

States, D.C., and 3 U.S. territories, have already been diagnosed with the Zika virus, and more transmission is expected. In my home State of Florida, there are more than 250 people that have contracted Zika, including 43 pregnant women. During pregnancy, the Zika virus can cause a serious birth defect called microcephaly, as well other severe fetal brain defects.

The Zika virus is primarily transmitted through two types of mosquitos, and according to a recent article in the Journal of Medical Entomology, 40 States and D.C. have reported the presence of one or both of those mosquitos.

Public health experts have made clear that it is not if we will have local transmission of the Zika virus in the continental U.S., it is when. Despite that risk, our Republican colleagues are on the floor today playing politics with women and children's access to federally supported healthcare services like Medicaid.

Through Federal healthcare services, women can visit healthcare providers to better understand how to prevent contracting the Zika virus, and children born with severe fetal brain defects can receive the healthcare services that they need.

Threatening receipt of Federal healthcare services by women and children in need of care to advance the harmful Republican war on women is unconscionable. It is shocking that anyone would even consider taking any action that would cut off federally supported healthcare services when the threat of the Zika virus looms so large in this country, especially during the summer, the height of tourist and mosquito season.

This bill is dangerous and irresponsible. Pregnant women who contract the Zika virus and infants born with microcephaly or severe fetal birth defects as a result should have the federally guaranteed healthcare benefits and services that they need and not be punished because the Republicans wanted to score more political points.

Enough is enough. I urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I pose a simple question: When did this institution and the political discourse lose respect for freedom of conscience protections in health care?

It is not fair. It is not fair that individuals today may have legal recourse to protect their civil rights but not

their constitutionally safeguarded conscience rights.

This straightforward bill reaffirms the Weldon amendment protections, gives individuals and entities a private right of action, and makes sure that nothing prevents providers from voluntarily electing to take part in an abortion.

It is written to protect a person like Fe Vinoya, who is one of the nurses from New Jersey. During a Conscience Forum just last week, Fe said:

Participating in the destruction of human life is not only a violation of my religious convictions, it conflicts with my calling as a medical professional to protect life, not to end life.

We owe this to Fe and anyone else who objects to being forced to provide or to pay for abortion services. So I simply urge you, I implore Members to vote "no" on the motion to recommit and to vote "yes" on the Conscience Protection Act of 2016.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1615

NO 2H2O FROM IRAN ACT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 819, I call up the bill (H.R. 5119) to prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds available to any Federal department or agency for any fiscal year to purchase or issue a license for the purchase of heavy water produced in Iran, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 819, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5119

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "No ²H₂O from Iran Act".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON OBLIGATION OR EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS TO PURCHASE OR ISSUE A LICENSE FOR THE PURCHASE OF HEAVY WATER PRODUCED IN IRAN.

No funds available to any Federal department or agency for any fiscal year may be obligated or expended—

(1) to purchase heavy water produced in Iran; or

(2) to issue a license for the purchase of heavy water produced in Iran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

I rise in support of this bill. What this would do is prohibit the United States from spending millions of dollars purchasing from Iran heavy water. Iran—I think we should remember—is the number one state sponsor of terrorism. Heavy water is essential to the production of weapons-grade plutonium.

While this relatively rare chemical is not radioactive, it has long been tightly controlled. Why? Because of its use as a coolant in heavy water nuclear reactors. These are the types of reactors which experts call a plutonium bomb factory.

The history of this goes back. If we think back during the Second World War, the fall of Norway and its heavy water plant to the Nazis created a very real risk that Hitler could win the race to build the bomb. In response, at the time, the Allies launched several daring commando raids—the most daring of the war—and hundreds of bombers in what was ultimately their successful effort to prevent the Nazis from using heavy water to develop weapons-grade plutonium. That is how important this process has been in history in the race to that weapon.

So fast forward several decades, and now the Obama administration's nuclear agreement does not limit Iran's ability to produce heavy water. This is one of the agreement's many flaws, in my opinion. But, instead, the deal allows Iran to possess a small amount of heavy water for its newly legitimized nuclear program and requires Iran to ship any excess heavy water that it produces out of the country.

So, while this deeply flawed deal allows Iran to sell its excess heavy water on the international market, it certainly doesn't require the United States to buy Iran's excess heavy water. If there are no buyers, then Iran would have to comply with the limits on its heavy water possession by suspending production, or it could also dilute any excess heavy water that it currently possesses. That makes sense to me.

Let me be clear. Despite false claims, enacting this legislation would not cause the United States or Iran to violate the nuclear deal. What we are talking about here is something that is not in the deal, whether or not we subsidize their production of heavy water.

So what it would prevent, clearly, is it would prevent the administration from going above and beyond the agreement to deliver Iran financial rewards that were never part of the agreement that passed this House.

That is one of the reasons why the Obama administration's purchase of 28

metric tons of heavy water from Iran is so concerning. Purchases like this only—as I indicated—subsidize and incentivize Iran's continued production of this sensitive material that plays an essential role in the production of weapons-grade plutonium.

I just want to go to the words of David Albright, which I think all of us should reflect on here. He is a respected nonproliferation expert, and he said these words: We should not be paying Iran for something they shouldn't be producing in the first place.

That is my point, Mr. Speaker. So this bill is simple. It prohibits U.S. purchases, prohibits us paying Iran for heavy water from their facility, and, thus, prevents U.S. taxpayer dollars from subsidizing this rogue regime.

I also want to thank the author, Mr. POMPEO, for his work. I urge all Members to support this bill.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, by now, everyone knows that I opposed the Iran nuclear deal. But as I have said again and again and again, now that the deal is done, we need to focus on holding Iran's leaders to their word and holding the regime accountable for its other bad behavior. I think you would be hard-pressed to find any Member of this body who disagrees with that goal.

But there is a right way to do that and a wrong way to do it. The right way to do it is to collaborate across the aisle to draft legislation that will win bipartisan support, that will make it across the finish line, and that the President will sign into law.

The right way to do it is to let committees go through a regular process, a regular order, so that Members on both sides have a chance to debate and contribute.

The right way to do it is to bring it to the floor in a way that ensures we end up with the best possible legislation so that we can honestly advance American interests and protect American security.

The wrong way to do it is to ram it through the Rules Committee—that is what happens here—and bring it to the floor with no chance to offer new ideas to make the bill better. But that is exactly where we are today. That is why this bill is so deeply flawed. That is why it has no chance of becoming law, and that is a shame, in my opinion, because this bill might have been a good starting point.

Again, I think we do need to deal with Iran more forcefully. Generally speaking, I agree that we shouldn't be buying heavy water from Iran. But this bill is far too broad. It is a blanket prohibition—no waivers, no sunset, no exceptions. We have no idea what the unintended consequences of this bill could be in the years ahead. Those are the uncertainties we try to deal with on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

So pull it out of a committee's jurisdiction, give it to the Rules Committee, and the Foreign Affairs Committee really has no say in what is truly an important Foreign Affairs Committee bill.

Mr. Speaker, traditionally, the House Iran-related bills have been bipartisan. The way we have dealt with Iran has maybe been the best example of nonpartisan collaboration on foreign policy, or bipartisan collaboration on foreign policy, and politics stopping at the water's edge. But in this case, the Speaker has totally circumvented the Foreign Affairs Committee and our normal bipartisan approach. I think there are serious consequences to the process that led us here. We are sending a message to the rest of the world that foreign policy issues are now part of everyday politics. This is a dangerous path.

I don't blame my good friend Chairman ROYCE for this lousy process. This isn't the way he runs our committee, and I am grateful, as always, for his fair leadership. Tomorrow, we are marking up 13 bipartisan measures in our committee. That is the way it should be. We pride ourselves in bipartisanship. That is how you pass legislation in foreign policy, and that is exactly what we are not doing here this afternoon.

But I am left to wonder, what happened to the Speaker's commitment to regular order? When he became Speaker, that was the platform he rode on. What do our friends in the Freedom Caucus and the Liberty Caucus have to say about the Speaker's change of heart? It just isn't right.

It leads to bad policy. Foreign policy is rarely black and white. There are very few times when it is smart to say: "This is the right way to go, without exception, in perpetuity." That is what the bill does. Complexity isn't a vice in foreign policy, and sometimes bills that are only a page or two long are the most dangerous.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that we are spending time on a measure that we all know isn't going anywhere and that we all know is just political theater as my friends in the majority move into the convention next week. We could be using this time in an honest effort to make our country safer with this issue, which is an important issue. But a flawed process has led to a flawed bill, and I am forced to oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on H.R. 5119.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO), the author of this legislation.

Mr. POMPEO. I thank the chairman for the gentleman's good work on policing and performing oversight on the JCPOA.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 5119, to prevent the United States purchase of heavy water from Iran.

I want to start by pointing out the recent statements from the Department of State and the Department of Energy confirming that the United States was under no commitment to purchase heavy water from Iran nor is it committed to do so in the future. The Obama administration only acknowledged this fact last month as a result of a congressional inquiry from my office.

This legislation is really very simple and as straightforward as you can get. H.R. 5119, the No 2H2O from Iran Act, would prohibit Federal funds from being used to purchase heavy water and also prohibit Federal funds from being used to issue licenses to purchase heavy water from Iran.

Tomorrow marks the 1-year anniversary of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. This week, the House is taking a stand against Iran and the dangerous deal this Nation entered into—reflecting very much what I hear when I am back in Kansas.

Americans know President Obama's unsigned and unratified political commitment with the Islamic Republic of Iran does not make them safer. Americans see Iran continue to test sophisticated ballistic missiles. They see Iran capture and humiliate American sailors. They see Iran hold Americans and other foreigners hostage. They see Iran fire rockets dangerously close to American aircraft carriers.

While many constituents are back home watching us vote on this issue, the Iranian Ayatollah is watching this too. I know this because Iran is desperate. On Monday, it announced that it had received \$8.6 million in exchange for 32 tons of Iranian heavy water that the Obama administration wanted to purchase back in April.

Only then, only after the Iranians had chosen to reveal the status of this funding, shortly before this very vote, did the Obama administration come clean to the American public with some details of this sale.

Mr. Speaker, must we always find out what is happening between the United States and Iran from the Iranians?

Mr. Speaker, my bill will protect Americans and ensure the United States does not become an active partner in Iran's nuclear program and its terror regime. We cannot legitimize this nuclear proliferator. We have already done enough for the Islamic Republic of Iran. We need not act outside the requirements of the nuclear deal, no matter how much Iranian mullahs

complain and no matter how much they threaten.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, one year ago, our country made the correct decision. We all agreed that Iran should not have a nuclear weapons program, but we decided the better way to achieve that was through diplomacy rather than war.

Today, we deal with yet another challenge to that agreement. The material involved is heavy water. For those who thought that war and military action was the only way to prevent nuclear weapons development in Iran, heavy water is the issue today, but it is just another way to sink a successful agreement.

□ 1630

When you look at the facts, how can it possibly be in our national interest to take away our own authority to take away from Iran a material that could be used in the development of nuclear weapons?

I don't think this is just about heavy water. When you consider the facts and all that is represented here, it is a heavy lift, or a heavy stretch, to believe that limiting ourselves somehow will protect our families.

There are a number of nonmilitary uses for heavy water. The water we are getting from Iran can be used by U.S. industry and research labs. Heavy water is a critical material for biomedical and diagnostic research, such as MRIs and pharmaceutical development, as well as a variety of chemical and environmental analysis.

By purchasing this material, we make our families and allies safer and boost American research and development. Exposed to light, objections to our procuring this heavy water really do evaporate.

In World War II, many lives were lost to keep heavy water developed by a Norwegian utility from being used by Nazi Germany for development of a nuclear weapon. Here, we are using dollars instead of the lives of young Americans and others to ensure there is no nuclear weapons development within Iran and that there is less of this dual-use material in Iran, and more of it in America.

I realize the strong desire here on the eve of the Republican National Convention to undermine any success this Administration has. But I believe this is a bipartisan success. That is one of the reasons that a large number of experts on security policy—and former Members of this body in the United States Senate, both Republicans and Democrats—have joined together in bipartisan support of an agreement that is working and that is making our families safer.

Don't vote to undermine the efforts of this international agreement. Don't drown diplomacy by adopting this heavy water bill.

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

Again, the reality today is that the agreement was not intended to be structured in a way that would give an inducement for Iran to go forward with a production of heavy water and the export of heavy water because, as we all know, in 15 years this agreement is going to be over. At that point in time, we do not want Iran to have a full-scale industrial weapons production capability.

If we create the market for heavy water—right now under the agreement they are not supposed to have it on hand—if we create the market by continuously purchasing this heavy water, yeah, they are going to continue to produce it and, as a consequence, will further develop their capability.

It is odd to me also, since the sale represents a government intrusion into the North American heavy water market, why we would prefer Iran continue the capability of developing this as opposed to an American ally, Canada.

Why would we open the door to future U.S. purchases of Iran's heavy water, which is what the administration is doing here, and choose Iran as the supplier rather than our ally, Canada?

For these reasons, I am very concerned with that line of argument.

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

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago this week, the administration agreed to a catastrophic nuclear deal with Iran, a deal that was eventually rejected by Congress in a bipartisan vote.

Despite negotiating from what should have been a position of strength, the Obama administration has gone out of its way to appease Iran. And even more disturbing, the administration admitted that it used a false narrative to sell the nuclear deal to journalists and, ultimately, to the American public.

As if the deal wasn't bad enough, the administration has made it a point to make concession after concession in order to keep Iran happy. The President tells us that Iran is honoring the deal, but German intelligence tells us they are not. We were promised snap-back sanctions, but the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury have been flying around Europe promoting Iran while trying to find creative ways to give Iran access to the U.S. dollar. Lately, it seems that our cabinet secretaries are acting more like ambassadors-at-large for the Iranian Chamber of Commerce than Secretary of the Treasury and Secretary of State.

We were told this deal wasn't about normalizing relations with Iran, but the administration reportedly is weighing whether to back Iran's bid to join the World Trade Organization. Rather

than just adhere to the deal, we are going above and beyond. We are using taxpayer dollars to buy heavy water from Iran and indirectly eating Iran's nefarious destabilizing activities in the region.

The administration claimed they understood the concerns of our ally, Israel; but Iran violated the U.S. resolution by firing a ballistic missile that said Israel must be wiped off the face of the Earth.

Mr. Speaker, the administration assured us that they are going to push back on Iran's destabilizing activities and human rights concerns, but 12 months later it seems like we have only empowered them.

If the administration won't hold Iran accountable, then the responsibility falls on the people's House.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Iran-related measures on the floor this week.

The ranking member, a few minutes ago, made a point of suggesting that there is no chance that the President would sign this bill, and that we are wasting our time by debating it here today. It is incumbent on us to call out the shortcomings on this deal. It is incumbent on the House and the Members of the House to point out when Iran has violated the deal. As I said frequently during the debate, you cannot do a good deal with a bad guy.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this bill.

I am listening to the debate and, frankly, it is interesting to have the two diametrically opposed views. This agreement a year ago was supported by a range of former Secretaries of State in both parties. It was an opportunity to move forward with our principal allies and with China and with Russia to try and make Iran less likely to develop nuclear weapons.

Mercifully, the agreement is in force, and for this first year it is working. There is a reactor filled with concrete. This item here today is an example of progress that my friends on the other side of the aisle want to turn back. Under this agreement, they are required to reduce the supply of heavy water. We are purchasing heavy water from them, taking it out of their hands. At the same time, there are 14,000 fewer centrifuges that are operating in Iran and under international supervision.

Why wouldn't we want to take away this essential element for the production of nuclear weapons, especially since the United States has an opportunity to purchase heavy water?

As my good friend from Texas pointed out, there are many research applications for which we need heavy water.

My friend, the chairman of the committee, alluded to the question: Why don't we use the North American production of heavy water?

Well, the United States doesn't manufacture heavy water anymore, and Canada has stopped producing it and is selling it off.

Where are we going to get the heavy water from?

I think it is perfect to get it from Iran. We use it, it is beneficial to us, and it takes a potential dangerous item out of their hands.

I think the House should reject yet another effort to undermine the agreement. The world is safer today than it was a year ago when Iran was a month or 2 away from creating a nuclear weapon, and it created a frenzy on the part of some of the people who are justifiably concerned about Iran. Now that breakout date is a year away and we are strengthening the potential ties.

The United States has serially mismanaged its relations with Iran since we worked with the British to overthrow their popularly elected government in 1953 and install a dictator, the shah, in charge. The United States backed the murderous Saddam Hussein in the Iraq-Iranian war when Saddam Hussein used poisonous gas against Iran.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that Iran is one of the few countries in the Middle East where the majority of the people still like the United States, unlike some of our so-called allies over there.

Admittedly, there are people in the leadership in Iran who are bad people who do bad things. The President of Iran has worked with us to try and move the ball forward. This agreement is a foundation upon which we can build. I am pleased that maybe they would buy airplanes from us rather than the French or the European Union Airbus consortium.

I hope that we can get behind the reflexive opposition to this and look at the facts. I think the facts are, at a minimum, we should buy all of the heavy water from Iran we can at a market rate, get it out of their hands, and help us with our needs.

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

I think there is some confusion here. The point is that Iran is continuing to manufacture heavy water. The point is that we are making a market for their ability to export this instead of taking the legacy stock of heavy water that is in the possession of Canada.

The reason Canada quit producing it is because they have ample stock, and the presumption was they would sell that to the United States. Why? Because Canada is not in the business of trying to become more proficient in de-

veloping a market for something which can be used for nuclear weapons production.

We have ample opportunity to purchase this from our ally. It is still a requirement under the agreement that Iran cut back its reserve of heavy water. If we are going to enter an ongoing program to continue to purchase this from Iran, what we are doing is enabling them, enabling them as they prepare 15 years from now, as I said earlier, to have that turnkey operation where they can then have industrial-size capability for the weapons program.

The other point I would make is that the reason the Iranians have a favorable disposition towards the United States—and that is reflected in the polling that shows that two-thirds of Iranians want a western-style democracy without a theocracy—is because they don't happen to agree with the policies of the Ayatollah and what happened in 1979 with the revolutionary regime grabbing control of that government.

The consequences of that government nationalizing companies is that the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps actually controls the economy. When we put money into that regime, what we are actually doing is aiding and abetting the efforts of those that go to the streets and yell "Death to America" and "Death to Israel," and that is exactly what the Ayatollah does.

We should have had a tilt to Iran, yes; but that tilt to Iran should have been to the people of Iran who had that election stolen from them.

□ 1645

That is where our tilt should have been. Instead, we are walking on eggshells, and every time there is a new demand like this one, that we now purchase and aid and abet their ongoing development of capability on heavy water, it is beyond me. We have an annual report that was published last month by the German Intelligence Service, and this is what it reads:

The illegal proliferation-sensitive procurement activities by Iran in Germany, registered by the Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution, persisted at what is, even by international standards, a quantitatively high level last year. This holds true, in particular, with regard to items which can be used in the field of nuclear technology.

Iran is violating this agreement as we speak. It is not being enforced. The debate here should be how we enforce this agreement, not how we augment activities to further encourage the regime to avoid what it agreed to.

Iran remains a center of illicit procurement, anxious to find ways to circumvent U.S. export controls and sanctions. The nuclear deal acknowledged this in annex I, which states that Iran intends to apply nuclear export policies and practices in line with internationally established standards for the export of nuclear material, equipment, and technology.

Now, Iran has done absolutely nothing to implement this provision of the agreement, and the administration appears content to allow them to get out of doing so. That is what is concerning.

Finally, the components for the heavy water plant were illicitly procured. Essentially, the United States Government is buying pirated heavy water because the components for that heavy water plant were illicitly procured.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 5119, the No 2H2O from Iran Act.

It is now clear that a glaring side effect of the disastrous nuclear deal with Iran is that it incentivizes Iran to keep overproducing heavy water—a critical component in the production of weapons-grade plutonium. Because this administration sees no problem with creating a new U.S.-approved heavy water marketplace, it is, thereby, giving Iran a green light to continue overproducing. There should, instead, be serious consequences for Iran's overproduction of heavy water. Under the administration's logic, we are paying and rewarding Iran for being in violation of the nuclear agreement, and we are making it easier for them to have nuclear weapons in the future.

It is high time for this administration to admit to the American people and to itself that Iran has no intention of complying with the nuclear deal. We should not give them any more concessions that cost American taxpayers their hard-earned dollars while advancing Iran's nuclear infrastructure.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to commend Mr. POMPEO and the chairman for their leadership on this issue, and I echo what the chairman said just a few moments ago.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 5119, the No 2H2O from Iran Act. This legislation would block the licensing and purchasing of heavy water—nuclear material that is needed for a nuclear weapon—from Iran.

The bill became necessary when the administration announced it intended to make an \$8.6 million purchase of 32 tons of this nuclear material despite the purchase not being required by the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Further, the administration never clarified how Iran would use such funds or if steps would be taken to ensure U.S. taxpayer dollars are not used by Iran to support terrorism, Iran's ballistic missile program, or to finance other nefarious activities or bad actors in the region.

The bill is necessary, unfortunately, because Iran is still producing heavy

water, and, now, to echo the chairman's sentiments, we are creating a market for it. That just doesn't make sense.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the chairman for his leadership. I think this is a very serious issue. I encourage all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to my friend from Pennsylvania. There is no requirement under the agreement that Iran cannot manufacture heavy water. There is a limit on the amount that they can possess. That is why the reserves are in storage elsewhere. The amount that we are talking about now is already being shipped to the United States as we speak.

Iran has a right, under the agreement, to continue producing heavy water, which it will.

Where is the heavy water going to go?

They can sell it on the global market. I would rather they sell it to the United States at market price than to North Korea or to Pakistan or to some other actor.

This bill is misguided and misses the point. They are not violating the agreement. We are better off in having the heavy water that we need, that we don't produce, and that Canada has stopped producing that we will be able to reinforce the possibility of having a successful agreement over time.

I appreciate the ranking member for giving me the opportunity to at least clarify what I think is reality.

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

A clarifying point is that they cannot sell it to North Korea. Iran would not be able to do that because North Korea is under sanctions on just that point.

I would also just make the argument that there is no scientific or medical breakthrough that is dependent upon purchases of heavy water from Iran; and, if there were, I have no doubt that we could work with our ally, Canada, to make it happen because Canada, in particular, has been creating a reliable, long-term heavy water supply that is able to meet the projected increased needs in North America and elsewhere. Canada stopped producing more because they have too much, and they anticipated that we would purchase this from them. The United States should support our ally, Canada, in this effort rather than in subsidizing a state sponsor of terrorism's production of sensitive material.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. I thank the chairman for yielding, and I thank Mr. POMPEO for his work on this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of H.R. 5119, and I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation.

Here, on the anniversary of Mr. Obama's deal with the theocracy of Iran, passing the No 2H2O from Iran Act is a commonsense thing to do.

There is nothing in the failed, ill-conceived, misdirected, poorly designed disaster of a nuclear deal which says the United States Government is required to help Iran fulfill its commitments to limit its stores of heavy water. I remain unconvinced today by the arguments of my friends in the loyal opposition of the idea that our government would obligate our taxpayers or even possess an option to buy Iranian heavy water in the future. It is ridiculous. There is a private market for heavy water in this world, and the Iranians are welcome to meet their deal obligations in that private market. It is Iran's responsibility to comply with the limits of its heavy water agreement.

As to the nuclear deal, it is not the United States' or any other country's responsibility to buy a commodity in an already limited global market from a government that has done nothing to indicate that it is a friend.

I am proud to support this legislation, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support its passage.

I thank the chairman for his leadership consistently on analyzing the President's transaction with Iran and its shortcomings. Here, a year has passed, and we still see the failings of this transaction every time we turn.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the chairman. I really appreciate Chairman ROYCE for offering this legislation, and I thank MIKE POMPEO for all of his hard work.

Mr. Speaker, here is the deal. We were told by people like Ben Rhodes that the Iran agreement was going to capitalize on winds of change inside Iran and that this could be a way for Iran to cease its offending conduct and become part of the community of nations. Yet here we are, over a year out from this Iran deal, and Iran is increasing its illegal proliferation procurement activities. It is increasing its missile procurement activities. This is not the action of a country that is looking to make nice with the rest of the world. They are taking the concessions that were granted to them in this Iran deal, and they are taking advantage of them, and they are expanding their influence throughout the Middle East.

It is curious because the deal itself, I think, clearly, in looking back on it, has been a failure; but what the administration is doing is doubling down on that, and it is going even beyond what the deal says. It wants to give Iran indirect access to the American dollar. Then this purchasing of heavy water is not a requirement of the deal's. It, ef-

fectively, acts as a subsidy on Iran for Iran's nuclear program. We see other things like really lucrative aircraft deals that will help Iran transport weapons to its proxies in places like Syria and Lebanon.

Of course, there are reports about uranium being found in Parchin, one of the military sites. We are never going to be able to inspect Parchin. That is not even in the deal. That is totally off the table. Iran is not going to permit inspections there; so you could have some of this activity continuing apace there.

I think it is great that a majority of us in this House has been on the right side of this in voting against the Iran deal, in voting for a number of years to sustain very tough sanctions on Iran. And now this series of bills that we have, I think, is important, and particularly the heavy water issue, because it is an unnecessary illicit subsidy that we are sending over to Iran.

If you ask the American people whether they want their tax dollars going to subsidize Iran's nuclear program, you will have overwhelming opposition to such a policy; so I am happy to be here, speaking in favor of this and of the other measures.

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

In the summer of 2013, we passed a very tough sanctions bill against Iran. The chairman and I worked on it together very closely, and we passed it unanimously out of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Think about that—unanimously. We have so many different ranges of ideologies on the committee; yet, when it came to slapping sanctions on a murderous regime, we found bipartisan consensus unanimously. That bill went to the House floor and passed by a margin of 400-20. We sent it over to the Senate, and, unfortunately, the Senate sat on it. It didn't pass it.

I raise this because it shows what can happen when we work in a bipartisan fashion on important foreign policy issues. This is important. My friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle who came up and who spoke disparagingly about Iran and the Iranian Government will get no quarrel from me. I am no fan of the regime's and I am no fan of a lot of things, but I do think that if we are going to pass legislation that is going to have meaning, then we ought to do it together in a bipartisan form.

□ 1700

For the past 3½ years, Chairman ROYCE and myself have worked really, really hard to put our heads together and come up with bipartisan legislation, and this could have been the same. This could have been the same.

This could have come to the Foreign Affairs Committee. We would have debated it, and we would have passed it probably. There would have been some changes with some difficulties that some of us find in the bill, and perhaps we would have had a very similar vote. But it wasn't done that way.

No regular order. Taking the bill out of the Foreign Affairs Committee, where no one on the committee had a chance to either vote or speak on it or give their opinion—absolutely nothing. It was taken to the Rules Committee, rammed down, and came to the floor of the House. There was no process, no transparency, no regular order, no bipartisanship.

My God, if we cannot be bipartisan when it comes to foreign policy, what can we be bipartisan on? Here is a perfect example.

So what happens is this bill is going to pass. I predict it will pass, mostly along political lines. The President won't sign it. It won't probably pass the other House.

But maybe if we had put our heads together and all worked together and sent the bills to the Foreign Affairs Committee and came up with legislation, maybe we could have had a bill that did 80 percent of what this bill did, or maybe 90 percent, or maybe 100 percent but had certain things in there—waivers and other things that are necessary—in the bill. That is why I know that this is not a serious attempt at doing it. It is an amendment attempt to score political brownie points, and that is not what we should be all about, and that is not what we should be doing.

My friends on the other side of the aisle and on my side of the aisle know, when I talk about foreign policy, I try to be principled. We may not always agree, but I try to be principled on it. I try to say what I feel. I try to find common ground.

So I hope this will be an anomaly. I hope that we can go back to the bipartisan ways of the committee. I know tomorrow morning when we mark up all those bills we will be doing it in a bipartisan way and, when we come to legislation, the final product, that it is bipartisan. It is not being bipartisan for the sake of it being bipartisan. It is not just a semantical debate. It is the fact that it is good legislation on foreign policy, and we always say that partisanship should stop at the water's edge.

My colleagues on both sides of the aisle have gone on trips all over the world. We have bipartisan delegations all the time. And what we always find is, as Americans, when we go around the world, there is very little that divides us. There is very little that divides us.

When we were in the majority and I was chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee for 4 years, we went around to all these countries. Everyone on my committee on my trip, Democrat or Republican, had the ability to say whatever was on their mind and not once was there ever a problem because, as Americans, we have so much more in common than we have differences. And that is why, again, bipartisanship should stop at the water's edge.

I worry because the world is watching as American foreign policy falls

victim to partisan politics. And, tomorrow, unfortunately, with another bill, we are going to get more of the same.

So I hope that, in the future, we can get back to business as usual because I know that Congress can work to push back on Iran's dangerous behavior. I know that we can hold Iran's feet to the fire and make sure that the nuclear deal, which passed—again, without my vote, but it passed—and I want to make sure that that nuclear deal is being implemented properly.

That is what we have to do: hold Iran's feet to the fire, do it in a bipartisan way, not try to score political brownie points.

We all love this country. We want the right thing for this country. Let's work together to make sure that foreign policy is as bipartisan as it can be.

For now, I have to vote "no" on this bill. I urge my colleagues to oppose it as well.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have a concern with the administration's decision on this issue over Iran, not necessarily my colleagues here. My concern is that, regardless of how we perceive the Iran deal that we voted on on the floor, my concern is that the administration is now going beyond that deal. It is the administration's conduct here that gives me pause.

When I hear the Secretary of Energy for the President, Mr. Ernest Moniz, he made it clear that the U.S. purchase of this heavy water, in his words, "will be a statement to the world: 'You want to buy heavy water from Iran, you can buy heavy water from Iran. It's been done. Even the United States did it.'"

Why are we giving the seal of approval to Iran's heavy water production? Why is the administration doing that? This is beyond me. It is beyond many experts.

I previously quoted nonproliferation expert David Albright, who has said we shouldn't be paying Iran for something they shouldn't be producing in the first place.

With this policy of purchasing Iran's heavy water, the Obama administration is achieving two things. And neither of those two things, in my opinion, are good. It is legitimatizing Iran's nuclear program, and it is putting more money into Iran's pocket.

More buyers for Iran's heavy water means it will continue to produce this sensitive material. And in just 15 years, when the President's flawed nuclear deal expires, Iran can use this heavy water to produce weapons-grade plutonium.

The Obama administration's latest effort to go above and beyond to accommodate Iran should be rejected.

So I would urge all Members to support this bill.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 819, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the order of the House of today, this 15-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to recommit on S. 304; and passage of S. 304, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 249, nays 176, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 441]

YEAS—249

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

Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)

Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Vela
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)
Zeldin
Zinke

□ 1731

Mr. CARNEY and Mrs. BEATTY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. GENE GREEN of Texas, VELA, and CÁRDENAS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 441, I was unavoidably detained outside the Chamber. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 441, I was unavoidably detained outside the Chamber. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 441. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate concurs in the House amendments to the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 636) “An Act to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.”.

CONGRESSIONAL GOLF TOURNAMENT

(Mr. CRENSHAW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce the results of a competition that takes place every year.

Every year, the House Republicans play against the House Democrats in a golf match that is patterned after the Ryder Cup. This is called the Congressional Cup.

This takes place once each year, and I have been privileged to serve as the captain of the Republican team for 4 years. I am pleased to announce with all the humility I can muster that the Republicans have won again for the fourth straight year.

The good news is that it is a fundraising event that has raised nearly \$2 million for an organization called First Tee, which introduces young people to the game of golf.

The event this year raised a little less than \$100,000. As I said, over a 15-year period, we have raised over \$2 million.

This introduces young people to the game of golf; the principles of golf, like discipline, hard work, and commitment; and life skills to help those individuals.

So I want to congratulate the members of the team for another great win.

There was a lot of hard work, dedication, et cetera.

I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), my counterpart, the captain of the Democratic team.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for yielding.

I am beginning to feel a little bit like “Groundhog Day.” Unfortunately, no matter what Bill Murray does, the result seems to be the same. We keep changing team members, strategies, and so forth, but it hasn’t mattered.

My congratulations to the Republican team. They played extremely well. We will keep trying.

The most important thing, as my colleague said, is the incredible sums of money we raise to help a phenomenal program like First Tee. Most everybody in this body has a First Tee chapter in their district. I know I don’t need to talk about the great benefit it provides to American youth.

So, once again, congratulations to the Republican team.

My final comment would be to say it has been an honor and a pleasure to co-captain this event with my good friend, ANDER CRENSHAW. This will be his last year as captain. I will miss him, but he has comforted himself in every instance with the class and grace you would expect of an avid golfer, as have the members of both teams.

Once again, congratulations to the Republicans. We will see you again next year.

CONSCIENCE PROTECTION ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (S. 304) to improve motor vehicle safety by encouraging the sharing of certain information, offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 244, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 442]

YEAS—182

Adams	Brady (PA)	Chu, Judy
Aguilar	Brown (FL)	Cicilline
Ashford	Brownley (CA)	Clark (MA)
Bass	Bustos	Clarke (NY)
Beatty	Butterfield	Clay
Becerra	Capps	Cleaver
Bera	Capuano	Clyburn
Beyer	Cárdenas	Cohen
Bishop (GA)	Carney	Connolly
Blumenauer	Carson (IN)	Conyers
Bonamici	Cartwright	Cooper
Boyle, Brendan	Castor (FL)	Costa
F.	Castro (TX)	Courtney

NAYS—176

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

NOT VOTING—8

Davis, Danny	Loudermilk	Takai
Hastings	Pearce	Young (IN)
Knight	Poe (TX)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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