

Trump has made it completely clear—in fact, he has offered negotiated positions and compromise, with no response from my good friends across the aisle.

The leader, I think, made some great points about our adversaries, our peer adversaries like China and Russia, and why this shutdown is a bad thing, which is why I ask them to come to the table and negotiate.

□ 1115

Everything he said, almost everything he said, I would agree with. Those are the reasons we need to come together and reasonably negotiate. And I think at the basis of all that, we should remember what this legislative body is all about, which is security for and service to our hardworking, tax-paying citizens. We are 435 different voices from different walks of life, and we know the perfect agreement is rarely possible.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. However, making compromises and trading ideas would do us a whole lot of good right now, but that requires reasonableness. It is time to come together on behalf of the American people and stop this political bickering that is befalling this conversation.

Our country is in desperate need of border security, but we aren't even talking about that now. We are not talking about the humanitarian crisis.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better. I ask the Speaker to come to the table, find a compromise, and let's get back to the work of the American people.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, my friends, end this Trump shutdown, vote “yes,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 52, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the joint resolution?

Ms. GRANGER. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Granger moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 28 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 1, beginning on line 5, strike “February 28, 2019” and insert “January 15, 2019”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, my motion to recommit amends this joint resolution, changing the date of the continuing resolution to January 15.

This will ensure that Federal employees will get the retroactive pay they deserve, consistent with the Government Employee Fair Treatment Act of 2019, that the President signed yesterday.

The Senate will not take up, and the President will not sign, a continuing resolution through February 28. The President has made clear that he will not open the government until our Nation's border security is addressed. But, the Democrats refuse to negotiate with Republicans. They refuse to come to the table.

This shutdown has caused real-world consequences for Federal employees, people who keep us safe and protect our borders, like the TSA, the Border Patrol, the air traffic controllers, and the Coast Guard. My motion will allow Federal employees to get the paychecks they recently missed.

This resolution provides some relief to Federal employees, while we wait for Democrats to come to the negotiating table. We need to start working on legislation that can be enacted into law.

Federal employees should not suffer because of the Democrats' refusal to negotiate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the motion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I must reiterate, today is the 27th day of the Trump shutdown, the longest government shutdown in American history. Therefore, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

This continuing resolution would provide an additional option for President Trump and Senate Republicans to take yes for an answer and end the shutdown. This CR would pay employees; it would reopen government through February 28, providing time for Congress to come to a full-year agreement, without further jeopardizing vital services or the pay of Federal employees.

The order of business would be simple, my friends: reopen the government, pay Federal employees, and then let's have a serious negotiation on border security and immigration policy. Maybe I will repeat that again, because the order of business is very simple: re-

open the government, pay Federal employees, and then negotiate on border security and immigration policy.

It is long past time for my colleagues across the aisle, and across the Capitol, to come to their senses and end this shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this motion to recommit and open the government today.

Mr. Speaker, 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 motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

DISAPPROVAL OF PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL RELATING TO APPLICATION OF CERTAIN SANCTIONS

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 30) disapproving the President's proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 30

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, Congress disapproves of the action relating to the application of sanctions imposed with respect to the Russian Federation proposed by the President in the report submitted to Congress under section 216(a)(1) of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017 on December 19, 2018, relating to terminating sanctions imposed on En+ Group plc (“En+”), UC Rusal plc (“Rusal”), and JSC EuroSibEnergo (“ESE”).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCaul) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5

legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 30, disapproving the President's proposal on certain sanctions on the Russian Federation, under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that we are in this situation. It is the result of the Trump administration, again, trying to make an end run around Congress on an issue as important as Russia sanctions.

On December 19 of last year, the Treasury Department notified Congress of its intention to relax sanctions against three corporations tied to Oleg Deripaska, a Russian oligarch and close associate of Vladimir Putin. The Trump administration may have a perfectly legitimate reason for easing those sanctions. But the reason we are on the floor today is that we just don't know. And, under the law, we have very little time left to get the answers we need.

The sanctions we are dealing with today were imposed under CAATSA—the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act—the bill we passed 1½ years ago to, among other things, slap sanctions on Vladimir Putin's cronies.

The law is written so that Congress would be able to step in if we thought any administration could be making a mistake in waiving or easing sanctions. The Republican majority at the time wrote strict and complex provisions for exercising that oversight, allowing only 30 days to pass a measure that could reverse such a decision.

Again: the Trump administration announced its plans to ease these sanctions on December 19, 30 days ago, in the middle of the holidays, just before the President shut the government down, at the end of the last Congress, and before committees in this Congress have had a chance to organize and look into this very serious issue. This timing leads me to believe that the administration was trying to jam this decision through so Congress would not be able to act.

We ask the administration to explain this decision. Their answers were, frankly, inadequate. We asked the administration to pump the brakes on easing these sanctions so we could review the decision further. They simply wouldn't.

So, with that 30-day window closing, we are now forced to bring this measure to the floor to try to block the decision. It is too bad, really. I would rather the administration respected Congress enough to allow us the time to address our concerns. And, again, the rules for this were put into effect by the Republican majority in the last Congress, and they are good rules. I would rather they hadn't dropped this

announcement when they did—that is the White House—so that our committees could hold hearings and do our work the way we want to.

But with the threat that Russia poses to the United States, to our friends and allies, to democracy around the world, Congress cannot just look the other way when the administration rushes a decision like this. There are too many open questions about whether Deripaska will still control the companies that these sanctions address.

So, we need to move this resolution of disapproval before the clock runs out, and I ask all Members on both sides of the aisle to support it today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this joint resolution.

I have long maintained that provocations by Vladimir Putin and his cronies require a decisive and forceful response by the United States.

As the former chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, I love the effort to strengthen our cyber defenses so that Russia cannot attack our political institutions and undermine our democracy. I have seen the classified reports and I know the threats. I take a back seat to no one in confronting Russia's malicious activities. The whole world has seen Russia's aggression in Ukraine and its support for Assad's brutality in Syria.

□ 1130

Bottom line, Putin's Russia is an adversary and must be treated as one. An effective foreign policy needs to use all economic and diplomatic tools to confront belligerent behavior by a foreign power. Those who threaten America and our allies need to understand that they will pay a heavy price so long as those threats persist.

As someone who believes that partisanship should stop at the water's edge, as the chairman often says at our Foreign Affairs Committee briefings, I don't believe that this issue should divide our two parties. In fact, it should unite us.

This also means that Congress must guard against playing partisan politics with sanctions. We must impose them when they are warranted, and we must allow them to be lifted when they have accomplished their goals.

I think many Members find Treasury's case for delisting these particular Russian companies to have an argument, but not very compelling.

For example, some still have questions about whether moving some of the oligarch shares to a family charity and to a sanctioned Russian bank will sufficiently sever the control and enrichment that he currently enjoys, and whether we can adequately monitor that with transparency.

Even though we may have a good-faith disagreement about the wisdom of this particular delisting at this

point in time, I do want to commend the Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control. They implement and police many of the sanctions that Congress enacts, and there are good reasons for their bipartisan reputation for integrity and professionalism.

But because we cannot be sure that we have removed the heavy hand of this Russian oligarch, I cannot support the delisting of these sanctioned entities at this point in time. Therefore, I support this joint resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), who is a valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

I listened to my friend from Texas, who I admire, but he is defending the indefensible. Partisan? I rise strongly in support of the H.J. Res. 30 today disapproving the President's unimaginable proposal to lift sanctions on three companies affiliated with a Russian gangster oligarch, Oleg Deripaska.

Congress overwhelmingly passed the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, CAATSA, in August of 2017, to hold Putin and his cronies accountable for Russian interference in our election, Russian invasions of sovereign territories of other nations, and its other malign behavior.

Under that authority, the Treasury Department Office of Foreign Assets Control imposed sanctions on Oleg Deripaska, a close Putin ally, and several of his companies, including United Company RUSAL, EN+ Group, and JSC EuroSibEnergo. In doing so, the Trump Treasury Department stated Deripaska has said he does not separate himself from the Russian state.

Deripaska has been investigated for money laundering and has been accused of threatening the lives of business rivals, illegally wiretapping a government official, extortion, organized crime, and racketeering. This is the man you want to lift sanctions on?

In addition, we have recently learned that Deripaska worked closely with Trump's former campaign manager, Paul Manafort, including on a lobbying project that Manafort said would greatly benefit the Putin government.

Manafort reportedly also offered to give Deripaska private briefings about the Trump Presidential campaign. Does this sound like someone deserving of exemption from U.S. sanctions?

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, apparently, it does to the Trump administration, which has agreed to lift sanctions on three of his companies in exchange for Deripaska dropping his ownership

stake from 70 to 44.95, never mind that the new chairman of United Company RUSAL's board, Jean-Pierre Thomas, has himself defended the Russian illegal occupation, condemned by the world, of Crimea, part of sovereign Ukraine.

That is exactly why Congress required in CAATSA a congressional notification before sanctions could be lifted to prevent this President from allowing his inexplicable bromance with Putin to supersede U.S. national security interests.

Now is the time not to ease pressure on Putin. I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 30.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and my classmate in Congress.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, 1988 was a good year.

Mr. Speaker, today we vote on H.J. Res. 30 to disapprove the President's proposal to terminate sanctions on Russian companies, including United Company RUSAL. My colleagues and I have serious concerns about many of the questions that, to this date, remain unanswered from the Trump administration.

Russian oligarch Oleg Deripaska is a sanctioned individual known as a bad actor with close ties to the Putin administration. The agreement reached between the Department of the Treasury and these entities seems to allow Deripaska to maintain considerable control and influence of Russian energy holding companies.

A week ago, I asked the Treasury Department to delay the lifting of these sanctions to allow for Congress to conduct meaningful oversight. My staff informs me that the Treasury Department has confirmed receipt of my letter, but to this moment, we have not received any word from Treasury on their intentions. Given an expiration date of tomorrow, it is unlikely that we will.

As Members of this Congress, our duty to the American people is to exercise the oversight that ensures that the administration's actions are, indeed, legitimate. We have a duty to ensure that this administration takes a firm stand on bad behavior by the Russian Government.

I think some of the more important elements of this consideration could be taken care of with just a few months of delay while we exercise our constitutional responsibilities.

The Russian Government has, time and again, prevented us from doing what I have just described. We intend here to proceed, even in the aftermath of this decision today and what the Senate did yesterday, to consider and to take a look at this act that we believe today violates the intention of our congressional responsibilities.

The malicious cyberinterference that has attempted to subvert Western democracies, including ours, needs to be fully examined. I urge my colleagues to vote for this joint resolution.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the chairman of the important Intelligence Committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in support of the joint resolution, which disapproves the removal of sanctions against three companies owned by the Russian oligarch and Putin crony, Oleg Deripaska. Mr. Deripaska's complicity and Putin's efforts to undermine our democracy and those of our allies is well known, and this is without the benefit of what the special counsel has investigated and thus far uncovered.

Simply put, the Treasury Department has not provided Congress with convincing evidence that the deal reached with Mr. Deripaska truly ends his control over the companies. And the Treasury Department has not provided Congress with convincing evidence that Mr. Deripaska will not, in fact, benefit financially from the divestiture of these businesses.

These sanctions were imposed last year on Mr. Deripaska and these companies, over Mr. Deripaska's malign efforts and the Kremlin's malign efforts to interfere in our democracy, as well as the efforts to invade Russia's neighbor and the continuing destabilization of Ukraine.

The simple reality is, having imposed these sanctions as a deterrent, nothing has changed in the Kremlin's behavior to warrant the relaxation of these sanctions.

Sanctions are imposed for a reason. The reason these were imposed was because of the malevolent actions of Mr. Deripaska and the Kremlin. They are intended to influence the Kremlin's behavior. So what has changed that merits now the relaxation of these sanctions? The answer is nothing.

The Russian actions in the last election continued, through the manipulation of social media, to meddle in our democratic affairs. Violence along the line of contact between Russia and Ukraine continues and within Ukraine continues. Nothing has changed in the Kremlin behavior.

Nothing has changed to warrant Treasury lifting these sanctions, and so I join my colleagues.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues on a bipartisan basis, and I thank my colleague from Texas for his support to disapprove of this relaxation of sanctions on Russia and Mr. Deripaska, and to urge the rest of the Congress to join us.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) the chair of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, you have heard all of the facts about what is happening in the Treasury Department. I do not understand, for the life of me, why there is any elected official who would support delisting these companies and Deripaska.

We are dealing with the enemy. We are in an investigation. Deripaska is a criminal. He is closely aligned with Putin. We know everything about him, and we know that he would benefit from this delisting.

He would retain 45 percent of the shares or the ownership in these companies. Of course, he will use that to basically pay off the debts to the bank that he owes.

I don't know why we have Republicans who don't understand this. Where are they? Why are they not down here defending what they are going to do with their vote? Why are they not down here explaining why somehow they are not putting this democracy first?

This is not the first sanction that they are going to try to delist. Oh, they are coming with another in a few days. It has to do with Jamaica, and I know all about that. And they are going to keep coming.

We should be implementing sanctions. This is about the invasion and the attack on Crimea. This is about all of the other atrocities that have occurred and have been implemented by Putin and the oligarchs of Russia.

We need to stand up, and we need to say that, yes, we are going to have sanctions. They are going to be implemented. We are going to make sure that we don't align ourselves with the people who are undermining this democracy.

They have hacked into our DNC. They have hacked into our State electoral systems. And here we have people who are willing to say that is okay; that is all right; let them continue to do what they do.

The Republicans who did not vote on the Senate side need to be called out. This is serious business, and I want the Republicans to face up to it. Don't hide. Come on down here and defend your views.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 17 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to be clear, as the Republican leader of the Foreign Affairs Committee, that I support this resolution. I am not sure if my opening statement was properly heard by the other side of the aisle, but I join my

colleagues on the other side and support this resolution in a bipartisan manner, as it should be, against our enemy Russia, Putin, and the oligarchs.

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

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

□ 1145

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my colleague and neighbor, Mr. McCaul, I hope that means that every Republican, none of whom are on the floor here with him to explain their position on this, will join us on this important vote, because this sanctions law against Russians was enacted over President Trump's objection. The purpose was to deter Russian aggression against us and our allies, not to yield the right-of-way.

But now the administration is lifting sanctions on a thug who is linked at the hip to Vladimir Putin and who only engages in more wrongdoing.

Let's not aid this one-way gift to Putin, a gift that was deliberately slipped under the Christmas tree at the Kremlin on the eve of congressional departure so we could have as little oversight as possible.

Secretary Mnuchin suggested he was open to meaningful additional time for us to review this, but he has gone radio silent. He calculated that there were enough House enablers to rubber-stamp this sordid deal.

We sought a classified intelligence assessment of whether sanctioned Putin buddy, Oleg Deripaska, would continue to control the world's largest aluminum company after these sanctions were lifted.

Leaders on both the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and Senate Special Committee on Intelligence have expressed their national security concerns about this deal, but Trump wants to us to rely on tweets, not intelligence; on fantasy, not reality. If only he were as eager to reopen this government for American businesses and American citizens as he is to reopen this sanctioned Russian company.

Trump provides sanction relief for a sham deal whereby this one thug transfers his shares to his personal foundation, a kind of Trump foundation-type-group, his ex-wife, and a sanctioned Russian bank.

Treasury refuses to identify for us any of these new, so-called "independent" directors. But what we do know is that the chair of one of these companies is someone who is under investigation by the British Parliament and who cannot see classified information, and the chair of another one is a cheerleader for the Russian invasion and annexation of Crimea and their war with Ukraine.

All of this misconduct is happening against the backdrop of a President who has increasingly become a loud

megaphone for Russian propaganda and attacking our most trusted allies, turning Syria over to Putin, suggesting we withdraw from NATO, praising the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan with a distorted history. Each day of chaos is another day when Vladimir Putin's investment in the election of Donald Trump pays him bigger dividends in driving to undermine Western democracy and our way of life.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, let us send a strong, bipartisan message, not just to the White House, but to the Kremlin, by rejecting this favoritism toward Putin.

Let's vote today as Members of the United States Congress, not the Russian Duma.

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES).

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the advocacy of Chairwoman WATERS, but this is fundamentally not a partisan issue, and I appreciate the ranking member making the point. This is a reputational issue, and I want everyone in the Chamber to understand that this is about the reputation of the United States, about the Congress, about the Treasury, and about each individual Member who votes today.

This is a complicated deal. I have spent hours understanding this deal.

But there is a big question that every Member ought to ask themselves: Is this the moment to relax sanctions on a Russian company; on a Russian oligarch?

Is this the moment to sign off on a deal that allows an oligarch to hand his shares to a Russian bank, which is also sanctioned and controlled by the Russian Government?

At the end of this deal, if this deal goes through, Mr. Deripaska will continue to own and vote 35 percent of the shares of this company. Mr. Speaker, you can control the company with 35 percent of the shares. But an additional 28 percent of those shares will be owned and controlled by affiliates of Mr. Deripaska.

Now, Treasury says that doesn't matter because there will be somebody independently voting those shares. I have asked three times now, and Treasury has not told me who those people are.

So what is the rush?

There is no problem in the aluminum markets today. The price of aluminum today is lower than it was before this company was listed. This is reputational.

The architect of this deal, Lord Barker of Battle, is a British peer who has been denied access to classified infor-

mation in the Parliament and who is under investigation by the Parliament because of possible ties to the Russians.

So I will just close, Mr. Speaker, by making this point: there is no rush. I have become an expert on this deal. Members who vote against this resolution, if Deripaska turns out to be worse than we think he is, if Lord Battle turns out to be worse than we think he is, and if the Russians and Deripaska continue to control this company after this vote, you too will become an expert on this deal, and not in a good way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. McCaul. I continue to reserve, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is our majority leader and the author of this joint resolution.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I thank the ranking member for his leadership as well.

Mr. Speaker, I join Mr. HIMES in saying this is not a partisan issue. This is an issue of America and whether or not we are going to hold accountable those who would threaten and undermine the interests of the United States.

I thank Mr. McCaul for his principled leadership on this issue, and I thank Chairman ENGEL for his continuing focus on making America secure.

Mr. Speaker, I am offering this joint resolution today because it is deeply concerning that the Treasury Department would terminate sanctions on companies owned by Oleg Deripaska.

Mr. Deripaska is a Russian oligarch—meaning essential is very, very wealthy—and is a very close associate of President Vladimir Putin.

The businesses he controls were sanctioned under the Russian sanctions legislation the Congress enacted through bipartisan action in 2017. As I have sponsored numerous bills with Mr. McCARTHY when he was the majority leader to make sure that the Congress was on record and had policies which would staunch the attacks on our country and on our security by the Russians.

I was deeply disappointed that the Republican Senate rejected a similar resolution yesterday. When I say they rejected it, the majority of the Members of the Senate—57 to be exact—supported this resolution.

I talked to Secretary Mnuchin yesterday and the day before, and I asked Secretary Mnuchin: Given the concerns about this legislation, about this withdrawing of sanctions on RUSAL, that they give us until February 28 to have hearings to reflect upon and have further discussions with the administration and make a determination whether we thought this action was in the best interests of our country.

Unfortunately, when the Senate failed to get the 60 votes they needed to bring cloture so that they could get to final consideration of the bill, the Treasury Department decided to go forward.

It is crucial that the Congress, however, make clear that the allies of Vladimir Putin, no matter how wealthy or how powerful they are, face appropriate consequences for their actions against America's security and democratic institutions. That is what this is about.

As Mr. HIMES said, it is not a partisan vote. As a matter of fact, in my view, if Barack Obama were President of the United States today, this resolution would receive unanimous support from my Republican colleagues and overwhelming, if not unanimous, support from my Democratic colleagues.

Now, I understand the Treasury Department's goal in this instance. It is trying to remove Mr. Deripaska from control of these companies. That is a good objective. I am also sensitive to the economic concerns of our European partners who are dependent on aluminum manufactured by RUSAL, which is the Russian aluminum company, one of the largest in the world and almost, maybe not a monopoly, but an overwhelming share of the aluminum market internationally.

However, I do not have confidence that this specific deal accomplishes that objective. I believe many of the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle share this lack of confidence. There are way too many remaining questions for Congress not to act on this resolution.

For example, I am not convinced that Mr. Deripaska would fully relinquish his control of RUSAL under this deal—as a matter of fact, I think it is doubtful that he would do so—or that the Treasury Department used its full leverage in this negotiation.

I am also concerned, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Deripaska would receive massive financial benefit from this deal—this is supposed to be a sanction—massive financial benefit, nearly unprecedented for a sanctioned entity.

Mr. Speaker, I hope our action today will force the Treasury Department to engage more thoroughly with Congress on explaining its actions on this deal and to seek a better one. I think their intent was an honest intent. I am doubtful they achieved it. I therefore urge my colleagues to join me and, hopefully, in a bipartisan way supporting this resolution and I call on the Senate to reconsider its position.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire of the gentleman from Texas if he is prepared to close.

Mr. MCCUAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and, yes, I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. Speaker, I was in the October 2016 classified briefings on the interference by the Russians in our Federal

elections and in our Presidential elections. I condemned it at that time, and I continue to condemn it. I supported sanctions then, and I support those sanctions today.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, until we have been fully satisfied by the Treasury Department, I support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, let me first say to Mr. MCCUAUL that I am very happy to hear those words come out of his mouth. As you know, we have had a tradition of bipartisanship on the Foreign Affairs Committee with Chairman Royce and myself, and now with me as chairman and Mr. MCCUAUL. So I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for speaking out forcefully and saying the right thing.

That is why Congress overwhelmingly passed sanctions on Russia in 2017, because Members of both parties understand the threat that Russia and Putin pose. From the illegal annexation of Crimea to the war in eastern Ukraine to the support to Bashar al-Assad to the attack on our own democracy in 2016, Russia is clearly a major adversary that needs to be dealt with strongly.

So when we see the administration—and I would say this about any administration, Democrat or Republican—when the administration appears to go easy on one of Putin's closest pals, we understandably have serious questions. We need to see the whole picture, and right now we are not.

Congress cannot be left out of decisions this important. That is something I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle understand, and I hope we can send the administration a strong bipartisan message to that effect. This resolution represents Congress doing our job, exercising oversight and using checks and balances provided in the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today the House voted on a motion to suspend the rules and pass H.J. Res. 30, disapproving the President's proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation (Roll Call no. 42).

I strongly support this legislation that prevents the Trump administration from terminating certain sanctions on three companies, including aluminum giant Rusal, controlled by Oleg Deripaska, a Russian oligarch and close ally of Vladimir Putin. These sanctions were imposed under a comprehensive sanctions law passed by Congress in response to Russian interference in the 2016 election.

There are far too many unanswered questions about this decision by the Trump administration. Congress must fully vet whether these companies are no longer owned and operated by Deripaska or his compatriots. Russia must be held accountable for their actions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 30.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1200

CHEMICAL FACILITY ANTI-TERRORISM STANDARDS PROGRAM EXTENSION ACT

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 251) to extend by two years the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendments is as follows:

Senate amendments:

On page 2, line 10, striking “[“6 years”] and insert “5 years and 3 months”.

Amend the title so as to read: “An Act to extend by 15 months the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last week, I came to the floor with Democratic and Republican leaders of the Homeland Security and Energy and Commerce Committees to urge the House to take urgent action to prevent termination of the Department of Homeland Security's Chemical Facilities Anti-Terrorism Standards program.

The House answered the call by passing H.R. 251 by an overwhelming margin of 414–3. Now, the Senate has acted on this critical legislation and sent H.R. 251 back with an amendment. It falls to the House to get it to the President's desk.

Although 414 Members of the House sent a strong message to the Senate