

lose a loved one in this mass killing back home. I wonder how we will look families in the eye when we leave Washington and say, there wasn't enough time, we wanted to go home, and yet those who died will never go home.

Mr. Speaker, there is time if we act today. I ask the Senate to stop the tragedy and please call up and pass H.R. 2646, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, because where there is help, there is hope.

HELPING FLORIDA'S ORANGE AND CITRUS FARMERS

(Ms. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, my home State of Florida is well known for the best tasting orange juice that I am fortunate to have grown up drinking, and we sell that orange juice across our great country. But today, our citrus farmers and orange industry are experiencing a crisis unparalleled to anything we have seen in the last century.

Citrus greening—an invasive disease that ravages citrus plants—has steadily taken its toll on Florida citrus, and it is spreading to other States, too. That is why I am proud to support the Emergency Citrus Disease Response Act, which would allow citrus growers to deduct the cost of replacing lost or damaged citrus plants from their taxes.

This Congress must work together across party lines to do all we can to help Florida's orange and citrus farmers. This legislation will help them afford the new trees they need to restore our citrus crop so we can all keep drinking the best orange juice ever.

TREATING INDIVIDUALS FACING SERIOUS DISEASE OR DISABILITY EQUALLY UNDER THE LAW

(Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 670, the Special Needs Trust Fairness Act, which I have cosponsored. This bill would allow non-elderly individuals with a disability to create a special needs trust for themselves, as opposed to needing a relative or guardian to create such a trust for them.

Importantly, these trusts would also be exempt from being considered as an asset when an individual applies for eligibility for Medicaid benefits, meaning the individual with the special needs trust can still be eligible for Medicaid benefits.

This legislation would make a straightforward correction in Federal law that would ensure all individuals facing serious disease or disability are treated equally under the law and are able to manage their lives with independence.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for acting to advance this bill.

HONORING A MINNESOTA HERO

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and thank a true American hero, Jason Falconer, for his bravery during a time of grave crisis in Minnesota.

This past weekend, terror struck our community when an attacker, whom the Islamic State took responsibility for, stepped into the Crossroads Center mall in St. Cloud with an evil intention: to kill innocent Minnesotans. The targets of this malicious plan were parents and their children, college students taking a break from their studies, and mall employees, all of whom found themselves suddenly trapped in a horrible nightmare.

This cowardly attacker had already stabbed 10 victims and may have succeeded in taking life if it were not for the heroic actions of an off-duty Avon police officer, Jason Falconer, who confronted and shot the attacker-terrorist before he could do more harm.

Mr. Speaker, words cannot adequately express the gratitude those of us in my State have for Jason Falconer. He stepped in when he was needed most and protected those around him without even the slightest hesitation or concern for his own safety. During such troubling times, it is a comfort to know that there are true heroes like Jason Falconer among us.

Thank you, Jason, and God bless you.

SPACE TANGO

(Mr. BARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a cutting-edge space technology company located in the Sixth Congressional District of Kentucky. Space Tango has an innovative business model that utilizes the unique environment of microgravity to commercialize new discoveries in exomedicine for various applications on Earth.

Space Tango established a test center called TangoLab1, a reconfigurable experiment ecosystem designed for microgravity research aboard the International Space Station. The company, ably led by CEO Twyman Clements and Chairman Kris Kimel, leases this space and provides technical assistance for research across several scientific fields. Space Tango provides realtime data and commanding capabilities using an end-to-end cloud-based portal as well as environmental telemetry and power consumption.

I recently had the privilege of visiting the offices of Space Tango in my hometown of Lexington, Kentucky, and learned firsthand from Twyman and Kris and their entire team about the

innovative work of this impressive company. I am convinced that, with this technology, we will find the next lifesaving, life-improving medical breakthroughs, and it will happen somewhere other than on planet Earth.

I am proud to say that Space Tango and many other aerospace companies call the Sixth Congressional District of Kentucky home, and I am excited to see what innovations and groundbreaking discoveries they will make in the future, both on Earth and beyond.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 21, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 21, 2016 at 9:10 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 5252.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2615.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 5937.

That the Senate passed S. 3076.

Appointment:

Public Interest Declassification Board.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5461, IRANIAN LEADERSHIP ASSET TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 876 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 876

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5461) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No

amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1245

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, as I was listening to the Reading Clerk read through the rule, it sounded a little restrictive. Today, I went back and referenced my notes just to make sure that I was right. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 876 is a structured rule, but it provides for the consideration of absolutely every amendment submitted to the Rules Committee on H.R. 5461, the Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act. Every single amendment that was submitted by this body to the Rules Committee for approval was approved and will be made in order by this rule.

The underlying bill requires the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to Congress and make that report available online in its nonclassified parts—obviously, the classified parts would be restricted to Members of Congress—that estimates the total assets under direct or indirect control of senior Iranian leaders, including those with ties to the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, it is well-documented that many of Iran's political and military leaders have amassed substantial personal wealth on the backs of the citizens of Iran. It gives them control over all sorts of sectors of the Iranian economy. In fact, the non-partisan Congressional Research Serv-

ice estimates that one-third of the Iranian economy—that includes telecommunications; it includes construction; it includes airports; it includes seaports—is controlled by leaders personally in the government—these political and military elites—through what they will call personal foundations.

Mr. Speaker, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action—that is what most of America knows as the Iran deal, signed by President Obama—has allowed many Iranian entities that are tied to government corruption to be removed from the list of entities that American businesses are prohibited from doing business with—those businesses sanctioned by the U.S. Government. Given the large agreement that we have in this Chamber that the Iranian Government is embracing corruption at every level, it is clear that much of the foreign investment from U.S. companies should be limited but is not under the current regime. What is more, U.S. businesses today that are able to invest in Iran are doing so without any of the knowledge of whom they are supporting and what kinds of corruption may be involved. That is bad news for America. It is bad news for American national security, and it is bad news for the American economy.

H.R. 5461 will shine a light on that internal Iranian corruption, and it will allow American businesses the information they need to determine whom and whom not to do business with. We may hear today in the underlying bill, Mr. Speaker, that these requirements are too burdensome. I tell you that that is nonsense. It is simply a request that the Department of the Treasury, using existing resources—public resources—as well as our classified resources, make this report to Congress. We are talking about only 80 folks. We are talking about the Supreme Leader of Iran; we are talking about the President of Iran; we are talking about members of the Council of Guardians in Iran; we are talking about the Expediency Council and about two dozen Revolutionary Guard Corps leaders.

In the war on terror, in the quest for transparency, I am certain that the United States Government, through the Department of the Treasury, can provide this information. We may hear in the underlying debate that such information will expose our intelligence sources overseas—again, nonsense. There is not a single Member of this Chamber, from left to right, who wants to do that. No one wants to do that. Anything that is in a classified setting that needs to remain in a classified setting will, in fact, remain in a classified setting.

Mr. Speaker, if you have any of those concerns—in fact, if any Member of this Chamber has any of those concerns—I invite him to support this rule. Again, with the passage of this rule, we will move to the underlying bill. We will have a full-fledged debate on that underlying bill, including a debate over every single amendment offered for consideration in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and to support the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for the customary 30 minutes.

With all that we have to do, I can't believe we are here doing this; nonetheless, here we are today, considering H.R. 5461, the so-called Iranian Leadership Asset Transparency Act.

This bill would require the Secretary of the Treasury to report to Congress and post online the estimated total assets under the direct or indirect control of certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, along with a description of how these assets were acquired and are employed, regardless of whether said figures are subject to U.S. sanctions.

The fact is that this bill—and let's be clear about it—is nothing more than another attempt by Republicans to undermine the historic agreement the United States worked so hard to achieve to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. Preventing Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons is a big deal. I am sorry my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't share that view, but it is a big deal. The world will be safer with a nuclear-free Iran.

Last July, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Russia, China, Germany—the P5+1—and Iran agreed to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, which required Iran to abandon its nuclear program in exchange for U.S., EU, and U.N. sanctions being lifted. The agreement officially came into effect on October 18, 2015. U.S. nuclear-related sanctions were lifted on January 16, 2016, after the International Atomic Energy Agency verified that Iran implemented its key nuclear-related measures described in the agreement and the Secretary of State confirmed the IAEA's verification.

Since the implementation of the agreement, Republicans have repeatedly tried to create the impression of numerous scandals surrounding Iran and of supposed violations of the agreement; but the reality is that the agreement has, so far, prevented Iran from developing a nuclear arsenal. While we will continue to counter Iran's hostile activities in the region, we will not undermine the JCPOA.

H.R. 5461 would absolutely do nothing to increase transparency within the Iranian financial industry. Rather, this bill would cause confusion regarding compliance obligations, deter non-U.S. banks from reengaging with legitimate Iranian business, and undermine the letter and spirit of the nuclear agreement the United States worked so hard to achieve.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy, which basically ends with this statement, that if the President were presented with this bill, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto this bill.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 5461—IRANIAN LEADERSHIP ASSET TRANSPARENCY ACT—REP. POLIQUIN, R-ME, AND ONE COSPONSOR

The Administration shares the Congress' goals of increasing transparency and bringing Iran into compliance with international standards in the global fight against terror finance and money laundering. However, this bill would be counterproductive toward those shared goals.

The bill requires the U.S. Government to publicly report all assets held by some of Iran's highest leaders and to describe how these assets are acquired and used. Rather than preventing terrorist financing and money laundering, this bill would incentivize those involved to make their financial dealings less transparent and create a disincentive for Iran's banking sector to demonstrate transparency. These onerous reporting requirements also would take critical resources away from the U.S. Department of the Treasury's important work to identify Iranian entities engaged in sanctionable conduct. Producing this information could also compromise intelligence sources and methods.

One of our best tools for impeding destabilizing Iranian activities has been to identify Iranian companies that are controlled by the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps (IRGC) or other Iranians on the list of Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons (SDN List) to non-U.S. businesses, so that they can block assets or stop material transfers. This process is labor-intensive and requires the judicious use of our national intelligence assets. Redirecting these assets to preparing this onerous public report would be counterproductive and will not reduce institutional corruption or promote transparency within Iran's system.

In addition, this bill's required public postings also may be perceived by Iran and likely our Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) partners as an attempt to undermine the fulfillment of our commitments, in turn impacting the continued viability of this diplomatic arrangement that peacefully and verifiably prevents Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. If the JCPOA were to fail on that basis, it would remove the unprecedented constraints on and monitoring of Iran's nuclear program, lead to the unraveling of the international sanctions regime against Iran, and deal a devastating blow to the credibility of America's leadership and our commitments to our closest allies.

As we address our concerns with Iran's nuclear program through implementation of the JCPOA, the Administration remains clear-eyed regarding Iran's support for terrorism, its ballistic missile program, human rights abuses, and destabilizing activity in the region. The United States should retain all of the tools needed to counter this activity, ranging from powerful sanctions to our efforts to disrupt and interdict illicit shipments of weapons and proliferation-sensitive technologies. This bill would adversely affect the U.S. Government's ability to wield these tools, would undermine the very goals it purports to achieve, and could even endanger our ability to ensure that Iran's nuclear program is and remains exclusively peaceful.

If the President were presented with H.R. 5461, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto this bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is going nowhere. Quite frankly, I think it is an insult to the American people that we are bringing up more and more bills that are going nowhere when we have so much here to do. Congress has roughly a week before we recess again, and instead of focusing on passing a bipartisan bill to actually fund the government, House Republicans are wasting more time with partisan bills like this, and it really is quite unfortunate.

But, since Republicans want to talk about transparency so much, let's talk about the transparency—or the total lack of transparency—of their Presidential nominee, Donald Trump. I have got to tell you that I have been doing this a long time, and I think it is safe to say that Donald Trump's lack of transparency would make Richard Nixon blush.

For 40 years, America's major party nominees have publicly released their tax returns, a simple and basic disclosure made to the American people to help them choose which candidate is best fit to be our next President. Donald Trump, the nominee of the party that is telling us today that they care so much about transparency, has repeatedly refused to release his tax returns. This comes even after he promised in 2014 that he "absolutely"—and I say that in quotes—would release them if he ran for President.

Let's be honest. In this House of Representatives, if Hillary Clinton refused to release her tax returns, there would be an outcry like you have never heard from my Republican friends. There would be calls for hearings and resolutions and probably even a vote to impeach her retroactively once she was elected. We all know that. But, on Donald Trump's lack of transparency—the guy who wants to be President of the United States—they are silent.

The secrecy and the lack of transparency doesn't stop with Donald Trump's tax returns. This month, Newsweek reported on how Donald Trump's extensive financial dealings overseas would pose an unprecedented conflict of interest that could threaten our national security and global interests.

In the article, they write:

Never before has a business posed such a threat to the United States. If Donald Trump wins this election and his company is not immediately shut down or forever severed from the entire Trump family, the foreign policy of the United States of America could well be for sale.

The Trump Organization has hundreds of business dealings involving more than a dozen countries on five continents, including Russia, India, Turkey, Libya, China, and South Korea. Newsweek warns that, as long as The Trump Organization remains open, foreign governments and businesses would be able to funnel money directly into the pockets of Trump and his family. That means American foreign policy would be literally for sale.

It is a situation unlike anything we have ever seen in American history.

For example, Trump's business deals could motivate him to abandon NATO allies like Turkey and important Asian allies like South Korea. His deals in Azerbaijan could force him to alter his position on Iran or undermine U.S. relations with Armenia. His deals in India could influence his position over longstanding conflicts with Pakistan—in a volatile subcontinent where both nations have nuclear weapons.

When it comes to Russia, there are concerns about Trump's heaping praise and praise and praise on an increasingly hostile foreign leader, Russian President Vladimir Putin, at the same time his company is seeking business opportunities in Russia and how that conflict of interest could evolve if Trump were President of the United States.

Newsweek also reports that the friction caused by Trump's business dealings could jeopardize relationships with our allies like Turkey in the fight against ISIS. Additionally, one of Trump's business partners is a South Korean company that is involved in nuclear energy, which makes you wonder if that is why he suggested South Korea should have nuclear weapons.

So, if you want to talk about transparency and if you are worried about conflicts of interest and corruption, you ought to demand that the nominee of your party come clean with the American people. You ought to demand that he release his tax returns, that he make it clear that he would end all of his business ties if, God forbid, he would become President of the United States, which is something that, I hope, we never, ever get close to.

The bottom line is that that is something that is real and is right before us, and, quite frankly, we ought to be doing more about it. We shouldn't be wasting the American people's time with more partisan messaging bills that claim to be about transparency—bills that are going absolutely nowhere. We should focus on passing a bipartisan funding bill that keeps this government open and that takes real action to combat the very real Zika virus and other public health crises that Americans are actually confronting.

I urge the Members of both parties to defeat this rule and get back to work on real issues that actually matter in the lives of the people whom we represent.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he has any further speakers remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would just inform the gentleman that we have one additional speaker who says he is on his way.

Mr. WOODALL. I tell the gentleman I, too, have a rumored speaker who is on his way, so we are in the same boat in that space.

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

I read further from the Statement of Administration Policy, the veto threat that the gentleman from Massachusetts noted earlier.

□ 1300

He did read the section that said: If the President were presented with H.R. 5461, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill.

There is more on this page, Mr. Speaker. He also says: “. . . the Administration remains clear-eyed regarding Iran’s support for terrorism, its ballistic missile program, human rights abuses, and destabilizing activity in the region.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, what he is referencing, no doubt, ties into the report that the State Department released over the summer, naming Iran the number one international sponsor of terrorism.

Now, what this bill asks is: If you know you have a corrupt government—again, in the administration’s words, Iran’s support for terrorism, its ballistic program, its human rights abuses, and its destabilizing activity in the region—if you know that you have a dangerous government and if you know that corrupt leaders of that government are hiding their resources in foundations across the nation, if you know that those foundations are controlling a third of the Iranian economy, continuing to keep its foot on the voice of the Iranian people, if you know that this is true, why won’t you stand up and be counted?

My friend from Massachusetts says we shouldn’t waste our time on this because it is going nowhere. Candidly, I believe leadership is taking those things that folks believe are going nowhere and making them a reality. That is what the President did with this Iran deal.

When I go back and think about the polling that was going on across the Nation while the President was pushing this deal around the globe, there was no more unpopular agreement with the American people. The American people were livid that we would be making a deal to perpetuate the power and control structure in Iran, but the President led on that. He forced that through. I don’t believe we ever got a majority of the American people behind it, but he got a majority of the Congress to support him in that effort.

Mr. Speaker, this is about information. This is about information on a known sponsor of global terrorism. This is about providing information not just to American citizens, but to Iranian citizens. If you live in the nation of Iran, if you have that average annual income of \$15,000, Mr. Speaker, you might be interested to know how the other half lives. You might be interested to know, when your leaders are talking about the Great Satan on national television, where it is they are stuffing their pockets. You might be

interested to know, when folks are talking about you rising up to fight the Great Satan, where those folks have their relatives working, where their millions are growing, what parts of the economy they are controlling. That is all this bill is going to ask for.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we are here to debate the rule today. The rule makes it in order to consider the underlying bill as well as every single amendment that has been offered by both sides of the aisle to perfect the underlying bill.

Again, I urge my colleagues to be enthusiastic in their support of the underlying bill and of the rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would just respond to the gentleman that the reason why the administration wants to veto this bill has nothing to do with the fact that they aren’t concerned about Iran’s role in promoting terrorist organizations around the world or being involved in very bad behavior.

I think they are opposed to this bill because they don’t think it is worth anything; that it is not going to work. In fact, rather than preventing terrorist financing and money laundering, this bill would actually incentivize those affected to make their financial dealings less transparent and create a disincentive for Iran’s banking sector to demonstrate transparency.

Look, we are all talking about this like this is all on the level. The real deal is that my friends on the other side are upset that the President of the United States negotiated a deal with Iran that prevents them from getting a nuclear weapon. So we see a multitude of bills like this coming to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. And if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation that would expand the Department of Homeland Security’s presence overseas.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would strengthen DHS’s operations by authorizing and expanding Department of Homeland Security, Customs and Border Protection, and Immigration and Customs Enforcement programs that vet and screen individuals before they enter the United States. It would add an additional 2,000 Customs and Border Protection officers for overseas and domestic operations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, to discuss our proposal, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for allowing me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” and defeat the previous question so we can bring up my bill, H.R. 5256, the Expanding DHS Overseas Passenger Security Screening and Vetting Operations Act.

Mr. Speaker, everybody we have talked to within the Homeland Security arena says that, as Americans, we are safer if we can push our borders out. So the notion that we should wait on the bad guys to get here is a notion that obviously would put us in harm’s way.

So what we are proposing with this bill is enhancing the ability for us to push our borders out. We have had examples of this. They have all been successful. So this is another effort to resource the opportunity to make sure that our borders not only are just safe, but as safe from American soil as possible.

So 15 years ago, Mr. Speaker, foreign terrorists carried out the most deadly and costly terrorist act on U.S. soil. We committed ourselves to creating the Department of Homeland Security. We resourced it. We put a number of agencies together. We are on a day-to-day basis tracking bad people all over the world, preventing bad people from getting into the United States. To the credit of our men and women, they are doing a good job, but we are only as good as the resources that we put to fight terrorism.

So this, again, is one of the tools in the toolkit that we have identified that we have to have, which is to push our borders out so that we can not only keep Americans safe, but we can, through our enhanced vetting process, keep bad people out.

So as the 9/11 Commission reported, the terrorists that carried out this heinous act on 9/11 were able to exploit legitimate channels of travel to the U.S. from countries around the globe. There is no question about that. To prevent terrorist travel, the Department of Homeland Security has made significant efforts to expand its presence and partnerships around the world to vet passengers well in advance of their arrival to the U.S.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, there are over 200 airports around the world. The last-point-of-departure airports, to speak of, where unless we can vet all those individuals who are trying to come here, they can’t get on the plane. So what we are trying to do is continue to enhance that effort and others to make sure that anyone trying to get to this country—and we can identify that they are bad people—that we will keep them away.

My legislation, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5256, will strengthen these operations to deal with evolving terrorist threats, including the threats posed by individuals traveling without visas from European and other countries with visa waiver agreements with the U.S.

Now, to prevent these terrorists and other dangerous people from entering the U.S., Mr. Speaker, this legislation directs DHS to strategically expand its program that vets and screens travelers. It specifically authorizes key DHS vetting and screening programs. It also provides for an additional 2,000 Customs and Border Protection officers for not only overseas operations, but also to address domestic shortages, particularly at U.S. international airports.

Mr. Speaker, even as we absorb the events of this weekend where Americans carried out terrorist attacks in Minnesota, New York, and New Jersey, we must do all we can to prevent foreign terrorists, including an estimated 3,000 Europeans trained as foreign fighters by ISIL, from entering the United States.

Defeating the previous question, Mr. Speaker, will allow Members to consider my bill, H.R. 5256, that will do just that. Again, Mr. Speaker, we are only as good as we resource the Department to fight terrorism.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), one of the great leaders of this conference.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I do want to commend the gentleman from Georgia for the great work that he does on the Rules Committee. Once again, he has done yeoman's work on this legislation before us.

Frankly, I have some reservations about the underlying bill, but I do respect the goal of this legislation. I also respect the gentleman from Mississippi in his efforts to come up with some legislation so that we can have enhanced interrogation of certain people wanting to come into this country. I think almost everyone on this side of the aisle believes in more detailed vetting of people wanting to come here, especially from countries that we deem as dangerous.

I rise at this time, though, just to make the point that—in response to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), who spent almost his entire time talking about this bill, talking about the transparency of the Republican nominee for President, I also, though, might make the point that the Democratic nominee, Secretary Clinton, has refused for many months to release the transcripts or copies of her many speeches that she gave to Wall Street firms for really what most people would consider to be small fortunes. In addition to that, she has refused to give out details of the approximately 60 percent of the people she met with while Secretary of State who had contributed to the Clinton Foundation, in some cases, very large amounts of money from foreign countries, which really is possibly more closely related to this legislation than is the tax return of the Republican nominee.

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

I would ask my colleagues respectfully to support us in our effort to defeat the previous question so we can bring up the legislation that Mr. THOMPSON mentioned, legislation that would strengthen the Department of Homeland Security's overseas screening and vetting programs.

I would like to think that even though Democrats and Republicans don't always agree on everything, we can agree on something and that this is something that we ought to be able to agree on, and hopefully we will be able to have a vote on it.

Again, I regret that we are bringing up a bill that, again, is another attempt to try to undermine the deal that we have brokered with other nations around the world to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear power, but here we are yet with another bill. The President is going to veto it. We can continue to debate the merits, but it is kind of a waste of time.

Again, I would hope my colleagues would vote "no" on the rule and vote "no" on the bill if we are presented with it.

I would just say one final thing to my friend from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), who I have a great deal of respect for: The deal is that Mr. Trump is the first nominee, I think, that I can recall, who has not released his taxes. Secretary Clinton has released years and years and years of her taxes. We know more about Secretary Clinton than we know about any other nominee, I think, in history.

I have always kind of wondered why Mr. Trump says some of the things he says, which, quite frankly, I sometimes find unbelievable, some of the comments on foreign policy. But when you look at his financial interests and his investments in these various countries, you can kind of understand why he defends dictators, why he never mentions the words "human rights," why he says some of the things he says about urging other countries to become nuclear powers when we should all be talking about how we control nuclear weapons in this country.

□ 1315

If we are worried about transparency and you are worried about conflicts of interest, and if we are truly worried about corruption, now is the time, I would urge my friends on the other side of the aisle, to tell the nominee of your party to come clean. There are so many tangled webs in The Trump Organization, so many financial ties to things that, quite frankly, should give every one of us concern. I don't know what the problem is about a little sunshine.

Like I said in the beginning, if Secretary Clinton did not release her tax returns, there would be calls for hearings and resolutions and there would be Special Orders, and it would go on and on and on; yet, with regard to their

nominee, it is okay for him to withhold all this information from the American people. I think that is unfortunate.

So if we are talking about transparency here today and if we are worried about corruption and if we are worried about conflicts of interest, there is that old saying, "Physician, heal thyself." I would urge my Republican colleagues to hold their nominee, hold their standard-bearer to a higher standard when it comes to transparency.

Mr. Speaker, I urge defeat of the previous question, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward nominees for the Office of the President.

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

I appreciate you issuing that reminder. I don't particularly enjoy this time of year on the House floor because we do have important business that needs to occur here, and we often get off base.

I don't think this is the right time to talk about the FBI investigation into Secretary Clinton. I don't think this is the right time to talk about the pay to play investigation going on with the Clinton Foundation. I don't think this is the right time to talk about all of her employees who have been questioned about her behavior and are pleading the Fifth, one right after the other, and are refusing to answer those questions. I don't think this is the right place for that. This is the right place to talk about something that brings us together, which is the defeat of a corrupt Iranian regime.

Mr. Speaker, my friend from Massachusetts is absolutely right. There are many of us on this side of the aisle who do not like the agreement that the President made with the Iranians. In fact, there are many on that side of the aisle who do not like the agreement that the President made with the Iranians, and you need go no further than this debate today to understand why.

I will read again from the President's own veto statement of this bill. It says: "This bill's required public postings"—these are the public postings of the assets and the corrupt arrangements that are involved in these top high officials of the Iranian regime. "This bill's required public postings . . . may be perceived by Iran and likely our Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) partners as an attempt to undermine the fulfillment of our commitments, in turn impacting the continued viability of this diplomatic arrangement that peacefully and verifiably prevents Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon."

I will say it again, Mr. Speaker, the President's concern is that, by making information public to the American people and the Iranian people—and this information would be published in four languages so that it would be available

to the Iranian people as well—by making information public about the corrupt business dealings of Iranian leaders, we will be violating the agreement the President signed with Iran.

How could this Nation possibly have signed an agreement, Mr. Speaker, that trades away our opportunity to shine sunlight on corrupt practices? I don't believe that we have. But my friend from Massachusetts said, Mr. Speaker: It undermines the letter and the intent of the agreement. To shine sunlight on corrupt practices.

Mr. Speaker, this is why the American people were concerned about the Iranian agreement. This is why we continue to be concerned about the Iranian agreement; but more importantly, this bill is not about that agreement.

The chairman of the Committee on Financial Services testified in front of the Committee on Rules last night, Mr. Speaker, and he said he just can't imagine why it is controversial for us to publish a list of officials and their holdings online. I agree.

It is baffling to me that the disclosure of what is, in many cases, publicly known information but that has not been compiled in a particular place could be a threat to preventing Iran from developing nuclear weapons. In fact, I would argue shining sunlight on the corrupt regime will empower the Iranian citizens to perhaps help us in this cause.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a controversial piece of legislation. This is, in fact, a transparency piece of legislation. The motion to recommit that the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) discussed, candidly, most of what he said I agree with. I don't believe a motion to recommit is the right place to do it. He was not in front of the Committee on Rules last night. The bill he offers as a bipartisan, common-sense compromise has absolutely no Republicans on it whatsoever; but I do believe that pushing out our borders, pushing out our vetting process is exactly the right idea for this country. This happens to be a bill from the Committee on Financial Services. The gentleman from Mississippi happens to be the ranking member on the Committee on Homeland Security. I hope the Committee on Homeland Security will get about that business. I support it 100 percent.

But what I ask of my colleagues here today, Mr. Speaker, is to support this rule so we can debate this bill. Folks on both sides of the aisle like it, don't like it. Debating the bill is the right place to expose it. Transparency is good for the Iranians, and it is good for us as well. If we support this rule, we will also consider every amendment that was offered in the Committee on Rules. Every alternative idea, every perfecting idea, every improvement that this body came up with and brought to the Committee on Rules last night, Mr. Speaker, we are going

to make in order for debate here on the floor.

This is a tough time of year. Politics don't often bring out the best of policy, but we have got a good shot at it today. We have got a good shot at it with this rule. We have a rule here that I think everybody can be proud to vote for; and, as my friend from Tennessee said earlier, then we will debate the merits of the underlying bill and have the House work its will.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 876 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5256) to enhance the overseas operations of the Department of Homeland Security aimed at preventing terrorist threats from reaching the United States, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 5256.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party of-

ferred a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair once again will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the nominees for the Office of the President.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3438, REQUIRE EVALUATION BEFORE IMPLEMENTING EXECUTIVE WISHLISTS ACT OF 2016; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5719, EMPOWERING EMPLOYEES THROUGH STOCK OWNERSHIP ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 875 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 875

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3438) to amend title 5, United States Code, to postpone the effective date of high-impact rules pending judicial review. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5719) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the tax treatment of certain equity grants. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as

amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of September 22, 2016, or September 23, 2016, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on House Resolution 875, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this rule forward on behalf of the Committee on Rules. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3438, the Require Evaluation Before Implementing Executive Wishlists Act, or the REVIEW Act, and H.R. 5719, the Empowering Employees Through Stock Ownership Act.

For H.R. 3438, the rule provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and also provides for a motion to recommit. The rule also provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, for H.R. 5719 and provides a motion, also, to recommit.

The rule makes in order two amendments to H.R. 3438, representing ideas from my colleagues across the aisle. Yesterday the Committee on Rules received testimony from the chairman and ranking member on the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law of the Committee on the Judiciary, as well as testimony from Congressman ERIK PAULSEN and Congressman JOE CROWLEY from the Committee on Ways and Means.

The REVIEW Act, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.

MARINO), went through regular order and enjoyed a thorough discussion at both the subcommittee and full committee level. In November of 2015, the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, of which I am a member, held a legislative hearing on the bill. The bill was marked up by the Committee on the Judiciary on September 8, 2016. Several amendments were considered.

The Empowering Employees Through Stock Ownership Act also went through regular order. It was passed by voice vote through the Committee on Ways and Means on September 14. This bill, which has bipartisan support, would promote employee ownership at startup companies by addressing the tax treatment of restricted stock issued to employees.

Both bills represent good governance and provide relief for American workers and companies. The REVIEW Act is supported by numerous organizations, including the Chamber of Commerce, the Associated Builders and Contractors, Forestry Resource Association, the National Black Chamber of Commerce, the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, and dozens more.

□ 1330

I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation because it ensures that American businesses won't have to waste billions of dollars if legally flawed new rules are thrown out by the courts. The bill is just plain common sense.

This legislation came about in response to a very real problem. In Michigan v. EPA, the court held that the EPA's Utility MACT rule was legally infirm because the EPA decided costs were irrelevant to its decision to promulgate the rule. Costs of implementing the rule were estimated to cost \$9.6 billion per year, with the intended goal of achieving benefits of only \$4 million to \$6 million per year.

Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. Costs of implementing the rule were estimated to cost \$9.6 billion per year, with the intended goal of achieving benefits of only \$4 million to \$6 million per year.

It seems that something like this would not be true. Unfortunately, it is. The EPA issued a rule estimated to cost more than \$9 billion per year, even though the rule was expected to achieve benefits in airborne mercury emissions of \$4 million to \$6 million per year. The rule costs more than 10 times to implement than it brought in benefits.

Even away from the government perspective, there were questions concerning the actual other benefits as well. You wonder why people are angry at the Federal Government. Rules like this are a good example. Even worse, while the court found the rule legally infirm, it failed to set aside the rule which required businesses to continue to incur compliance costs, pending remand to the court of appeals.

This rule was not stayed by the courts during a multiyear legal battle