL)
Delaney
Hastings
Johnson, E. B.
McDermott
Nadler
Nugent
Pingree
Rooney (FL)
Takai
Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1755

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 809, S. 2943, as amended, is considered as passed.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 794 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5485.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1756

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 38 printed in House report 114–639, offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. MESSER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 40 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to commence any administrative adjudication or civil action under section 1053 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 more than 3 years after the date of discovery of the violation to which the adjudication or action relates.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), for his great work on this important bill.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering today is a simple and modest proposal. It ensures that the CFPB follows the statute of limitations established by Dodd-Frank during agency administrative proceedings.

This amendment is a response to the CFPB blatantly ignoring the express statute of limitations in Dodd-Frank and the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act, otherwise known as RESPA.

□ 1800

In January of 2014, CFPB launched an administrative proceeding against the PHH Corporation alleging a violation of RESPA. In the case, CFPB Director Richard Cordray claimed the express 3-year statute of limitations within Dodd-Frank did not apply to the CFPB's administrative proceedings process—deliberately ignoring the law.

Using this unprecedented rationale, the CFPB retroactively imposed fines of $109 million against PHH Corporation for alleged violations dating back to 1995, meaning that the CFPB imposed fines for alleged violations that occurred 19 years after the statute of limitations had expired—again, 19 years past the express statute of limitations.

These fines are illegal under Dodd-Frank, and they deny businessowners basic liability protections guaranteed to them under the statute of limitations. Without those protections, the CFPB could threaten litigation forever, handcuffing businesses' ability to create jobs in perpetuity.

You can't just make it up. This is lawless behavior and it is dangerous for the rule of law.

My amendment is very simple. It prohibits the CFPB from using any funds to take administrative actions past the express 3-year statute of limitations in Dodd-Frank.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment prohibits funds from the CFPB to commence any administrative adjudication or civil action beyond the 3-year statute of limitation in Dodd-Frank.

In doing so, it would limit the board's ability to bring enforcement action against wrongdoers. This represents a free pass for bad actors who have swindled borrowers on a host of practices and products under the Bureau's jurisdiction—credit cards, student loans, mortgages, auto loans, debt collection practices, and payday loans, just to name a few.

Title X of Dodd-Frank does provide a 3-year statute of limitations for claims being brought by the Bureau under that title. However, the Bureau has argued in court that the statute of limitations does not govern claims brought under the enumerated consumer protection laws transferred to the Bureau—laws like the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, the Truth in Lending Act, the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, and the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act.

While some of these enumerated statutes have their own statutes of limitations, others do not. The board has argued in court that, even under those laws that do have statutes of limitation, they do not apply to the Bureau, but instead only apply to private litigation.

Of the enumerated laws that do not have statutes of limitation, the Bureau has argued in court that no statute of limitation applies.

When it comes to administrative law judge proceedings, rather than those brought in court, the Bureau also contends the statute of limitation does not apply.

In the final analysis, this is currently being adjudicated by the Bureau and defendants in the courts. It would be premature and disruptive for Congress to step in with this amendment, which tilts the playing field in court toward the side of special interests.

Moreover, both the House and Senate authorizing committees of jurisdiction have not even considered this issue during hearings or markups. At the very least, it would be premature to adopt this amendment, which significantly alters existing law and throws into flux cases pending before the courts, without any regard for regular order.

Finally, this amendment creates uncertainty and complications as to how our regulatory agencies can enforce the law.

The Wall Street Reform Act transferred enforcement authority to the Bureau for a host of consumer protection statutes. Yet banking and other market regulators have retained authority on a number of those laws, thereby creating two sets of standards: one for banking and market regulators, where the statute of limitations would still be being interpreted by the courts, and one for our lead consumer regulator, the Bureau. This will only serve to confuse the industry.

That is the main reason why I oppose the amendment and urge a ''no'' vote.

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), the chairman.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment. It is common sense. We all believe in regulation, but we believe in reasonable regulation. What the gentleman is trying to do is just kind of curtail some of this regulatory overreach.

When this agency was set up, it was outside the appropriations process. They get a check from the Federal Reserve for $600 million with no strings attached. Nobody asks anything. In our underlying bill, we put them under the appropriations process. We say: You ought not just have a single director. Have a five-member commission like a lot of these regulatory agencies. So it is a good amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, what I would ask the gentleman to do is to consider the fact that this is being still dealt with in the courts, and this is not the right time for us—or any time—to get involved before the court has decided. That is one of the problems that we have on many of these issues, that we get involved and we try to get our will, our

way on an issue, before the courts have decided what to do with it.

This is a big issue for them to decide, and I would hope that we can see our way to letting those decisions be made before we set a tone that kind of sways what the final outcome might be, and that is not the right thing to do.

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I respect the gentleman's position. I would just submit that the express language of Dodd-Frank says what we should do here. It creates a 3-year statute of limitations for the CFPB, and the CFPB is ignoring the rule of law and ignoring that express language. All this amendment does is say that the CFPB cannot use dollars to violate the express letter of the law. I urge my colleagues for their support.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, there are other parts covered by the Bureau that have their own statute of limitations. That is why these questions are being asked. While the gentleman is correct that Dodd-Frank says 3 years, in other areas it is not 3 years. It is being settled, and we should stay out of it until then.

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 41 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act (including title IV and title VIII) may be used to carry out the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014 (D.C. Law 20-261) or to implement any rule or regulation promulgated to carry out such Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like, first of all, to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) for his work on this bill.

My amendment would prohibit funds from being used to implement the District of Columbia's Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014, or RHNDA.

The Declaration of Independence declares that: ''We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.''

These founding principles remain true today. The reason life was included by our Founders as the first principle is because without life there is no liberty; it is a prerequisite for liberty. Without life, there is no pursuit of happiness. In fact, it is self-evident, without life, there isn't even a discussion about any rights.

Liberty encompasses social and political freedoms, and the tenets associated with liberty were those used in drafting the First Amendment to the Constitution. With life and liberty, you can pursue happiness. Take away either and the pursuit becomes difficult or impossible.

My amendment protects all three, but I will focus my comments on liberty as it relates to the free exercise of religion clause in the First Amendment.

The First Amendment states in part that: ''Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.'' Without my amendment, some employers in the District of Columbia would not only be prohibited from exercising their religion, but would be forced to embrace the beliefs of the 13 members of the D.C. Council.

The District of Columbia allows abortions until the moment of birth, but a number of employers in the District of Columbia believe in the sanctity of life and protecting it. In fact, many organizations in D.C.—such as March for Life, Americans United for Life, and the National Right to Life Committee—exist solely to protect life. The Constitution provides them the right to exercise those beliefs, just like it does those who oppose it.

That is why when the District of Columbia passed the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014, former Mayor Vincent Gray expressed concerns about the law. In December 2014, Gray wrote a letter to the D.C. Council about RHNDA, describing it as ''legally problematic'' and saying: ''. . . the bill raises serious concerns under the Constitution and under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993. Religious organizations, religiously affiliated organizations, religiously driven for-profit entities, and political organizations may have strong First Amendment and RFRA grounds for challenging the law's applicability to them.''

Employers who oppose abortions and paying for them as part of a compensation package have every right to exercise their freedom not to do so, and those who want to receive abortions or have them paid for have every right to seek employment from someone willing to do so. That is how freedom works. It does not work with one group imposing its version of freedom on the other, which is what this District law currently provides for.

In its 2012 opinion in the case of Hosanna Tabor v. EEOC, the Supreme Court unanimously affirmed the right of religious organizations to hire employees that support the mission of the organization where their employees are responsible for carrying out its mission. The opinion says: ''The interest of society in the enforcement of employment discrimination statuses is undoubtedly important. But so too is the interest of religious groups in choosing who will preach their beliefs, teach their faith, and carry out their mission.''

Would you require PETA to hire someone that comes to an interview in a fur coat? Would you require Planned Parenthood to hire a nun or anyone adamantly opposed to abortion? Neither of these situations makes sense, nor does requiring a pro-life organization to hire someone who explicitly contradicts their moral conscience or religious beliefs. The Supreme Court agrees.

My amendment would restore religious freedom to employers inside the District of Columbia. Those who want to have abortions do not have to work for employers who oppose them. They have life and the liberty to pursue their own interests with another employer.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to vote ''yes'' on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. This amendment would, once again, overreach into the District of Columbia's local affairs by prohibiting funds for D.C.'s local law, the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014.

The D.C. law this amendment would vacate prohibits discrimination based on reproductive health decisions. This amendment would allow workplace discrimination if the employer disagrees with the employee's use of contraception, in vitro fertilization, and even perhaps a medically necessary abortion.

D.C. is attempting to protect workers from losing their jobs because their supervisors may or may not agree with their personal decisions. This amendment offered today would strip those protections from D.C. workers.

In addition to being bad policy, this amendment goes around the law which states that Congress has 30 days to review bills passed by the D.C. Council. The 30 days are up, and the Republican-controlled Congress did not legally stop these laws from going into effect. The House passed a resolution disapproving the D.C. bill on reproductive health, and the Republican-controlled Senate did not.

The Congress had time to act on these issues, and it failed to do so. D.C. residents should not be subject to endless efforts to overturn its laws. It continues to be part of what I always complain about, this desire that we have on the other side to tell the District of Columbia what to do.

□ 1815

In this case, there was actually protection for the Congress if the Congress had acted within 30 days. But it didn't, and now we want to, in this bill, get around that lack of action by putting in new action to overturn their law.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, obviously, Article I, section 8, clause 17 of the Constitution states that Congress shall have power ''to exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District.''

Moving aside the jurisdictional issue, I take exception to my colleague's point that it is acceptable to infringe on the religious liberties of certain people, those who actually believe in protecting life. If those who don't believe in protecting life want to find employment, let them find employment at like-minded organizations.

The D.C. government should not be able to compel pro-life organizations to hire pro-abortion employees. That is exactly what the Religious Freedom Restoration Act was in place to protect, as Mayor Gray pointed out in his letter to the D.C. Council. I can't say that I always agree with the Mayor, but his serious concerns were, and remain to be, completely valid.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, very carefully let me say that there are many instances where people have disagreements, but the law prevails. Not every employer agrees with everything that the employee does and vice versa, but if there is a law in place, then the law prevails. Here there is a law in place, number one.

Number two, we should continue to try not to meddle in the District of Columbia's issues.

Number three, I repeat, we had a period, a legal period for us to act—some would say a constitutional period for us to act—and we didn't act. Now we want to get around that by using this bill improperly to undo what the people in the District of Columbia, through their representatives, found to be correct for them, just like other States, other communities throughout this country, maybe communities even in the gentleman's and many of the gentlemen and gentlewomen on the other side's districts.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment. The amendment prohibits the District of Columbia from using its local funds, consisting of local taxes and fees, to enforce a local nondiscrimination law, the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act, giving employers license, in the name of religion, to discriminate against employees, their spouses and their dependents based on their private, constitutionally protected reproductive health decisions. Contrary to the sponsor's claim, the D.C. law does not require employers to provide insurance coverage for reproductive health decisions. The law states expressly: ''This section shall not be construed to require an employer to provide insurance coverage related to a reproductive health decision.''

The amendment permits employers to fire a woman for having an abortion due to rape, or to decline to hire a woman for using in vitro fertilization, or to fire a man for using condoms, or to reduce the salary of a parent for buying birth control for his or her child.

The D.C. law is valid under both the U.S. Constitution and federal law. Indeed, the law has been in effect for more than a year, and there appear to have been no lawsuits challenging it.

Under the U.S. Constitution, laws may limit religious exercise if they are neutral, generally applicable and rationally related to a legitimate governmental interest. The D.C. law applies to all employers, does not target religion and promotes workplace equality. Under the federal Religious Freedom Restoration Act, which applies to D.C., laws may substantially burden religious exercise if they further a compelling governmental interest in the least restrictive means. D.C. has a compelling interest in eliminating discrimination, and the D.C. law is the least restrictive means to do so.

The D.C. law protects religious liberty. The law is subject to constitutional and statutory exceptions to non-discrimination laws. The Constitution's narrow ministerial exception allows religious organizations to make employment decisions for ministers and ministerial employees for any reason whatsoever. D.C. law permits religious and political organizations to make employment decisions based on religion and political views. Under the D.C. law, employees must be willing to carry out employers' missions and directives.

I urge Members to vote NO on this amendment in order to protect employees' reproductive health decisions, workplace equality and D.C.'s right to self-government.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 42 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 43 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO), I offer amendment No. 43.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed rule entitled ''Voluntary Remedial Actions and Guidelines for Voluntary Recall Notices'' published by the Consumer Product Safety Commission in the Federal Register on November 21, 2013 (78 Fed. Reg. 69793).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit funds for the voluntary recall proposed rule at the Consumer Product Safety Commission and prevent them from moving forward with a rule that would cripple the highly successful voluntary recall program currently in place.

Congress has expressed significant concerns over this proposed rule. Two years ago, the House approved this amendment, and Congress has repeatedly made it clear to the CPSC that it would cease in its quest to make unnecessary changes to a recall system that has worked well over the past 40 years. This system—one based on a successful partnership between businesses and the Commission—has helped ensure that consumer products sold in the U.S. are the safest in the world.

Congressional intent has been expressed in House-passed legislation, report language, letters from lawmakers, and oversight hearings. However, the Commission has failed to withdraw the proposed rule and has continued to indicate in its operating plan that it will move forward.

The CPSC does not even have the statutory authority to issue the rule. The CPSC has presented absolutely no evidence supporting its proposal, and all but one comment submitted expressed serious concerns over how the proposed rule would actually delay recalls and harm the effectiveness of our recall program.

The Commission unilaterally seeks to transform the voluntary recall process into a legal negotiation equivalent to a settlement agreement. The proposed changes would require companies seeking to implement a recall to hire an attorney, dragging out the process and creating a financial burden for small businesses.

The CPSC's proposed rule on voluntary recalls would slow down a process meant to be conducted with speed

and without red tape. Consumers would ultimately be more at risk as recalls are delayed. This proposed rule would make it more difficult to remove defective products from the marketplace.

Mr. Chairman, passage of this amendment would remind the Commission that its mission is to protect the public against unreasonable risks of injury associated with consumer products in an efficient and reasonable manner. The proposed rule to significantly alter the voluntary recall process is contrary to that mission.

I urge Members to adopt this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. I rise in opposition to this amendment. It would prohibit the CPSC from taking action on the proposed rule on voluntary recall actions and voluntary recall notices.

The Notice of Proposed Rulemaking was published in 2013. There has been no further official rulemaking action taken on it since then, so this amendment is not necessary.

For that reason, I oppose the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. POSEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 44 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, enforce, or codify into regulation, the guidance relating to ''Commission Guidance Regarding Disclosure Related to Climate Change'', affecting parts 211, 231, and 249 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations (as described in Commission Release Nos. 33-9106; 34-61469; FR-82).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit the Securities and Exchange Commission from using funds under this act to pursue a political agenda on climate change and, instead, return its focus to their three-part mission: to protect investors; maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets; and facilitate capital formation.

My amendment relates to the SEC's 2010 interpretive guidance for companies to disclose the impact that global climate change may have on their businesses.

My amendment is necessary and timely, given the SEC's recent regulation S-K Concept Release that suggests the SEC is moving toward further action on this issue. It is even more important, in light of a campaign by several States' attorneys general, to impede the First Amendment rights of those who dare question the accuracy of climate change science.

More and more, we have seen the Federal securities laws and disclosure system abused for political purposes—from the median pay ratio disclosure requirement of Dodd-Frank to conflict minerals, to climate change. These politically motivated and mandated disclosures are not about protecting investors, they are about shaming companies, or at least attempting to shame companies, into adopting their agenda.

It is a waste of resources for the companies, for their shareholders, and for the SEC. Publicly traded companies are already required to disclose all material information. Having companies disclose information on immaterial issues, like the climate, is highly speculative and dubious at best.

Regardless of how you feel about climate change policy, securities law is not the place for it. We already have agencies in place to help protect our environment. The SEC's job is to protect investors, and that means making sure they have material information to make sound investments.

The SEC's guidance is also at odds with the FAST Act of 2015—legislation the President signed—and that requires the SEC to simplify, not make more complex, the current disclosure regime by June 1, a deadline which the SEC has already missed. Clearly, there are better, more pressing, uses for the SEC's finite resources.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment and refocus the SEC on their core mission.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to be funny here, but I am trying to figure out what political climate issues are. Maybe it is Democrats manipulate the weather so it only hurts certain people. I don't know what it means.

Mr. Chairman, indeed, this amendment would prevent the SEC from enforcing or codifying into law its 2010 interpretive guidance to public companies intended to provide greater transparency to investors on the material risks—and opportunities—of those companies to climate change.

This guidance was put forth after nearly 100 investors, representing $7 trillion in wealth management, specifically petitioned the SEC for this clarity.

Additionally, the guidance doesn't create new climate change regulatory frameworks or mandates. Instead, it simply provides clarity on what companies should view as a ''material'' risk or opportunity that ought to be disclosed to investors.

Given that Hurricane Sandy caused $70 billion in damage, it is difficult to say that climate change doesn't have an impact on business, unless you deny the existence of climate change in the first place.

Democrats support efforts by the SEC to modernize public company disclosures so that investors are appropriately apprised of the material risks, including the risks of climate change.

H.R. 4792, for example, represents a bicameral effort by Democrats to encourage the SEC to do more, not less, to ensure investors are aware of climate change risks like the effect of carbon costs on oil and gas companies.

This amendment always runs counter to a recent decision by the SEC to require ExxonMobil to allow a shareholder proposal from the New York State Common Fund and the Church of England to come up for a vote on this issue. That proposal would require ExxonMobil to disclose to shareholders how climate change may impact their profits.

Indeed, shareholders are increasingly craving this information. Since the beginning of 2016, eight shareholder proposals have gone to a vote at oil and gas and utility companies requesting increased disclosure of their plans to mitigate the impact from climate change on their operations. Average support for the proposal was 31 percent, but at Occidental Petroleum, nearly a majority of shareholders voted in favor. In comparison, in 2015, climate change-related proposals received an average of 17.5 percent support, with the highest support of 36.3 percent at Marathon Oil Corporation.

If the SEC guidance on this was stronger, and if the SEC enforced this mandate, these shareholder proposals, which go further than voluntary disclosures, would not be necessary.

As the impacts of climate change continue to be felt by individuals and businesses alike, shareholders will demand more information about the risks associated with their investments. The SEC should do more, not less, to clarify to companies the material risks they must disclose to their shareholders and owners.

I urge opposition to this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1830

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chair, I apologize if I wasn't clear.

This amendment does not stop companies from mentioning bona fide weather and environmental risks in their disclosures. If a company wants to weigh in on climate change, nothing in this amendment would prevent it from volunteering that information; but the reality is that companies are already required to disclose all material information.

We shouldn't allow the disclosure system to continue to be used as a tool for special interests. Instead of forcing agendas on companies, the SEC should be focused on protecting investors, maintaining fair, orderly, and efficient markets, and facilitating capital formation. The SEC let Bernard Madoff run free for 10 years—a decade—while he evaporated $70 billion worth of people's life savings and hard-earned money. They were asleep at the switch. They were busy doing something else like this. Their job is to protect investors, and that is the intent of this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I have been in public office for 42 years, 43 years, and only once in those years in the New York State Assembly and in Congress did an agency come before me and say: ''We don't want any more money. We have enough.'' That was the SEC in the old days, under another administration. They didn't want any more money, and I was shocked. No agency ever does that. Then, when Wall Street fell apart, we found out why. They didn't want any more money because they didn't want to enforce anything.

The gentleman is right in that Madoff got away with a lot of stuff; but now, when we have an SEC that looks at things differently—that says that we should ask questions, that we should, for instance, tell shareholders what they are doing to mitigate the problems that they may face as shareholders—we want to stop them. We can't have it both ways.

I agree with the gentleman in that Madoff and people like him got away with things, but not because this SEC, in these modern times, was looking the other way. It was because it was during a period of time when they didn't care, when they didn't enforce anything. A lot of people didn't enforce anything. I will give you an example which is related.

To my understanding, not a single person from Wall Street went to prison. I don't know if that is possible anywhere else.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have left.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chair, with regard to the new SEC and the old SEC, I have been here a little less than 8 years, but I heard the new SEC Secretary say, well, there is really nothing to worry about and that half of the 38 employees who were culpable in allowing Madoff to run free are no longer with the agency. She couldn't tell us what happened to them, if they were with another Federal agency or if they retired on the public dime. That is just like saying a pedophile changed neighborhoods—problem solved.

The fact is that we need to have the SEC focus on protecting investors. That is their main course. That is what they are supposed to do, and that is what the public expects them to do. That is what this amendment will allow them to do.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. ROSKAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 45 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available to the Department of Treasury by this Act may be used to issue a license pursuant to any Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) memo regarding Section 5.1.1 of Annex II to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action of July 14, 2015 (JCPOA), including the January 16, 2016, OFAC memo titled, ''Statement of Licensing Policy For Activities Related to the Export Or Re-Export to Iran of Commercial Passenger Aircraft and Related Parts and Services'' and any other OFAC memo of the same substance.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chair, we have an opportunity to do a good thing, and the good thing is this: to prohibit the Iranian regime from getting a product that is fungible militarily. One begins to ask oneself: What can that be, and how could the Congress be involved in that? It is very simple.

There is a large American company, which is the Boeing Company, that is now seeking to do a deal, and the deal that they are seeking to do is to sell billions of dollars' worth of planes to the Iranians.

Now, the Iranian regime—let's stipulate that everybody agrees—is the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism. When I say ''everybody,'' I mean everybody. Capitol Hill agrees; the administration agrees; the President says that is true; the Secretary of State says that is true. Yet they are on the verge of getting something that can be used for a military purpose. What is that? That is a Boeing plane.

This is a tweet from May of this year when the Boeing Company tweeted this: ''These airplanes don't retire. They're getting another 20 years of life. See how. #freighters.''

That is exactly it. Boeing, in a moment of candor, overdisclosed one of the interesting things—and they are really attractive things—about their products. Why? Their products can be used as freighters. Their products can be used to transfer things on behalf of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, whom everybody acknowledges has been complicit in terror.

This amendment is very simple, and it is very clear. It says that the Treasury Department cannot use money that is appropriated to license this deal.

I urge its passage.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, if you listen to the last comment by the gentleman, for whom I have a lot of respect, this is really not about this particular situation. It is about the Iran deal. Anything to make it look bad—to make the agreement look bad, to make any future work on it look bad, to make any future vote on it look bad—some folks will do.

What he says is not to allow any dollars to be appropriated by this committee to help in any way, shape, or form, or to get involved with the Iran deal. That is a situation we see a lot of on this committee, and it shouldn't be. It doesn't belong here. It belongs in another committee.

If you are opposed to what the President has proposed—with what the President is trying to do and with what many of us believe is correct—then we should work on that but not necessarily work on trying to cut funding and say that this particular part cannot be done and that that particular part cannot be done. It simply speaks to a larger issue, and I think we should be fair and honest with ourselves and say: I oppose this whole deal. I oppose this proposal. I oppose all of this, and I am simply trying to get at it in another way.

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

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chair, the gentleman has conflated a number of issues, so let me explain and try to bring some clarity to this.

There is, really, a false notion and a false narrative, which is to collapse the JCPOA—that is the nuclear deal—and the activity around Iran and the ability to sell. So what am I saying? The Iranians, under the JCPOA, are entitled to civilian aircraft, but it is to use for civilian purposes.

Boeing, by their own admission, Mr. Chair, says this: ''Building on success: Boeing's commercial jetliners make an ideal platform for a variety of military derivative aircraft.'' Mr. Chair, this is Boeing's language from their own promotional materials.

How about this? This is according to Boeing: ''Good news. Modifications can take 3 months to 2 years. It all depends on how much militarization they want to do.''

Don't you see the point, Mr. Chair? Don't you see the point? To give these types of planes to the Iranian regime, which is still the world's largest state sponsor of terror, is to give them a product that can be used for a military purpose. We are not talking about baby formula. We are not talking about licorice. We are not talking about sandals, for crying out loud. We are talking about aircraft that can be used.

What can fit in a Boeing 747? This can fit in. It can fit 100 Shahab ballistic missiles or 15,000 rocket-propelled grenades or 25,000 AK–47 assault rifles.

Let's not do this. Adopt this amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chair, let me point out one other piece of literature. Again, this comes from the Boeing Company. This is from their Frontiers Magazine: ''Military derivatives front and center.'' This is a continuing problem.

Look, this is in stark contrast, Mr. Chair, for a company like Lockheed Martin. Lockheed Martin has said they are not going to do business with the Iranians. God bless Lockheed Martin. They could be assembling helicopters—they could be doing all kinds of things—but they recognize that they ought not to be complicit in this adventure.

It is also interesting to me to say that, a couple of minutes ago, my friend, the gentleman from New York, was echoing a criticism from the U.S. Chamber. The U.S. Chamber said this: ''Congress should avoid intervening in commercial contract agreements in instances such as these where national security matters are not involved.''

Okay. It is wrong on two counts. Number one, it is an assertion that this is a commercial deal. I am asserting that it is military, and that is true by definition. It is true by Boeing's own admission. Secondly, when do we defer to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce for military and national security advice?

This is a good amendment. It is targeted. It is thoughtful. I urge its passage.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, in closing, it is interesting that he singles out this particular situation, because, if we were to look at every place to which we send any kind of armament that, maybe, some people would disagree with sending it to, we may not be selling anything to anyone throughout the world because there are plenty of people who oppose just about everything. I mean, we probably would only be sending stuff to the British and to no one else, perhaps, and everybody else would be in trouble. So that is not such a strong argument.

The thing is that, if we start nitpicking—and I am not saying the gentleman is—this piece and that piece and that piece, then we could find so much that we can't send to Iran, and we will have no relationship at all. The whole purpose of what we are trying to do here is to establish some sort of understanding of who they are and an understanding of what their behavior is, but to still hope that, through conversation, though diplomacy, through other means, we can reach agreements that are good for us, good for them, and good for the world and world peace.

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

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman for acknowledging that we are not nitpicking.

Mr. Chair, let me just say this. Look, let's set aside every other country in the world. Let's come together, and let's agree on one thing. As for the world's largest state sponsor of terror that has been involved and complicit in killing thousands of Americans—the number one of the hit parade of evil regimes that are projecting terror and malevolence—let's agree not to give them more capacity.

I urge the passage of this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. ROSKAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 46 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to authorize a transaction by a U.S. financial institution (as defined under section 561.309 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations) that is ordinarily incident to the export or re-export of a commercial passenger aircraft to the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

□ 1845

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, similar theme, this is a limitation amendment that would prohibit the administration from being involved in expediting the financing for the Boeing sale to Iran.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chair, the last amendment dealt with the actual sale of the planes. The Iran nuclear deal, the JCPOA, does provide that we should license those planes if we are sure they are going to be used for civilian purposes. So there is, at least, some argument about what Iran is supposed to get under the JCPOA.

This amendment deals with whether we finance airplanes, whether they are made by Boeing or Airbus or anybody else, and exactly what we are going to let our banks finance.

This amendment has nothing to do with the JCPOA, the Iran nuclear deal. Nothing in that agreement promises, hints, or even discusses the possibility that we would go so far as to lend money to one of the state sponsors of terrorism.

I know there is concern: Do we want to boycott everybody in the world? There are only three countries that are state sponsors of terrorism, and two of them—Syrian and Sudan—no bank would lend money to. So this is one country that we have to deal with that is a state sponsor of terrorism that might borrow money.

Why shouldn't we allow it?

First, because we shouldn't allow our banks to endanger their depositors' money with loans to Iran.

Second, because we don't want major banks lobbying this Congress and saying: ''Oh, my God, you have got to be nice to the Iranians or we won't get paid back and we might fail and then you will have to bail us out.'' We don't need Wall Street to become a lobbyist for Iran.

Finally, because when it comes to fairness under the Iran deal, some say the Iranians have violated it. Some say they are barely technically complying. But everyone agrees they are not overperforming, they are not erring in the direction of being consistent with the overall purposes of the deal. There is no reason we should massively overperform and provide financing we didn't even hint that we might do.

Finally, keep in mind what we would be financing if we finance these planes.

Hundreds of thousands of Syrians have been killed. Most of the country is either in an internal exile or is fleeing the country. Bodies wash up on the beaches of Greek islands from people who risk their lives to escape an Assad regime that is kept in power by the thugs, the money, and the weapons carried to Damascus by Iran.

We don't have to finance this terrorism. We're not obligated to do so, even if we are going to be in the strictest compliance with the JCPOA. We shouldn't expose our banks to that risk.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has the same purpose as the amendment we just debated, that is, to undermine the Iran agreement and penalize American manufacturing companies.

We have already gone over this, but it is worth repeating. The JCPOA closed the four pathways through which Iran could get to a nuclear weapon in less than a year. We do not gain anything by putting limitations on the United States' ability to engage or monitor Iran's compliance with the agreement.

My objection to this amendment is the same objection I had to the last amendment: I see no need to proactively cut off domestic industry's access to a large market and, at the same time, undermine the commitment under the agreement regarding the exportation of commercial passenger aircraft and related parts and services to Iran.

The financial mechanism for any transaction regarding U.S.-manufactured commercial aircraft has not yet been determined. Once the contracts are completed, Iran Air will decide how it wants to finance its purchases. Like the discussion on the gentleman's last amendment, all payment matters will be done in full compliance with U.S. sanctions.

I understand that there is concern amongst some that the financing of any arrangement would be done through the Export-Import Bank of the United States. I would just note here that the Export-Import Bank of the U.S. is prohibited from providing financing to any Iranian airline. We should not be dictating the finance mechanisms for the purchase of American-made commercial aircraft, consistent with an international agreement and U.S. law and policy.

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I have repeated myself. So let me just say this: The amendment harms U.S. manufacturing jobs and ensures that U.S. companies will be locked out of a large aerospace market which is expected to grow for decades to come.

Under this agreement, Iran is being subjected to the most comprehensive, intrusive inspection regime ever negotiated to monitor a nuclear program. If Iran tries to cheat, if they try to build a bomb covertly, we will catch them.

The President has repeatedly said that he will continue to take aggressive steps to counter any activities in violation of existing sanctions. There is no reason to believe that the next President will not do the same.

I strongly oppose this harmful amendment and encourage my colleagues to oppose it as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Quickly, there is the nuclear deal over here. There is Iran, the terrorism regime, over here. What we are focusing on is the latter, the terrorism regime.

This is a map. This is a map that was put together by the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies. It shows flights.

A few weeks ago, an Airbus A300 aircraft belonging to Iran Air, which historically has been on the terrorist watch list by the way, took off from an airfield in southwestern Iran. The commercial jet left Abadan, a logistical hub for the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, and left for Syria. This is not a regularly scheduled flight. There is nobody with a straight face that can say these were tourists, this was commercial travel. Complete nonsense. This is illicit behavior.

Let me show you one other slide. This is from yesterday, Mr. Chair. Iran's air force flew a Boeing 747 from Tehran to Damascus yesterday, and this is the documentation of it. Iran systemically uses commercial aircraft to spread death, destruction, and mayhem; and we can do something about it.

So divorce in your mind, Mr. Chairman, the notion of the nuclear deal that the gentleman from New York was speaking about. It is completely separate. This is our ability to stop an iconic American company that has basically said: ''Well, look, somebody else is doing it.''

Let me ask you one question in closing, Mr. Chairman. When does history ever treat well the entity that said: ''I did this terrible thing because somebody else did it too''?

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is about the Iran deal, and you could paint it any way you want. Anyone can say what they want about it, but it is about a deal that people would like to destroy. And so any opportunity we find, we do it.

The charts that you showed are very good. The charts that the gentleman showed, Mr. Chair, are very good, are very strong, with a lot of information. But I am wondering, aren't those charts being shown to our military? Aren't those charts, in fact, being seen by our government? Isn't our President aware of whatever the gentleman claims?

He makes it sound like it is a secret that somehow folks on the other side found out. Whatever is happening, if something is happening, our government, our military will react to it.

He says to separate the Iran deal from what is going on. Well, separate the military from this President that the other side doesn't like. The military very carefully looks at this and advises the President. So, if something was going on that was out of order within the deal, they would tell him immediately. I know that, and I am confident of that.

This, I repeat, is just one of the many ways that we will see, not only tonight and have seen today, but on many other bills and for as long as we can, to see if we can undo the Iran deal, just the same way some people are trying to undo some other deals that were put together recently by this President.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to administer or enforce part 515 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (the Cuban Assets Control Regulations) or section 910(b) of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7209(b)) with respect to any travel or travel-related transaction. The limitation described in this section shall not apply in the case of the administration of a tax or tariff.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I want to be clear that in just a few moments, I am going to be withdrawing my amendment.

Before I do so, I just want to say a couple of things because this amendment was a very simple and straightforward amendment that did nothing more than allow Americans to travel to Cuba, which is to say this amendment ultimately was about American liberty.

We just heard a long conversation about Iran, and yet, as an American,

you can travel to Iran. You could travel to Syria. You could travel to North Korea. There is no prohibition for any other place on the globe, except for one, and that is Cuba. And that may have made sense 50 years ago.

The reality of today is that it does not make sense today. And so this has ultimately been about American liberty. It has been about the bundle of rights that come with liberty. The Supreme Court has said that as real as the food that we eat or the clothes that we wear or the books that we read, the ability to choose where you come and go, where you travel to, is an American liberty.

So Jefferson said 200 years ago that the normal course of things was for government to gain ground and for liberty to yield. And I think it is very, very important wherein we run into policies that have outlived their usefulness, that may have made sense 50 years, that don't make sense today, that we push back against them. That is what this amendment was about and, again, affording people the true American way, which is to travel as they choose, not as government sees.

Two, it is about bringing change. I signed on to the original Helms-Burton language. The definition of insanity is continuing the same process and expecting a different result. We have tried this approach for 50 years. We have the longest-serving dictatorship in the world in the form of the Castro brothers in Cuba. And it would seem to me, if it hadn't worked in 50 years, might we not trying something different?

It was Ronald Reagan that encouraged engagement. In fact, that has been the policy of this country. So I don't like what goes on in Russia or in China or in Vietnam, but we allow Americans to travel there, believing that that personal diplomacy is part of changing those places.

Finally, this is about government regulation. It is interesting that we are at the eve of real connections, real flights going down to Cuba. But we will have to sign affidavits. We will have to store records for 5 years. We will be subject to 10 years in prison and $250,000 in penalties if we fill out a form wrong. And so this is also about easing government regulation.

So, in my closing, I would just like to say a couple of thoughts. I want to thank KEVIN CRAMER, TOM EMMER, RICK CRAWFORD, TED POE, JIM MCGOVERN, KATHY CASTOR, BARBARA LEE, and about 130 other Members of this House who signed on to this bill. I want to thank Senators JEFF FLAKE, JERRY MORAN, MIKE ENZI, and others over on the Senate side.

I want to thank the U.S. Chamber, who is going to key vote this vote tonight, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Washington Office of Latin America, Engage Cuba, the Farm Bureau, the Americans for Tax Reform, and a long list of others who said that this is something that makes sense.

Finally, I want to say, there is real momentum. As I just mentioned, just today U.S. transportation is outlining eight airlines that will be able to travel to Cuba. Last night, I think there was something of a deal struck between ag interests and the ability to export product or a deal that will be formed in exporting product to Cuba. I think that makes sense.

Given the fact that the Speaker is working against this amendment, I see the handwriting on the wall. I think it best to withdraw, so that is exactly what I am going to do.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 49 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. CARNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 50 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY), I offer amendment No. 50.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to remove any area from the list of areas considered to be HUBZones, until such area has been designated as a redesignated area by the Administrator for at least 7 years (as such terms are defined under section 3(p) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chair, I rise tonight to offer this amendment on behalf of my colleague and good friend, Congressman JOHN DELANEY of Maryland. Unfortunately, Mr. DELANEY couldn't be with us this evening. His father passed away a few days ago, and he is at the funeral in north Jersey tonight. He did ask me to make sure that this amendment was given consideration as a part of this legislation.

□ 1900

Mr. Chairman, the Delaney amendment is a simple reform to the Small Business Administration's HUBZone program to give affected communities additional time to respond to the potential loss of their HUBZone status. The Committee on Small Business has expressed a desire to reform the program more broadly, but there are more than 2,000 HUBZones that are affected by this right now, so we can't wait to see if such a provision is enacted as part of those reforms. Our communities and the economies in those areas need help now.

The SBA's HUBZone program was created in 1997. It was designed to encourage economic growth in historically underutilized areas, areas that have often struggled with poverty and a lack of opportunity. Small businesses in SBA HUBZones receive contracting assistance and a pricing preference for Federal contracts.

For the last two decades, this program has enjoyed bipartisan support. It benefits communities in both rural and urban areas. Right now the Census Bureau works with the SBA to update the locations of Federal HUBZones and, in some cases, to remove an area's HUBZone status. Many small businesses and communities that lose their HUBZone status, including in Mr. DELANEY's district in Garrett County, Maryland, believe that the process is just too abrupt, there is not enough time for these small businesses and the communities they support to adjust.

The short redesignation process also inhibits long-term investment in these communities, which is badly needed. This does not give local lawmakers in those areas enough time to adjust to potentially large job losses that would negatively impact those communities. The Delaney amendment extends the redesignation process, giving underserved areas additional time to respond to the loss of their HUBZone status. This is good for small businesses that are using the HUBZone program; this is good for the employees who work for those businesses; and it is good for the communities that are benefiting from these additional local jobs.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my friend and colleague, Congressman DELANEY, I urge support of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the chairman of the Committee on Small Business.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the House Committee on Small Business, which I chair, has oversight responsibility of the HUBZone program. Our committee has not yet had the opportunity to hold hearings on the program to uncover ways it can properly be improved. It wouldn't be prudent to extend or expand the program until the committee has had the opportunity to perform its due diligence.

I am committed to working in a bipartisan manner with our ranking member, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and others to hold hearings and develop legislation to update and reform and improve the

HUBZone program. I would therefore urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment, but I invite them all to share their ideas as we work through regular order in the committee process. That way we can be sure to take the action that best serves American small businesses and this country.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman for his willingness to work in a bipartisan way with the Committee on Small Business—in particular, my colleague Ms. VELÁZQUEZ—on this issue and the reforms therein.

Mr. DELANEY, I know, would like to see an extension, which is why he has offered this amendment, so that the affected communities have some time to react to the phaseout, potential phaseout of the HUBZones in their areas. I would again urge support of Mr. DELANEY's amendment to extend the HUBZone redesignation period.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Over the years, the Committee on Small Business has seen the HUBZone program move further and further away from its goal, and this amendment would only amplify this problem. Allowing a massive expansion of the program, as has been proposed, would greatly reduce the efficacy of the program by steering contracts away from active economically distressed areas.

The amendment will also dilute the competition in HUBZone contracting opportunities as well as in the free and open marketplace. In some cases, agencies will even be required to pay up to 10 percent more for goods and services to companies that would otherwise not qualify for the program. The chairman and I are committed to working on the HUBZone program.

The committee plans on conducting a hearing in the fall, and I am working on a comprehensive reform bill. We will welcome Mr. DELANEY's participation as we look further into how we can improve this program, while ensuring that contracts are awarded to those areas that need them most.

However, I cannot, in good conscience, support the inclusion of this provision. It has not been vetted by the committee of jurisdiction, and there is not any evidence that this amendment will further the mission of the HUBZone program of supporting economically disadvantaged areas. I therefore ask my fellow Members to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, let me close by saying that we know there is some concern about redesignating the HUBZones, but we have listened, and I think it is best that we wait and let the authorizing committees of jurisdiction work through this issue; and so, therefore, I urge a ''no'' vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 51 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS), I offer amendment No. 51.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay final judgments, awards, compromise settlements, or interest and costs specified in the judgments to Iran using amounts appropriated under section 1304 of title 31, United States Code, or interest from amounts appropriated under such section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, earlier this year, the Treasury Department transferred $1.7 billion to Iran's Central Bank to resolve a long-running financial dispute regarding Iran's arms purchases before the revolution of 1979.

The agreement involved the return of $400 million in Iranian funds that the United States seized after the revolution plus an additional $1.3 billion in interest. This financial transaction was carried out through the Department of the Treasury Judgment Fund, a permanent, indefinite appropriation that was created by Congress in 1956 to pay judgments entered against the United States.

While the U.S. Department of the Treasury claims that the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, IRGC, remains sanctioned under our current sanctions regime, an associate fellow at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies, Saeed Ghasseminejad, recently noted that Iran's Guardian Council approved the government's 2017 budget that instructed Iran's Central Bank to transfer that $1.7 billion to Iran's military establishment, which includes the IRGC.

According to administration officials, outstanding legal claims against the United States by Iran remain, meaning that future payments could be made as a result of any resulting settlement.

It is unacceptable for additional U.S. taxpayer dollars to flow into the hands of the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, and that is why this amendment is needed. It prohibits funds from being used to pay final judgments, awards, compromise settlements, or interests and costs specified in the judgments to Iran using amounts appropriated under section 1304 of title 31, United States Code, or interest from amounts appropriated under such section.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would put the United States in breach of its international legal obligations. It would also lead other countries to question U.S. integrity and reliability in entering into settlements and dispute resolution clauses in a wide range of treaties that directly affect our international economic interests, including treaties designed to protect U.S. investors abroad.

Under the 1981 Algiers Accords, awards of the Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal are final and binding and enforceable in the courts around the country. If the U.S. does not pay, Iran will attempt to enforce the awards against U.S. assets around the world, which are significant. Even if not successful, Iran could tie up U.S. assets in litigation for years.

In almost every administration, the United States has entered into settlements with Iran, including especially with respect to claims at the Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal. Settling certain cases with Iran is key to the U.S. ability to avoiding far greater liability where we believe the Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal is likely to award a far larger award against the United States.

The U.S. has settled certain cases or parts of cases in the past for this reason, including most recently the settlement in January involving the Iran FMS Trust Fund. In cases where the administration does not believe we have serious exposure, it litigates vigorously.

In sum, this amendment would put the United States in breach of its international obligation, expose U.S. assets abroad to needless attachment litigation, and remove our ability to assess U.S. litigation risk regarding claims against the United States and prevent the United States from making important settlement decisions that are in the U.S. taxpayers' interest.

For that reason, for trying not to expose our country to those problems, I urge opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment offered by Mr. DESANTIS of Florida, which has been part of a very effective effort on behalf of Mr. DESANTIS advocating for a more effective foreign policy, especially in light of a deal entered into approximately 1 year ago with Iran that is not in our best interests.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, in closing, the gentleman just proved to me what we already know, and that is that this is about feelings about the deal that we arranged some time ago. It is also an attempt to embarrass the people who put the deal together, embarrass our President, whatever the issue may be; but this one is a dangerous one, because this one exposes the United States to various situations throughout the world that we should not be caught up in.

We have a reputation about paying our debts, about keeping to our treaties, about keeping to our arrangements, even with people we may not be crazy about. If that is what the idea is and that is what the deal is, we should live up to it, and this amendment goes against that. I still oppose the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 52 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS), I offer amendment No. 52.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Treasury to modify regulations that prohibit, or impose strict conditions on, the opening or maintaining in the United States of a correspondent account or a payable-through account by a foreign financial institution that the Secretary finds knowingly engages in any activity described in subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E) of section 104(c)(2) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–195; 22 U.S.C. 8513(c)(2)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I present this amendment on behalf of Mr. DESANTIS of Florida.

Section 401 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 requires the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe regulations to prohibit, or impose strict conditions on, the opening or maintaining in the United States of a correspondent account or payable-through account by a foreign financial institution that the Secretary finds knowingly engages in Iran's illicit activities.

□ 1915

Under section 401(f), the Secretary of the Treasury may waive these prohibitions or conditions if the Secretary determines that such a waiver is necessary to the national interest of the United States, and submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing the reasons for the determination.

However, as noted in a recent Congressional Research Service report, section 401 was not waived to implement the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, while many entities with which transactions would have triggered sanctions under section 401 were delisted in accordance with the deal.

This delisting is unacceptable, given that the U.S. Department of the Treasury claims to be more than aware of the ''concerns that remain'' regarding Iran, ''such as transparency issues, corruption, and regulatory obstacles,'' as reported in a recent Free Beacon article.

Given that the U.S. Department of the Treasury is circumventing the law, this amendment was introduced to prohibit funds from being used by the Secretary of the Treasury to modify regulations that prohibit or impose strict conditions on the opening or maintaining in the United States of a correspondent account or a payable-through account by a foreign financial institution that the Secretary finds knowingly engages in any activity described in section 401(c)(2) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010.

I would encourage my colleagues in this Chamber to support this amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, it is the same thing. I am repeating myself over and over again. That is redundant. Anyway, it is just the same thing. It is that we are not happy with the Iran deal and want to try to find any way possible to undo it.

There is enough support all around to at least try to reach a new day with the Government of Iran and try to find a way to have a better understanding. You know, I am a big supporter of this situation, and people have asked: Why?

Simply because I have seen, I have been a Member of Congress during wartime, I have been alive during wartime, I have been alive during peacetime, both as a Member of Congress and out of Congress. I would rather give peace a chance. The Iran deal allows for that situation.

Secondly, the Iran deal closed many of the pathways that Iran had to building a bomb within a year. And those are still there.

The President, trust me—do I know this for a fact? Am I in the room there in the oval office? No—if there is one item the President does not want to fail, it is on this one. So there are people looking at this on a daily basis. Any chart we come up with, any photograph we come up with, they have it at the White House, I assure you, and they are dealing with this on a daily basis.

So I understand the gentleman from New York, my colleague, has this amendment representing someone else, but he believes in it, and I respect him for that, but I think we should give this an opportunity to work. And if it doesn't work, the very people who supported it, I assure you, will be the first ones criticizing it and making sure that it gets undone or is done away with. But this needs a chance to work, and it is the best we can do. It is the responsibility we have to bring peace to future generations.

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. DESANTIS for bringing this important amendment as we strive to hold Iran accountable.

There are many other bad activities Iran has been involved in directly impacting the United States, our allies in the Middle East, and around the rest of the world. So I do commend the gentleman from Florida for bringing this amendment. I would ask all of my colleagues to vote for it this evening.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. YARMUTH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 54 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 317 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 317).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment with Ms. ESHOO,

Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. WELCH that will make it easier for the American people to figure out who is trying to influence their votes through campaign ads.

In today's political reality of nonstop campaigning, our system continues to fail the American people by allowing special interests and shadow groups to flood our airwaves with anonymous ads, with no true disclosure whatsoever.

Section 317 of the Communications Act of 1934 requires broadcasters to disclose the true identity of political ad sponsors on air during the ad. The FCC currently relies on an outdated 1979 staff interpretation of this law that does not account for the dramatic changes in our campaign system that have taken place over the last 6 years. This has resulted in a major loophole in which special interests and wealthy donors can anonymously spend limitless sums of money to influence the outcomes of our elections.

To be honest, when an ad disclaimer says, ''Paid for by Americans for Kittens and Puppies,'' or ''Paid for by Americans for a Brighter Tomorrow,'' that really doesn't help the American voter understand who may be behind those ads. This is not what Congress intended. Despite having the authority to do so, the FCC has yet to take action to close this loophole.

In January, 168 Members joined Ms. ESHOO and me in sending a letter to the FCC to unmask secret sponsors of political ads. They have yet to act. It is my hope that our amendment, which simply states that none of the funds may be used in contravention of section 317, will send a strong message to the FCC that it is time to uphold the original congressional intent.

But this is not just congressional intent; it is also the intent of the Supreme Court. In the widely discussed Citizens United decision—something that I certainly don't support—Justice Kennedy, writing for the majority, said:

> The First Amendment protects political speech; and disclosure permits citizens and shareholders to react to the speech of corporate entities in a proper way. This transparency enables the electorate to make informed decisions and give proper weight to different speakers and messages.

He also wrote:

> There was evidence in the record that independent groups were running election-related advertisements while hiding behind dubious and misleading names.

In the McCutcheon decision, which basically said that anybody can give unlimited sums to Federal elections, Chief Justice Roberts wrote:

> Disclosure of contributions minimizes the potential for abuse of the campaign finance system. Disclosure requirements are, in part, justified based on a governmental interest in providing the electorate with information about the sources of election-related spending.

So what we are hearing here is not just congressional intent, but also the recognition by the Supreme Court that disclosure is an important part of guaranteeing transparency in our electoral process.

We all know that dark money has flooded our politics, weakened accountability in government, and made it harder for voters to develop a true opinion of the individuals to Congress to represent them. This amendment will help change that and, hopefully, restore a minimum level of honesty in our electoral system.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I have been looking at this amendment and what it says is that none of the funds made available by this act may be used in contravention of section 317 of the Communications Act. This says that you can't do anything against what the law says. I guess that is another way of saying you have got to do what the law says. We call that a double negative.

It doesn't make a whole lot of sense, but I guess it is a good opportunity for my good friend to stand up and talk about Citizens United and make his points, which I find interesting, and I am willing to listen some more.

I want to urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this somewhat superfluous amendment that maybe would prevent the FCC from actually doing its job. That is my observation. And I respect my good friend a great deal. I am just curious as to why he filed this amendment, other than to talk a little bit about what he has been talking about.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of my good friend from Florida. I understand that this amendment has no legal impact in terms of forcing the FCC to do what it is statutorily required to do. It is just a prod. It is a way to say to them: We expect you to do your job.

We are in the middle of a very, very contentious political season in which hundreds of millions of dollars are being spent anonymously to influence voters' opinions and their votes. And we think that it is time for the FCC to act.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, which will help ensure that the public knows exactly who is trying to influence their vote during elections.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I hope the FCC got the urge.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 55 will not be offered.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 57 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. JENKINS OF WEST VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 58 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

> Page 34, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.
>
> Page 37, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, one of the most effective tools in fighting the drug crisis is the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program. It is also known as HIDTA.

This program works at Federal, State, and local levels, bringing together law enforcement to stop drug trafficking in our communities. In my district, the funding is to provide necessary resources to local police departments and county sheriffs' offices to help facilitate efforts to stop drug trafficking. It teams up with local law enforcement, the FBI, and the DEA to get drugs off our streets and lock up traffickers.

The police chief in my hometown of Huntington, West Virginia, says HIDTA is critical to the success of their counterdrug mission. They rely on HIDTA funding to support training and operational activities.

The amendment I offer today is straightforward and completely offset. It will increase funding for the HIDTA program by $2 million. The increase will go a long way in ensuring our sheriff and police departments can continue making strides in combating the drug crisis.

I want to thank Chairman CRENSHAW and the committee for their tireless efforts to fund programs making a difference in our communities. His work on this bill and continued support of HIDTA are truly making a difference in combating the drug epidemic.

□ 1930

Mr. Chairman, while I have only served on the Appropriations Committee for 2 years, it has been a pleasure working with my colleague from Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW.

Again, thanks to the chairman, Chairman CRENSHAW, and I ask for support for my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 68 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to revise any policy or directive relating to hiring preferences for veterans.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank, first, my colleagues, Congresswoman KIRKPATRICK and Congressmen TAKANO and AGUILAR, for helping me with this amendment. We strongly believe that veterans who served our Nation in uniform deserve the chance to serve our Nation in the Federal Government.

Unfortunately, a provision slipped unseen into this 1,700-page document, the Senate defense authorization bill, severely undermines these policies that have been helping veterans get jobs with the Federal Government. Specifically, it will prevent veterans from benefiting from the preference system if they are already employed by the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, this misguided provision was never the subject of a public hearing, it was never the subject of a public debate, it was never the subject of a roll call vote, and it was never voted on in the committee or on the Senate floor. I am willing to bet the vast majority of my colleagues in the Senate do not know that this provision is in the National Defense Authorization Act.

America's veterans deserve better. We deserve the chance to proudly and publicly make our case for veterans preference, a system which has done so much to help courageous Americans returning from war to find good jobs so they can provide for their families. That is why I am offering this amendment. I want to give the Members of this body the chance to go on record in support of our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Chairman, this issue is deeply personal to me. After I got back from Iraq, I saw my friends and fellow veterans struggle to find employment and to get on with their lives. I personally witnessed the physical and emotional toll that joblessness can take on a veteran's life and on their families.

Simply put, the Senate language is a step in the wrong direction. After years of painful progress in combating economic distress and homelessness among our veterans, now is not the time to dilute a system that is working, that has been proven highly successful in promoting veteran employment.

The American people recognize that we owe an immense debt of gratitude to the brave men and women that have served our country. Many of them left civilian jobs, left their lives behind for months, or even years, to risk their lives to defend our Nation.

The veterans preference system helps create a fair playing field for veterans by compensating them for the time they spent fighting overseas instead of working in government or the private sector.

Instead of getting master's degrees, veterans were going door to door looking for insurgents. While other civilians were building their résumé in civilian jobs, our men and women in uniform put in time away from their family, in dangerous situations, with little monetary compensation.

Veterans are not asking for a handout. We have earned this preference through the blood, sweat, and tears we have given this country.

Mr. Chairman, this provision sends the wrong message to our troops. It establishes the wrong policy for our government and for our country and sets the wrong precedent for our future.

On behalf of America's veterans, I urge every Member of this House to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his amendment. I did not have as illustrious a military career as he had, but in the sixties I was proud to serve our country.

There is something that troubles me a lot, and I have to say it. There is always so much talk about our veterans, our veterans, our veterans, and yet, at the same time, people cut the Veterans Health Administration. At the same time, they try to take away preferences that they have gotten and they have earned the hard way.

When we think of veterans, we shouldn't only think of that picture we always see of the person in uniform and so on. There is also the veteran in a wheelchair. There are the young kids that come here and greet us Monday nights sometimes, with a missing limb and so on.

So, to me, I am either a contradiction or I am the way a lot of people should be. I will have to be really forced into voting for Congress to declare war. Given a choice, I don't want any war.

But coming back from that war, I have become a big-spending liberal when it comes to veterans. Give them whatever they want. Give them whatever they need. Give them whatever they deserve. And I mean that sincerely.

So this, to me, is an important amendment that the gentleman brings up. This, to me, is one that sticks to our comments that we care about the veterans. If we start chipping away at the benefits that veterans get, the day will come when we treat veterans just like any other Federal agency and cut away all their benefits and all the support that they need from us.

So I strongly support this amendment, and I hope that everybody else will do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MRS. HARTZLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 70 printed in House Report 114–639.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection for a contract for consumer awareness and engagement tools and resources communication.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would limit the CFPB's ability to unilaterally enter into fiscally irresponsible contracts for the purpose of advertising.

The CFPB has shown itself to be irresponsible with their spending and politically motivated with their choice of advertising firms. In fiscal year 2016, the CFPB has so far spent $15.3 million on Internet ads which have achieved questionable results. The CFPB is devoting a greater portion of its budget to advertising than nearly every other Federal agency.

Moreover, nearly all the CFPB's advertising dollars, including a $12.5 million contract signed in February of this year, are going to a single advertising firm that just happened to be used by the Presidential campaigns of President Barack Obama and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. This is reckless, out-of-control government spending at its worst, and it reeks of cronyism.

Congress must act to rein in this abusive waste of taxpayer funds and stop the agency from throwing away money. We need to end this misuse of tax dollars by passing my amendment. And I thank the Rules Committee for making my amendment in order.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I want to thank her for bringing this before the body tonight, and urge its adoption.

This underlying bill talks about the CFPB, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. We have talked about it a lot tonight. One of the things the underlying bill does is it puts it under the appropriations process, and this is a pretty good example of why they ought to be under the appropriations process.

Most other agencies in the Federal Government are. They come to Congress, and they say: This is what we plan our spending on and here is how much we would like. But they are not accountable to anybody. So we are just trying to bring some transparency.

But this is the classic example of why they ought to be under the appropriations process. If they would walk in and say, ''We just want to spend $15 million of hard-earned taxpayer dollars on advertising,'' we might ask them questions about that.

So it is a good amendment, and I urge its adoption.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the Chairman. I really appreciate his support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, this is an ambiguous and punitive amendment which could prevent the Bureau from making seniors, servicemembers, and students aware of predatory financial practices, interrupt the Bureau's ability to work with consumer advocates and the financial services industry on consumer education, and keep American consumers in the dark about the only agency designed specifically to protect their interests.

For every dollar spent on financial education, $25 is spent on financial marketing. You can see that for yourself by searching for a ''car loan'' or ''credit card offer'' on Google, or looking through the junk you get in your mailbox every week. In fact, marketing of these products has become so pervasive, Google recently banned advertising for payday loans on the basis they were harmful to Google's own customers.

The Bureau has developed a number of tools that we should all be helping to make Americans more aware of, including a great set of resources on home ownership and mortgages called ''Know Before You Owe,'' as well as an online tool that arms consumers with the information they need to identify the most competitively priced loans in the marketplace.

The Bureau has used Internet advertising, as well as TV advertising, through GSA-approved contractors that offer advertising management services to get the word out about these important resources that help consumers plan for their financial futures and save their hard-earned money.

While Republicans claim to support transparency and competition in markets, they want to shut down the Bureau's efforts to educate consumers on how to get the best deals on financial services and avoid debt traps.

At the same time, Republican allies have spent millions of dollars on Internet and television for a smear campaign cynically named ''Protect America's consumers,'' which has falsified quotes from Members of Congress and misrepresented Bureau activities to discourage taxpayers from taking advantage of the Bureau's services.

One Sunlight Foundation analysis found that this bogus group spent $58,000 just on television advertisements smearing the Bureau. What real consumer nonprofits have that kind of money to throw around? Not anyone that I know.

Fortunately, none of the Republican attacks have been able to keep the Bureau from returning $11.4 billion to consumers, or from providing financial advice to more than 12 million unique visitors to their Web site.

We would, however, like to thank the Republicans for giving the Bureau some free advertising for those who are watching the debate. Make sure you visit consumerfinance.gov for more information on mortgages, student loans, credit cards, and banking accounts. And that is consumerfinance.gov, just in case anyone missed it.

I urge opposition to the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I would just thank the gentleman for giving some free advertising there to the agency and proving my point: that we don't need to spend over $15 million of taxpayer money on this. All these services are available already online. Consumers can find this information.

This is about fiscal responsibility and accountability. We weren't even aware that the CFPB was spending this amount of money. As the chairman mentioned, there is no accountability for the agency. So Congress didn't know until a newspaper article did an investigation on it. That is how we became aware that this agency has spent 2.5 percent of its budget this year on ads, the second-highest level among all Federal departments and comparable regulatory agencies for this year to date.

So this is egregious. There is no accountability. It is not needed. So I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1945

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I encourage all my colleagues to support this commonsense measure to save the taxpayer dollar and to curb irresponsible spending. More thorough oversight of the CFPB is necessary, and I believe this is a step in the right direction.

So I thank the chairman for his support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri will be postponed.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia) at 8 p.m.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 794 and rule